

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

## **The Top 3 Things Christians Need to Know About Government, Evolution, and the Health Crisis with Dr. Jay Richards**

(December 31, 2024)

### **FRANK:**

Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the final podcast of 2024. But I hope this will be an evergreen podcast, meaning you can listen to it anytime, because we're talking about principles here that are not just current events.

We're talking to my friend Dr. Jay Richards. We just had him on the podcast on the American Family Radio Network talking about the essentials of some important topics. We covered a little bit of economics based on his book 'Money, Greed, and God'.

Then we start talking a little bit about transgenderism. He's leading the charge to protect young people from this insidious fad that's been going on through the Heritage Foundation. Go to [heritage.org](https://www.heritage.org) for more on that. And then we just started to talk a little bit about the role of Christians in politics and some of the objections you get for that.

We're going to continue our conversation there. Then we're going to get into intelligent design, a little bit, macroevolutionary theory. We're also going to get into American wellness. In other words, how can we improve the health of Americans? Jay's written a book about that as well. But Jay, let's start talking a little bit about politics, if you will. What is the biblical purpose of government? According to the Bible, why do we even have a government? Let's start right there.

### **JAY:**

Yeah, I mean the government is basically to punish evildoers. I mean that boils it down. And so, if you think about it in terms of nation states, I mean the purpose of a government is to protect us from each other.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

So, protect people from getting stolen from, or enslaved, or kidnapped, or murdered, and then also to protect us from external enemies. So, the country as a whole from other aggressors. So, it's foreign and domestic harm. That's its function.

That's its proper God given function. I don't think that we'd be better off without a government. So, I'm not a radical anarchist. The government has a job to do. And because of the fall, it's absolutely essential. Now historically, I think most governments maybe were more bad than good, at least in the sense that they did lots of things that we would find atrocious.

But the question of whether you need a government or not, I think that it's a no brainer that we do. That's what it's for. The danger of course, is always because the government is supposed to enforce the rule of law and protect the rule of law, but it's also can be the primary violator of the rule of law.

So, that's the kind of key political question. How do you have a government competent and strong enough to be able to protect us and enforce the rule of law, but not so unlimited that it violates the rule of law?

**FRANK:**

When we talk about American exceptionalism, some people think it's sort of arrogant to talk about that, but that's not what it means. What does it really mean?

**JAY:**

I think what it means is that the American experiment, we devised a system that's inherently self-correcting and stable and it's really suited for a massive country. I mean, there's certain things that might work well if you're a city state like Singapore or something like that, in which everybody is basically walking distance from you.

There are things that you can do there, just like there are things you can do in a small neighborhood you can't do in a nation state. The United States traverses a continent. It has the two major oceans on either side and it's in the name the United States of America. So, we, our country, our nation is made up of 50 states which all have their own kind of forms of independence.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek      **PODCAST**

All the functions of government aren't in Washington. In fact, a lot of them are the state or the local level. And so, we have that. So, it's a federated system in which power has been distributed between the individual states and the federal government. Then in the federal system we also have a division of power.

So, we have the three branches, of course, we've got the judicial, we've got the executive and the legislative. And then within the legislative, so the Congress, it's divided into these two chambers, the House of Representatives and the Senate, which are elected and determined in different ways.

And then we have a Constitution that specifies what the government's supposed to do and then even have a Bill of Rights. And the purpose of the Bill of Rights is really to just say here's a bunch of stuff the government doesn't get to have control over. And so, that is an amazing system, really well suited for an enormous country that traverses a continent and for limiting the tasks of government so that the private sector and the voluntary sector can do a lot of what needs to be done.

**FRANK:**

Now, our country, contrary to some popular opinion, was not founded directly on Christianity. It was founded on the natural law that's consistent with Christianity that Jefferson referenced in the Declaration of Independence.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men were created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. So, people who don't even believe the Bible can know these rights, Jay. What has happened to sort of natural law awareness in our country?

**JAY:**

Yeah, and the way I would put it is that that's right. At least the national founding was articulated in terms of these universal moral truths that in principle are knowable by everyone apart from special revelation.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

But that by itself is not enough to sustain a country. This is why Adams and all these guys in Washington said that you still need a religious people because you need the kind of reinforcement of that. The natural law by itself is sort of vague. Nevertheless, the federal government doesn't establish a national religion that everyone has to obey.

And I think that's a really good system. So, the free exercise of religion, where we get to bring our religious faith to the public square, it's not ridiculously squelched in the public square. It informs our culture and our institutions. But then when we're arguing about public policy, we try to make the case for the public policy based upon this natural, universal moral law, which I think is real and I think it's taught in the Bible.

The problem is that for really a better part of a century, at least, in the courts, that idea that our laws are based upon a universal natural law has been undermined. So that the law is sort of treated as an evolving social construction, which is essentially kind of a consensus about whatever the elite law schools happen to think at any one time. You can call that progressivism.

And then that treats, President Woodrow Wilson, you know, he treated the Constitution and Bill of Rights as it was a sort of an impediment to his aspirations. That's a fundamentally different political philosophy than the one that was founded in the United States. And I honestly think when I go around and I talk to other conservative Christians, basically what we want, we don't want a theocracy.

What we want is to return to that original synthesis in which we have the free exercise of religion and we're rooting our laws on the natural moral law and not on just whatever happens to be fashionable at Harvard Law School.

**FRANK:**

So, what happened where people started to get this idea that there's this separation of church and state? And what do they even misunderstand about that?

**JAY:**

Yeah, well, of course, it's not in the Constitution. It's a famous quote that Thomas Jefferson wrote in a letter to the Danbury Baptist Church Association. He wasn't a quote he even coined.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Now, Jefferson on these things was probably more radical than the other founders, but he was basically telling that, you know, the Danbury Baptist Church Association getting tormented by another established group that had more power and so he was saying, okay, well, we want a wall of separation between the institution of churches and state.

