

## **HELP! I Want to Believe! Atheist Woman Shares Her Struggles on the Quest for Truth**

(February 11, 2025)

### **FRANK:**

Ladies and gentlemen, I just received an amazing series of questions all the way from France. And this one email that I received has so many questions in it, interesting questions that I'm going to take this entire show to interact with and attempt to answer. So, let me get right into it. I won't read the entire email at once. I'll read sections because this woman who writes in goes from one topic to another.

But I'll tell you where she stopped speaking and my response. So, let's jump right in. This comes from a lady by the name of Sev. She says, I'm 43, female, mother of two grownup girls and three times divorcee, sadly. Remarried now. I live in France and both French and Australian and was raised in complete atheism. No religion, no spirituality, no deity, no afterlife. Nothing but hard maths, science and materialism.

All right, let me stop right here. Very insightful that she is very specific about what she was taught. I think many people may have been taught materialism and didn't even know what to call it. It's just sort of the water we swim in in the West. Anyway, she goes on to say this. However, I've struggled my whole life with the fear of death, as death to me means a black void of nothingness, no consciousness and no continuity.

This fear has caused me to seek out other alternatives. But my hard background, which taught me that everything is just stardust and air, the materialist/Darwinist education I received makes it very challenging read impossible thus far to believe in someone resurrecting Jesus or in miraculous deeds. I'm one of those atheists who needs to see in order to believe. I regret this. I wish I wasn't like this.

But to be honest, I am. And I haven't yet managed to fool myself into believing something I've never actually sincerely found believable. In my quest for reassuring answers to my fear, I came



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      **PODCAST**

across and read your book 'I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist'. I agree with you that Jesus existed and was certainly killed. On that we are okay. But I asked myself a question while reading your book, which it doesn't answer. What if Jesus had a twin brother no one knew about and having read the Old Testament, he decided to dig his dead brother up and pretend he is Jesus reborn?

Obviously, this presupposes that no miracles are performed and that he didn't ascend to heaven as heaven is just, well, outer space where nothing can survive for the scientifically minded. All right, let me stop right here. Sev, this is very honest. Thank you for writing in. You read the book. I, yeah, I didn't deal with the Jesus twin brother objection. But let me back up because it seems that you really have a difficult time believing that miracles are indeed possible.

One of the things we set out in 'I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist', was to show that the greatest miracle of all has already occurred, and that is the creation of the universe out of nothing. That space, time, and matter literally had a beginning out of nothing. And if space, time, and matter had a beginning out of nothing, as even now atheists are admitting. As we point out, Stephen Hawking famously said, almost everyone now believes that the universe and time itself had a beginning at the Big Bang.

If that is true, what could have caused that? And as you know, we point out in the book, it can only be a spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, moral, personal, intelligent creator when you throw the moral argument in there. So, from the cosmological argument that the universe had a beginning, from the teleological argument that the universe is fine-tuned, so it must have a fine tuner. That's what the evidence seems to show. And of course, life appears to be designed as well. And from the moral argument that whatever created the universe has a moral standard, we know that through conscience.

From those three arguments we can conclude that there is a theistic God out there. A spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, moral, personal, intelligent creator who created all things and sustains all things to this very moment. We unpack that in the book 'I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist', but also in more detail in the book 'Stealing from God: Why Atheists Need God to Make Their Case'. Now, if that all is true, and I think it is, I don't have any

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

problem believing in miracles. And I don't think anyone should because the greatest miracle has already occurred.

By the way, what was Stephen Hawking's explanation for the beginning of the universe out of nothing? He says this on page 181 of his book. And he said this. Sev, he said, because there is a law like gravity, the universe can and will create itself out of nothing. Yeah, he said that in the book 'The Grand Design.' Create itself out of nothing? Hello McFly. I mean that doesn't make any sense. You can't create yourself because you don't exist prior to creating.

And the gravity first of all doesn't create anything. Gravity describes what does once a creation exists, and gravity just acts on pre-existing material. It doesn't create anything. So, to say that gravity created the universe makes no sense. Gravity didn't exist prior to creation, as far as we know anyway. Gravity is part of the space/time continuum.