He was not saying that the public square ought to be scrubbed of all vestiges of religion. But that's unfortunately how jurists in the 20th century started to use that. And so, different courts over time have invoked it as if we're supposed to have a radical, secularist public square, which is just completely contrary to American history, and I think to our constitutional order.

Now, the difficulty is that what happens is that, and we all do this. If there's an error in one direction, we're tempted to overcorrect in the other direction. So, secularists have been saying, okay, that we can't have that Christmas tree in the public square. I'm sorry, you've got to get rid of that granite cross, you know, I drive by every day.

The Bladensburg Cross case had to go all the way to the Supreme Court. And so, we're just dealing with this constantly, this ridiculous secular, secularist fanaticism. And so, then Christians will, some will say, okay, great. Well, we just need to have an established religion, and we'll just establish Christianity. Okay?

But the question's always, okay, like, which denomination? I mean, there's a million questions here, but, you know, that's a kind of overcorrection. What we really want is a freedom and the kind of the robust practice of our faith in the public square. Look, as a Christian, I believe if I'm allowed to articulate these things, for the most part, we can build common cause with people.

And most of us have found that in politics. I mean, I'm at the Heritage Foundation. It's not an explicitly Christian organization. There's Catholics and there's Protestants and there's Jews. But we have a lot in common, partly because we share a lot in common on our faith, but also because the natural moral law, everybody knows that it is wrong to torture children for the fun of.

You don't need the Ten Commandments to teach you that. If you don't know it's wrong to torture children for the fun of it, you need to be locked up somewhere. As soon as you hear it,

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

you know it. That's what Paul said in Romans about the law that's written on the heart. The Gentiles have the law written on their heart.

So, though they had not the law that is the law given to Moses, they still manage to kind of know what is right in a dim way. That's the natural law. Now, we're fallen, so we tend to distort it and kind of ignore it. But that's important to remember, that look, even atheists, they a basic knowledge of right and wrong, even if they're denying the foundation of their knowledge.

And so, for me, I always say the job isn't to tell well, if you're an atheist, you don't know murder is wrong. Bad argument. The question is, what is the status metaphysically of a moral truth that, you know, if materialism is true? It really doesn't make nearly as much sense on materialism as it does on theism.

But that's really important, especially for Christians, to realize. Your fellow human beings, if they're basic functioning people, have a pretty good idea of the kind of rough outlines of moral truth.

**FRANK:**

An atheist certainly knows murder is wrong. He or she just can't justify why it's wrong because they have no moral standard outside themselves.

**JAY:**

Yeah.

**FRANK:**

So, Jay, one other thing about this that I've talked about quite a bit, and it's this idea, in fact, let's go to the issue that you're working on right now, transgenderism. There are many people out there claiming that they have certain trans rights, but many of these people are atheists.

And there's no way to justify such rights without an external standard. So, how can we skillfully navigate this with people to point out that they have no justification for what they're saying? And where do rights come from? I mean, what is a trans?

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

What does that even mean? JAY: Yeah, exactly. Like people... You know, I've had reporters ask me, so do you believe trans kids exist? My answer is, can you define what that means? Because what they are wanting to imply is there is this kind of metaphysical truth. There's these kids floating around, they're trans kids somehow. Right?

Well, if they specify it's going to be, do I think there are kids that have gender dysphoria? Well, of course. Right. But they don't want to say that. They want to sort of participate in this kind of weird metaphysical game. Well, it's the same thing with rights. In some ways, the concept of rights has so permeated the west and frankly the world that we don't really think about, okay, what would be the metaphysical foundations of this?

It is really hard, if not impossible to justify the idea of a universal human rights. So, something that we all have by virtue of being human. If you are a materialist and think fundamental reality is just these blind atoms colliding with atoms, because a right is a claim, a moral claim, you have on someone else or on the government or something.

And it corresponds to a duty. So, if I have the duty not to murder other people, that means you have a right not to be murdered. And that's how you can tell if some things are right. Does it have this kind of universal quality, right? So, there's a right on one side, a duty on the other that we share among us.

Those are moral truths. I think that that's a truth. They are logical truths. There are empirical truths about things we observe. But then the question is, okay, so what are moral truths exactly? What does that sort of mean if you're a materialist? It's really very strange.

And so, anyone that wants to sort of invoke rights, they can't be empirical, right? You can't say, well, we're all equal. Well, equal in what sense? We don't have the same intelligence, or motivations, or looks, or height, or strength. We're different in almost every way you could sort of imagine.

So, equality's got to be something else. It's ultimately, it's a claim of metaphysical status that we have an intrinsic equal value in some sense that confers upon us certain rights. Thomas Jefferson said it explicitly. Right?

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

It's in the Declaration. We hold these truths to be self-evident, that we're all endowed by our Creator. Look, Jefferson himself was probably kind of the least orthodox of the most the founders. And he grounded explicitly in theism.

And I've yet to see a good argument that does it on any other grounds. **FRANK:** Ladies and gentlemen, our country is founded on theism. If you don't like it, you're welcome to go elsewhere. But that's just... [Laughter]

**JAY:**

That's just where it is. You're happy to live here, but don't pretend that that's not true.

**FRANK:**

Right? That's right. By the way, also one other note, ladies and gentlemen, when you think about Thomas Jefferson. Thomas Jefferson had zero to do with the writing of the Constitution. He wrote the Declaration of Independence. He was in France at the time when the Constitutional Convention came together in what, 1787 and the Bill of Rights, 1791.

**JAY:**

And he's hanging out in France. He was very sanguine about the French Revolution early on, whereas John Adams was like, this is a disaster. You know, Adams absolutely won that one.