And even if it did exist, it doesn't create. It just acts on pre-existing stuff. But yet that's what Stephen Hawking said. That was his explanation. And you know, others have tried to talk about a multiverse. Well, a multiverse, even if true, doesn't get you away from a creator. Who created the multiverse? Why does a multiverse exist? So, it's really hard to conclude that miracles are not possible when we're all living in a miracle. Now, the question is, have miracles occurred since the first miracle?

And the greatest miracle other than Genesis 1:1 would be the resurrection of Jesus. Now, I did not address the twin theory in my book. I don't even know if it was something mentioned back in 2004 when we wrote that. But even if it was, it seems so outlandish to me. And it would die just by analysis if you spend a little time going through what would it mean if Jesus had a twin brother?

Suppose He did have a twin brother? Suppose the real Jesus did die, as you admitted, Sev. Well, He would be in a tomb and the tomb could be and would have been opened for or by the Jews and the Romans because they didn't want Christianity to flourish. They would have stomped Christianity by parading Jesus's dead body around. And then if Jesus's twin tried to make out like He was the Messiah, then everyone would have seen, well, He had a twin.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

So, he's not really the Messiah because here's the real Jesus. He's dead. And by the way, that twin would have also had to have done miracles to convince the scared, scattered, skeptical disciples that He really was God. He didn't just rise from the dead. He apparently did miracles over a period of 40 days. How did the twin do that? Remember, and this is spoken about by Paul in 1 Corinthians, chapter 2. I'm paraphrasing. But he says something like, that the prophecies in the Old Testament were veiled, so the forces, the evil forces of this world didn't know who Jesus really was.

If they had known, they never would have crucified the Lord of glory, says Paul. He says that in 1 Corinthians, chapter 2. In other words, the disciples were not expecting Jesus to rise from the dead. In fact, let me read the passage because I just did a bad job of sort of paraphrasing it. He says in 1 Corinthians, chapter 2, verse 7, we declare God's wisdom a mystery that was hidden and that God destined for our glory before time began.

None of the rulers of this age understood it, for if they had, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. The rulers of this world didn't know who Jesus was. And I don't even think the disciples knew who He was. I mean, they depicted themselves as dim witted. They didn't really understand who Jesus was until He ascended to heaven. Prior to that, they're denying Him. Peter, their leader's denying Him three times. They're running away at the crucifixion; they're doing all sorts of embarrassing things they never would have invented if they were inventing the entire story.

And by the way, what motive would they have even to say that Jesus had resurrected from the dead when His twin was the real person who hadn't resurrected but was alive? What motive would they have to say He had resurrected from the dead if He didn't do miracles to prove who He was? What motive would they have to say He was the Lord of Glory? Because by saying Jesus had risen from the dead, then they got themselves beaten, tortured, and killed, which last I checked, was not a list of perks.

And they also abandoned many of their ancient beliefs. Remember, all the writers of the New Testament, with the exception of Luke, were all believers in Yahweh. And there were a couple of things they didn't believe as believers in Yahweh, God's chosen people. They didn't believe

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

that one man could claim to be God, or a man could claim to be God. That was considered blasphemy. And secondly, they didn't believe one man would rise from the dead.

They knew we'd all rise from the dead at the end of time because Daniel, and Isaiah, and even maybe Ezekiel talk about that. But they didn't think one guy would rise from the dead in the middle of time, so to speak. Yet here they are going around saying that a man claimed to be God and rose from the dead when in fact that cost them dearly. And then they go abandon many of their ancient beliefs when they could have quite obviously been motivated not to abandon those beliefs because they really thought those beliefs were true.

They didn't say, well, let's give up the Sabbath, let's give up animal sacrifice. In fact, think about it this way. They gave up animal sacrifice, which they had believed for 2000 years. They gave up a binding law of Moses. They gave up strict monotheism for a trinity. They gave up the Sabbath. In fact, Paul even says, don't let anyone tell you have to obey any Sabbath or festival day. They gave up, at least in His first coming, the conquering Messiah. And they gave up circumcision, which was their sign of the covenant.