**FRANK:**

Yes. In fact, let me go back to what you said earlier, Jay. Was it, I think it was Adams who said that our Constitution was made wholly for a religious and moral—

**JAY:**

Yeah. A religious, moral people and wholly inadequate for any other. And that's John Adams, who was a Unitarian. He wasn't a trinitarian Christian, but he was very much a conservative. He was very pious. You know, in some ways, the Unitarians of that age in Massachusetts, they kind of retained the kind of moral precision and fervor of their Puritan ancestors.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**





*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek      **PODCAST**

They just lost the Christian orthodoxy. Because if you read Adams now, I mean, the guy... First, he's just amazing, I have to say. You know, when I was 18, I really liked Jefferson. I think when you're kind of young and libertarian, Jefferson's your guy. The older I've gotten and the more I've read of the Founders, the more I admire Adams.

I just think he of all those men, are just absolutely remarkable people. I mean, it's just staggering. That's why I really do. I think there was this clear providence involved in this. And this is something that we have a stake in. We have a stake in the continued success of this republic that God has given us.

**FRANK:**

And David McCulloch, I think, has a great book on John Adams, if I'm not mistaken.

**JAY:**

It's very good. In fact, Yeah, the movie... Actually, there's an HBO series, John Adams. It is very much worth watching.

**FRANK:**

Yes. And didn't Adams and Jefferson die in the same day?

**JAY:**

It did. Died on the same day. I think it was July 4th of 1820. They were sort of bitter political enemies for years, but then their last years they corresponded with each other and reconciled. It's really—

**FRANK:**

I want to say... Maybe this is too Hollywood to say, but I thought it was 50 years to the day after the Declaration. Maybe I'm wrong about that, but it was...

**JAY:**

It's something really, really staggering. I know. I wish I could immediately pull it up here without Googling the detail, but I know that they died on the same day.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

**FRANK:**

That's right. That's right. Anyway, friends, a lot on politics I wrote in the book 'Legislating Morality'. All laws legislate morality. The only question is, whose morality? Not my morality, not your morality, but the morality. That's what we ought to legislate. That's what Jefferson said.

That's what basically Paul says in Romans, chapter two, the Gentiles who do not have the Law have the Law written on their hearts. Also, I mentioned that, of course, in 'Correct, Not Politically Correct'. So, if you want to read more on that. Now, Jay, you wrote a book with James Robinson on this called 'Indivisible'. Am I right about that?

**JAY:**

That's right. James and I wrote a book in 2012 called 'Indivisible'. And then actually this year, we wrote a similar book called 'Fight the Good Fight', which is, I think, a kind of simpler version of our argument, which is just essentially, how should we think about all the various political issues that we have to deal with as Christians?

First, how do we think of them as Christians? And then how do we argue for these things in the public square? And those aren't always the same things. You know, I have, I think, justified religious beliefs for things that I hold, but I think I can also make public arguments that don't, you know, presuppose specific Christian ideas.

**FRANK:**

Good. So, sum it up before we move on to Macro Evolutionary Theory, Jay. We're kind of giving people the overview of these big topics here. What are the top three things you want people to remember about Christians in politics?

**JAY:**

First is that Christianity played a decisive and crucial role in the founding of the American Republic, and it would be a disaster if that were lost. Secondly, we have a limited government in which religion is not established at the federal level. And as long as that's understood properly, that's a good thing.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

And three, that you can make arguments in the public square. You can bring your religious practices, your free exercise of religion to the public square and make the case for things based on that. And that is not theocracy, and that is not Christian nationalism.

**FRANK:**

All right, let's talk about Macro Evolutionary Theory. Your most recent book or an update to 'Privileged Planet' talks more about fine-tuning. But you've also written about Macro Evolutionary Theory or Discovery Institute for quite a while, along with Stephen Meyer, and Jonathan Wells, and several other great scholars up there.

What are the essentials? First of all, what is Macro Evolutionary Theory, Jay? Let's start there, and then we'll give a few essentials about what you need to know about it.

**JAY:**

And so, the word evolution means so many different things. And you know, you want to sort of nail it down, but evolution can just mean, well, things change over time or different things exist at different stages. So, some animals lived in the past that aren't alive now, things like that. And then, so narrow that to biology.

So, we're not talking about the universe as a whole. We're just talking about the biological world. So, the history of life would be sometimes people use the word evolution when what they're really talking about is the origin of life.

So, how do you get from mere chemistry to biology? And then once you've got, let's say the first living cell, the question is, okay, how do you, what happens that you can go from that to all the amazing biological diversity you have around us? And the sort of most popular theory in biology, we'll say for going on certainly more than a century, is Darwin's idea.

In other words, two things. One, that all organisms share a common ancestor. So, if you work your way back historically, you'll find that every organism, plant, animal, whatever, has an ancestor in common. And if you get all the way back, you're going to get back to this sort of fundamental common ancestor.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

So, that's an account of descent, right? And then Darwin proposed his version of the modification is that you get the variety by the result of what he considered a blind, purposeless process called natural selection, sifting, random variation.

So, you have a population of, let's say finches, right? And they have some variation in their beaks. They're on different islands in the Galapagos. And on some islands, there's a survival advantage if your beak is a little longer and, on another island, maybe where it's a little thicker.

And so, what natural selection does is if you have a survival advantage for having a certain kind of beak, what that means is that you're going to reproduce more than the ones you're competing against. And so, that beak will come to predominate in the population. That's just natural selection.

It's kind of a natural sifting process in which, hey, those that with a survival advantage, they survive over the others. And so, you're going to get particular features preserved in the population. Here's the key question. It's not, is natural selection a real thing?

Is natural, you know, variation a real thing? Of course it is, you know, and we have good examples of it. Antibiotic resistance and bacteria that come to resist antibiotics. The question is, how much does that really explain? How much does this Darwinian process explain in terms of the origin of fundamentally new body plans of biological form, all this amazing adaptive complexity we see in the biological world.

And Darwinists want to insist that it basically explains most of what needs explaining and therefore the idea of purpose or design is superfluous. It's not needed. And then secondly, they'll say, oh, and by the way, design's not scientific, so you're not allowed to say that anyway.

And that's essentially how it goes, right? And so, that's why you see Darwin fish on cars, is because, notice I've never seen an Einstein fish. I've never seen a Newton, fish or a Maxwell fish, or Mendeleyev fish. But there are Darwin fish. Why is that?

It's because unlike almost every other theory in science, Darwin's theory carries a bunch of metaphysical baggage. Or it carries a lot of metaphysical water for materialism. Because

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

biology, by all accounts, you know, when people look at the cheetah or they look at the mammalian eye, you just immediately and naturally think that's designed.

And so, that's the kind of testimony of nature. If you're an atheist, you've got to get over that. And so, that's why the leading Darwinist, Richard Dawkins, in his book 'The Blind Watchmaker', he said biology is the study of complex things that give the appearance of having been designed for a purpose.

He admits that. He recognizes it. So, he says, but it's just the appearance of design. Natural selection and random genetic mutations, they can explain all that stuff that you thought actually required design. That's the whole debate.

And so, the question is, okay, so what's the evidence that natural selection really has that power? And remember, you can't think, because this is what Christians will often do, this is a way they want to get out of this. Let's say, okay, but I think that it could be natural selection, but God's guiding it behind the scenes.

That's not what's being claimed, though. You've got to remember that it's supposed to substitute for God doing something. If God's doing something, that's a different theory.

**FRANK:**

That's intelligent design.

**JAY:**

Yeah, exactly. We all want to do that because you can feel the cost of challenging this idea. But if you can be neutral about it and just look at the evidence, the evidence for natural selection and random variation is that it works. It's like tweaks around the edges. I say, if you were trying to explain the origin of the Encyclopedia Britannica, there are copy editors involved in fixing things at the end.

The copy editors don't explain the essays in the Encyclopedia Britannica. That's natural selection and random variation. It's a mechanism. It does some things in terms of preserving

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

certain traits in populations. It probably has virtually nothing to do with the kind of fundamental questions that still need to be answered in biology.

**FRANK:**

I've heard it put this way that natural selection might be able to explain the survival of a species, but not the arrival of a species.

**JAY:**

Exactly. Yeah, it's the survival of the fittest, not the arrival of the fittest. It's like the pruner that comes in, but it's not the gardener or the planter.

**FRANK:**

What happened to Darwin's finches because he noticed, it's been noticed since then that they didn't really change into other creatures. What happened to them?

**JAY:**

That's the key point. They're still there. They are still finches. I mean, we only treat them as different species because they can't interbreed, because they're on different islands, but they still breed if you put them together.

And so, at least the kind of fundamental you know, understanding of a species as a, you know, a kind of fundamental sort of organism. There's no evidence that natural selection and random variation can even traverse that. I mean, even between a cat and a dog.

I mean, all of the hybrid, all the interbreeding, you know, all the selective breeding, rather, that we do with domesticated dogs. So, you've got a Chihuahua, and you've got the Great Dane up here, right? They're all still dogs. In fact, they're kind of the same species.

And so, that shows you can have a huge amount of variation. In that case, you're actually intentionally selectively breeding. And it just hits a wall. That is a basic observed feature of the biological world. And Darwin's theory has never come to terms with it.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

The only reason that's not admitted is because, frankly, I think that the, the alternative seems unthinkable to people. And so, they don't want to say, well, if it's not natural selection or random genetic mutation explaining the apparent design, now we've got to deal with, maybe the apparent design is real design. Yikes.

**FRANK:**

They will call you a God of the gaps person if you say, well, God did it, and you just can't say God did it. What are they missing when they say that, Jay? Because it's not just an argument from, I don't have a natural explanation. There's something else going on here.

**JAY:**

Absolutely. And so, of course, all I've talked about is there are these limits to the process of natural selection. By itself, that's not an argument for design. And so, the question is, well, okay, let's just think abstractly about what are the features of things or events in which we reasonably infer design?

We do this all the time. People are doing it right now. They're listening to us. Right? Certain sounds, if you have a background knowledge of English, correspond to certain meanings or written text or a sculpture. Right? And then the question is, okay, we reliably infer design.

We detect the activities of intelligence all the time. We would be able to do it if it was aliens from another planet or another galaxy under certain conditions. And then now let's just apply that to the natural world and to biology in particular. And that's what kind of the entire intelligent design literature for Michael Behe, and Michael Denton, and Stephen Meyer has been about is really explicating that in different areas of the natural world.

One, what are the limits of a kind of certain types of explanation and what are the positive evidences or arguments for design as an account of the natural world? Because science ultimately is not about, okay, what's the best kind of narrow sort of physical explanation we can make for things.

What we want to know is why and how things happen in the universe. What's the best explanation for the stuff in the physical universe? And if it's the result of design, we need a

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek      **PODCAST**

system that allows us to see that and to be able to develop it and to argue it. And it's not a, okay, well, I can understand it this far.

And then now, God did it. Nobody is ever making that argument. In fact, a lot of the details have to be cashed out. But you can tell, you can conclude that something's designed, even if you don't yet have a precise account for how that design was implemented.

Like if you discover an artifact. You know, we always use the example in 2001, a Space Odyssey where the astronauts, they find this black monolith under the surface of the moon. No one debates whether this thing, is this a moon rock?

What is this, right? I mean, everybody just knows immediately this has been planted there by some intelligent civilization, but they don't have any idea what it does, what's it for, who did it? That tends to be the case all the time.

We can tell, okay, look, this is the result of getting this system, this bacterial flagellum, in the case of Mike Behe's famous sort of thing that he talked about in 'Darwin's Black Box.' You need lots of protein parts all working together, assembled in the right order in order to get a functioning flagellum.

In other words, in order for the bacterium to have something that would give it a survival advantage, that's not the kind of thing natural selection produces. Natural selection doesn't have foresight. What does have foresight? Intelligent agency. And so, when you see stuff like that, that's not just an anti-Darwinian argument. That's an argument in favor of design based upon things that we're observing.

**FRANK:**

This kind of conclusion is fraught with moral baggage, ladies and gentlemen, for many people. And what I mean by that is, if there is a designer, then maybe He wants us to live a certain way, and a lot of people don't like that implication. In fact, I think it was, why is the guy at NYU escaping me right now? Thomas Nagel.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**





*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

**JAY:**

Yeah, Thomas Nagel.

**FRANK:**

Yeah. Thomas Nagel famously wrote, he said, I don't want there to be a God.

**JAY:**

No, I don't want there to be God. I don't want the world to be like that, you know? And what's funny though, is that Nagel then went and wrote a terrific book, 'Mind and Cosmos'. The subtitle is like, 'How the Neo-Darwinian Accounts of', I don't remember something 'Is Almost Certainly False'. I mean, he himself, as a kind of materialist, realized, okay, this just doesn't really explain stuff very well.

**FRANK:**

So, Jay, before we move on to our final topic, what would be, say, the top three things you would want people to know about Macro Evolutionary Theory/Intelligent Design? What do people need to walk away with? Maybe you could recommend a book or two.

**JAY:**

Absolutely. I mean, I'll just. Steve Meyer's, terrific book, The End of the God Hypothesis is a really good kind of compilation of a lot of this stuff.

**FRANK:**

'Return of the God Hypothesis'.

**JAY:**

Really good. And he talks about the sort of evidence for design across the disciplines. But one is that the sort of the arguments for the Darwinian mechanism are vastly oversold. The mechanism does explain some things. It's real, but it's vastly oversold. The arguments for intelligent design are not God of the gaps arguments or arguments from ignorance.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

And three, if you apply the standard modes of reasoning that we used to detect design in the everyday world, they suffice to lead us to the conclusion that the universe, the natural world are also intelligently designed.

**FRANK:**

Go to [Discovery.org](http://Discovery.org), ladies and gentlemen, for much more on this issue. The folks there at Discovery, Jay has been a fellow there. You're still a fellow there, Jay?

**JAY:**

I am, actually.

**FRANK:**

Okay. Yeah. [Discovery.org](http://Discovery.org), Jay is good at so much. So, that's one of the reasons we have him on this show to do these kind of give me the essentials of each of these topics.

And so, [discovery.org](http://discovery.org) and Stephen Meyer works at [discovery.org](http://discovery.org). Doug Axe does as well. Doug has a great book called 'Undeniable' where he points out, even kids of atheists are saying, that butterfly is designed dad! [Laughter]

**JAY:**

That's right. And Doug's book is such a good supplement to all this because even though he's a very serious scientist, he just points out that, look, everybody kind of knows this. It's just been bludgeoned out of us.

**FRANK:**

Let's do one more topic, Jay. And this is really come up to, I think, the forefront of the American mind certainly in the past year, but ever since COVID and now with President elect Trump, and RFK, Robert Kennedy Jr. American Wellness is now suddenly become an issue and for very good reason. And you wrote a book called 'Eat, Fast, and Feast' a little while ago. Give us your insights on this issue.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

**JAY:**

Absolutely. Well, so 'Eat, Fast, Feast' is an argument for the benefits of fasting. So, it makes the spiritual and theological case, why did Christians fast for so long? What did they do? Why did we for the most part abandon it as a spiritual practice alongside prayer? And then also what's the scientific evidence for fasting?

Because it turns out there's a lot of data about the physical benefits and the health benefits of fasting, which just fasting just means not eating for some period of time. And so, it turns out it's actually bad for us to eat frequently and all the time when we're awake. It's much better for us physically, and mentally, and metabolically if we have periods when we eat and periods when we don't eat.

**FRANK:**

There may be some exceptions for people with certain health conditions.

**JAY:**

Of course that's always true. Like yeah, of course, if you're a nursing mother or something. I'm just talking about on the whole and on average. And that a lot of the metabolic problems and the health problems that we have, I think are the result of the so-called standard American diet. And in particular the way we eat.

It's not just that we eat too much. And then the book is designed first to help people understand that really basically. And then if they decide they want to do it, how do you develop what I call fasting lifestyles? Because you have to ease into it. If you've never done this, most people think that say going 24 hours without eating is just impossible.

But fasting is a skill and you adapt your metabolism to do it. It takes about six weeks, I would say, to really kind of get yourself adapted. But then it opens up vistas that would seem impossible to you if you didn't know how to do it. And so, you may not know, Frank, this has always been kind of my avocational interest, health and fitness.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

In fact, probably honestly half the books I read in any one year are in this area. But in some ways, I mean, we're having these conversations about lots of different topics. The thing, the sort of thread that connects all of them is a bad ideological misuse of science.

And that's true in nutrition science. So many of the things that we're dealing with now as Americans that RFK Jr. talked about in his speech on Aug. 23 when he endorsed Donald Trump. If listeners have not read that speech, just go online and read it.

You might have kind of preconceptions about RFK. You read that speech, it's all about the epidemic of chronic disease, especially among children. Massive increases in everything from Type 2 diabetes, and obesity, and anxiety, and autism disorder.

I mean, crazy, crazy increases. What chronic disease is, is that's a disease that you deal with all the time. So, not a heart attack. Right? Or getting your arm cut off or something.

**FRANK:**

That would be acute, yeah.

**JAY:**

Yeah. And so, the chronic diseases, because these are the things that you would assume, okay, look, we're living longer. Medicine is more sophisticated, so we should be getting healthier and healthier. And in fact, basically the American system is a sickness system. It just treats people's sickness, and it treats symptoms. And we're good at kind of keeping people alive for 20 years sick. But there's something happening that's leading to this massive increase in chronic diseases.

And I'm convinced that a lot of it actually has to do with the kind of perverse incentives created by, I'm just going to call it a cartel, but it's the kind of government regulatory agencies, pharmaceutical and food companies, the media who get most of their ad dollars from these, and then non-profit organizations that you think are medical organizations, but they're really lobbying organizations.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

And when you combine all that, it creates a really, really perverse set of incentives that I think is making us fatter and sicker. Now, if I had been saying this six years ago, people would have thought, okay, he's crazy. I don't know he's talking about. But I think the lockdowns and the vaccine mandates woke up a lot of Americans to this problem.

Because that was like the first time. It's like, wait, why are we locking healthy populations down and closing schools for this thing and silencing scientists who question it? And then you do a rush approval for a vaccine that then you're not just making it available to people, you're mandating it and firing them if they don't get it.

That suddenly woke people up to the kind of dangers of a public health biosecurity state. But it's just all that was a kind of manifestation, I think of a much larger problem. And so, I think this focus on wellness and on chronic disease is extremely helpful one, because it's a serious problem, but also because I think it's going to bring a lot of people together that were not political activities allies before, didn't know they had something in common.

You know, the kind of hippie commune in Bend, Oregon that's trying to live off the grid and the Catholic homeschool mom in Front Royal, Virginia with her Berkey filter. You know, they end up having a lot in common. And this is millions of people focused on this. And so, I'm just super optimistic that we can do something about it. But it's going to take some really serious reforms in Washington D.C. in the next few years for us to do it.

**FRANK:**

Give us a couple of stats, Jay, because I remember that speech that it was very startling. Yeah, let's start with obesity and then maybe you could talk a little bit about autism, the increase.

**JAY:**

It's just crazy. And so, the numbers vary and so I'm always a little careful about this because some of the increase in autism might be the result of just improved ways of diagnosing or even over diagnosing. So, but that could explain a little bit, but we're talking orders of magnitude. So, something like, you know, 1 in 10,000 to 1 in 100 or 1 in 50 or 1 in 36.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

**FRANK:**

So, 50 years ago, autism was diagnosed—

**JAY:**

Very rarely. Very, very, very rarely. And in most of this has actually just been in the last few decades. So, just autism alone, even if you say okay, maybe half, if you said okay, yeah, maybe one order of magnitude could be explained by improved diagnosis. But that's not it. And in fact, they've been using the same way to diagnose it for the last few decades and it's been increasing even with that.

The same thing with so-called metabolic syndrome, which is this cluster of symptoms all of which relate to each other. So, high blood pressure, high fasting glucose levels, large body mass index, hypertension.

It's a kind of cluster of problems almost all related to something called insulin resistance in which your body resists, essentially resists the effects of insulin, which is the hormone your body releases to get sugar out of your bloodstream, which is a function actually of our diet, which is, I'll just state my opinion on this.

Generally, a function of the fact that we've been told now for almost 60 years by the USDA and the CDC that we should avoid saturated fats, and we should eat lots of carbohydrates. That's exactly what you'd want to do if you wanted to make the population insulin resistant and Type 2 diabetic.

So, massive increases in Type 2 diabetes, massive increases in what's called non-alcoholic fatty liver syndrome. So, for the longest time there was a thing called alcoholic fatty liver syndrome in which you have fat around your liver as a result of metabolizing ethanol from over drinking alcohol.

And then when people started getting it and they'd say, well, I don't drink alcohol. And doctors are sort of skeptical. Well, no, yeah, this is what alcohol is what causes this. And then kids started getting it. Then everybody knew they weren't obviously drinking a fifth of vodka every

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

night. And this is the result actually of a massive increase in the intake of fructose, which is half of table sugar and often more than half of high fructose corn syrup.

That's massive increase in our diets. And so, here it's not just Americans have gotten sort of lazy and gluttonous. We've been actually following official guidelines by the federal government that were deeply misguided, and we now know they're misguided. And so, it would be one thing to say, okay, well, we just all need to exercise more and eat more healthfully and things like that.

Yeah, that's what you use, you know, your physical trainer or your gym for. This is a policy problem in which government regulators and companies kind of working together have helped kind of create a set of conditions that's led to massive increases in chronic disease. That's what makes it politically salient. If we're just talking about some vague thing with the FDA, people aren't going to care anything about it.

**FRANK:**

So, what are your thoughts about RFK? Because five years ago he was seen as a crazy man. Yeah, you know, he's way off the reservation. He's against science and all this. And friends, as we said so many times before, science doesn't say anything. Scientists do.

**JAY:**

Exactly.

**FRANK:**

What do you think of him now? You've read all his books. You know, we don't agree with him on the abortion issue.

**JAY:**

Certainly not at all. Yeah. And I really hope now I can say this is just my own opinion. He's never seemed enthusiastic about abortion like some politicians. The reality is, if you're going to be a figure in the national Democratic Party, you have to sort of say certain things about it.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

But if you look at what he's been passionate about, he has been talking about the corruption of these institutions in Washington really for a couple of decades and really focused in on chronic disease. He's well known because he's a critic of the vaccine schedule. People call him an anti-vaxxer, which implies that he's opposed to every vaccine in every form.

**FRANK:**

But he's not.

**JAY:**

He's not. It's ridiculous. He said, you know, it doesn't make you, you know, anti-factory because you complain about the practices in one factory. I mean, it's ridiculous. He complains about the safety of the childhood vaccination schedule, which is, that's a different thing.

And so, Frank, I can tell you, starting in 2020, I came to evaluate people less on, okay, where are they on the political spectrum than are they willing to defend the truth in public when it is costly to them?

Will they destroy their career and their reputation on behalf of the truth? So, Jay Bhattacharya, and Martin Kulldorff, and Sunetra Gupta, who wrote 'The Great Barrington Declaration' in 2020 saying we should not be locking down whole populations. We should do focus protection on the most vulnerable and at risk.

They got vilified. Right? And Jay Bhattacharya has now told us he lost 30 pounds because he couldn't eat and couldn't sleep. I have respect for people like that. I have respect for people like Naomi Wolf who said things even though she was sort of pulled off of Twitter.

I have respect, amazing respect for Jamie Reed who is the whistleblower and in the St. Louis Pediatric Gender Clinic. These are people that put their careers on the line, made their lives harder in the short run for the truth. That is what RFK Jr. did. He was talking about this even when people were calling him crazy and a crank.

And now he has been nominated to be the next secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services. As someone said, I think on CNN the other day, he's the most relevant

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**





*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Kennedy alive. And he's, if you listen to him, I mean, he really is convinced that God, like gave him this path, this message that he's supposed to deliver.

I just think he's sincere. Look, he's not a philosopher, so he's not always going to say things as precisely as, you know, a philosopher or a scientist might. But I think he's generally been saying stuff that's proven true again and again.

**FRANK:**

What are the top three things you would want people to know in this area, Jay, in this wellness area that...? We obviously have a nation, it's undeniable have gotten off track when it comes to health. We're really good on acute care. We're awful on chronic care.

**JAY:**

Absolutely.

**FRANK:**

You know, if you need a, you know, a heart transplant, or you need know, your ankle, your broken ankle fixed, yeah. Come to America.

**JAY:**

Come here. Exactly. Like anything that's sort of like carpentry on the body, this is where you want to be, you know. But it's that we genuinely are having an epidemic of chronic disease, physical and mental health crisis, that it is fixable and that it is largely the result of the corruption and the perversion of incentives at this sort of nexus of corporate media, government regulators, what I'm going to just call Big Food and Big Pharma, which distort the incentives that would otherwise take care of themselves.

There's one example would be mentioned, you know, would be the 1986 law that allows vaccine manufacturers not to be liable for injury for people that receive their vaccine. Okay, well that completely blows up the natural incentive of a company not to do things that are going to harm its customers.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

Now add it to a vaccine schedule where it's effectively mandated. That's a good gig if you can get it. I'm going to manufacture something. The government's told everybody they can't sue me for it. And now the government's going to make everybody get it. I mean, you don't need to know anything else to know, oh, that sounds like a suspicious system I want and need to look into.

**FRANK:**

Right.

**JAY:**

That's unfortunately what we're dealing with. And I honestly, I think that half the population is ready to listen to the arguments, whereas before the lockdowns and all that stuff, I think most people were probably tuned out.

**FRANK:**

You certainly want to pause, ladies and gentlemen. We've just had some grandkids born recently.

**JAY:**

Same.

**FRANK:**

And I'll tell you, in the hospital they wanted them day two, they want to come in there and jab that kid with every single possible shot you could imagine. And we're like, whoa.

**JAY:**

Yeah, what's up here?

**FRANK:**

What are you doing?

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

**JAY:**

Yeah, the Hep B the day after they're born. To me, that's kind of the thread. It's like, okay, that's crazy. And then you start pulling on it. And so, I mean the reality is that even if you have kids that are 25 years old, the things that you were doing when those kids were little is going to be completely different than what's happening to your grandkids.

**FRANK:**

So, know, number one, that there's perverse incentives going on from our government, our corporate media, our corporations. They're following the money; they're following the power. What else do people need to know about this wellness issue? And where can they go to get reliable information on it, Jay?

**JAY:**

I mean, honestly, at the moment, I don't know that there is a clearinghouse, you know, for this. I'm just going to recommend my friend Calley Means and his sister Casey. You know, now, theologically, I'm not exactly in the same place as they are in that book, but this book, 'Good Energy', it's a terrific book that I think manages to distill a lot of this stuff really well.

Casey is a trained medical doctor and then her brother Calley, who was actually involved in pharmaceutical lobbying early in his career. Another book called 'Brain Energy' actually by Chris Palmer, that came out recently. He's a psychiatrist at Harvard, talking about these things. And so, there's actually a really good literature, but at the moment, at least, I don't know of a single clearinghouse for this, because I think what we're seeing, we're seeing the formation of a...

First of all, it's a kind of fundamental political realignment, and then it's the formation, I think, of a public coalition of Americans that didn't exist before, but that are suddenly coming together and sharing information.

**FRANK:**

You know, it's interesting, Jay. And Jay, you were instrumental back in 2016, pulling together a group of us evangelicals and Catholics who were going, I don't know about this Donald Trump guy. Right?

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

We had our reservations. We had a couple of meetings with him, as you know. And what I said in every election since 2016, 2020, 2024, I said, look. If you don't like the people at the top of the ticket, I understand. I understand the style. I understand some of the things that have been said and done. I don't agree with either. But when you're voting for president, you're not voting for one person.

You're voting for 5,000 people to go to Washington and implement an agenda. Now, who would have thought, even just a couple of years ago that you'd have this coalition of people who just two years ago were at odds politically coming to Washington. You've got just below Trump now, you've got Elon Musk, you've got Vivek.

**JAY:**

Yes. You've got Joe Rogan who endorsed him.

**FRANK:**

Yeah, you've got Joe Rogan now. You've got RFK in the mix.

**JAY:**

Yeah. Tulsi Gabbard.

**FRANK:**

Tulsi Gabbard.

**JAY:**

You've got Jay Bhattacharya, who was vilified during 2020, that's now been nominated to be the National Institutes of Health director. I mean, it's absolutely, like, if you told me this was going to happen three months ago, I would have said, that is the craziest thing. There's no way that's happening. And here we are. And so, you know, I say, I feel like, as a Christian, we got what we wanted, not what we deserved, at least for now, you know.

**FRANK:**

Well, we're going to have to be diligent because this could go off the rails at any point with any group of different people, you know. So, Christians have to be diligent moving forward to

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

ensure we maintain our religious freedom, to ensure that we love our neighbor by putting good laws in place.

**JAY:**

Yes.

**FRANK:**

And not watering down the pro-life message. Tragically, that has been watered down.

**JAY:**

And we've got to figure out pro-lifers, we've got to figure out how to make the case for life, because I think a lot of us felt like the country was more pro-life than it actually is. So, we're going to have to figure that out, but we cannot surrender that issue. But, Frank, I just want to say, I mean, as somebody that works at the Heritage Foundation, lives in the D.C. area, you mentioned that when you're voting for a president and vice president, you're voting for these thousands of other people.

Those are the political appointees. These are people I know; these are my friends. And I can tell you, I can tell your listeners some of the best, smartest, you know, people you'll ever meet with amazing integrity, working behind the scenes, humble people that will be appointed to this government.

And you should be thankful that it's people like that being appointed to the CDC, and the NIH, and the Department of Agriculture, and not the people that could have been appointed, which would have been a disaster. That's who you're voting for. It's like, okay, what, 4,000 or 5,000 people? Who would you prefer actually making those appointments? That's the real question, not, okay, whose personality do you like the most?

**FRANK:**

Right. Yeah. Policies are going to last a lot longer than personalities, ladies and gentlemen. And we can all hold our nose on certain personality traits. I get it. Yeah, but governance is important, and we need to maintain our ability to preach and live the Gospel.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek      **PODCAST**

And we want to protect innocent people from evil. That's why we're involved in government, we should be involved politically. We don't just say only atheists are qualified to run the country. I don't know where we come up with that idea, Jay. Doesn't make any sense at all. But Jay, give websites again where people can get a hold of you, how they can follow you, that kind of thing.

**JAY:**

Yeah, absolutely. So, you can check us out. The Heritage Foundation at [heritage.org](http://heritage.org). If you're interested in the intelligent design issue, [Discovery.org](http://Discovery.org) is absolutely the go to place. For the gender dysphoria stuff, I recommend [segm.org](http://segm.org), [segm.org](http://segm.org) and [biologicalintegrity.org](http://biologicalintegrity.org) from the American College of Pediatricians. And for people that want to follow me in real time on Twitter or that is on X, it's [@DrJayRichards](https://twitter.com/DrJayRichards).

**FRANK:**

And the book that you wrote on health is called 'Eat, Fast, and Feast'.

**JAY:**

And it's a perfect book to read right after the Christmas holidays because we're just entering that feast cycle. But I think God intended for us to feast. But I think it's also supposed to be paired with fasts.

**FRANK:**

Yes, exactly. Well, ladies and gentlemen, it's always great having Dr. Jay Richards on. By the way, I did look it up on the internet, Jay. And since it's on the internet, it has to be true. According to [history.com](http://history.com), Thomas Jefferson and John Adams died July 4, 1826.

**JAY:**

'26.

**FRANK:**

Exactly 50 years after the Declaration of Independence. Yeah. So, there it is, ladies and gentlemen. We know it's got to be true. It's on the internet. [Laughter] It's on the internet right

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

there. Oh, the one other book you mentioned, the Calley's. The Calley's have been on Jordan Peterson.

**JAY:**

The Means. Calley and Casey Means. They've been on Jordan Peterson. They've had, Tucker has interviewed them.

**FRANK:**

Charlie Kirk just had them at AmFest.

**JAY:**

That's right.

**FRANK:**

So, they're pretty reliable you think?

**JAY:**

Yeah, they really are. That is, it's a really, really good book. And it's one of these books that consolidates a lot of research that, you know, most people aren't going to have access to. And so, I've read it three times actually.

**FRANK:**

The name of the book again is?

**JAY:**

It's called 'Good Energy'.

**FRANK:**

'Good Energy' by Calley and?

**JAY:**

Casey and Calley Means.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

**FRANK:**

Casey and Calley Means, brother and sister, I think.

**JAY:**

Yes, that's right.

**FRANK:**

Okay, beautiful. Well, friends, hopefully we gave you some, at least Jay did. Gave you some great insights on some essential insights on big issues. You obviously can go deeper. That's why we're recommending these books and websites you can go to more. So, thanks for tuning in with us today. Also, thank you. At the last minute, anyone wanting to donate, remember, 100% of your donations go to ministry, 0% to buildings. We come to you.

You don't come to us. We go to a college campus. You're the one funding us to go. Everything you see online, you're funding. Thank you so much for what you do. It's all tax-deductible. Go to [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org). Click on donate. I mentioned online courses.

We've got the online course, 'How to Interpret Your Bible' starting January 9th. You don't want to miss that. I'll be your instructor. Just go to [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org). Click on online courses. You'll see it there. And Lord willing, we will see you next year. What a nerdy thing to say. All right. Thanks, Jay. Thanks, friends. See you next time. God bless.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**