Why would they do all this? And by the way, talk about embarrassing details they never would have invented. Do you think anybody inventing a new religion would invent circumcision as their sign of entry, as their point of entry? As their price of entry? What do I got to do to join your group? What? No, I'm out. Forget it. Who would invent all this? But they gave up animal sacrifice for Christ sacrifice.

They gave up the binding law of Moses for Christ's life. Christ fulfilled the binding law of Moses. They gave up strict monotheism for the Trinity. They gave up the Sabbath for Sunday worship. Actually, Sunday worship wasn't the new Sabbath. They just gave up the Sabbath and began worshiping on the day He rose. They gave up a conquering Messiah for a sacrificial Messiah. And they gave up circumcision for baptism and communion. Because a twin rose, didn't rise from the dead. Because they were mistaken about who Jesus was. It was really his twin brother. I don't think.

I don't think. I mean, is that possible? Well, sure it's possible. Is it reasonable to believe? I don't think so. I don't think so. Because again, they could have gone to the tomb, taken out Jesus's

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

dead body and squashed Christianity. They would have had to somehow fake miracles. Well, the twin brother. And there's no evidence that Jesus had a twin brother either. I mean, you can say anything. As someone who is doubting the Christian worldview, sure, almost anything is possible.

But as my friend, J. Warner Wallace, the cold-case homicide detective, says, yeah, it's possible. But is it reasonable? I don't think it's reasonable. And Gary Habermas taught this to me years ago. Gary Habermas, the world-renowned expert on the resurrection. He said, when you come up with an alternative theory for the resurrection, you can say anything, you can come up with any possibility. But that is not enough. You can't just come up with possibilities. You have to come up with evidence for the possibility.

What evidence do we have that Jesus had a twin brother? In fact, I remember someone talking about this. I don't have the stats clear in my head. But the remoteness of even having a twin is such that you shouldn't believe Jesus had a twin. I mean, how many people do you know that are a twin? Very, very few people are twins. So, to say that Jesus that your explanation for why the New Testament writers and the apostles gave up their ancient beliefs and said that Jesus was God and rose from the dead and said that he did all these miracles at basically the cost of their lives and their ancient beliefs.

If the explanation is the possibility Jesus had a twin brother for which we don't have any evidence, that seems to me to be very weak. Possible? Anything's possible. Almost anything's possible. Is it reasonable to believe? I don't think so. Especially given the fact we live in a theistic universe where miracles are not only possible, this miracle was predicted. In fact, go back to the Old Testament. Look at the Old Testament prophecies.

While they weren't clear looking forward, they certainly are clear looking backward. In fact, the New Testament is the box top to the puzzle of Old Testament prophecy. When you look at the New Testament and the events of the New Testament, suddenly so many of the Old Testament prophecies jump out at you.

Oh, now I see how Micah 5:2, and Isaiah 53, and Daniel 9, and Isaiah 9, and so many other passages now fit together to show that the Old Testament predicted the Messiah and the

**CROSS**  
**EXAMINED**  
**ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

Messiah being Jesus of Nazareth, that He would be cut off in 33 A.D. according to Daniel 9, and that he would be a suffering servant, according to Isaiah 53. That He would be born in Bethlehem, according to Micah 5:2, that He would actually come to the temple. That's what Malachi 3:1 says.

That had to happen prior to 70 A.D. because the temple was destroyed in 70 A.D. So, looking backward, we go, got it. Looking forward, it was veiled as 1 Corinthians chapter 2 says. So Sev, I appreciate, and I understand, by the way, psychologically why it's hard to believe in miracles, especially when you're taught materialism, especially when you might look into certain miracle claims.

You go, that's bogus. That didn't happen. But miracles by definition have to be rare if they're going to get our attention. If miracles occurred all the time, they wouldn't be miracles. We'd say, this stuff happens all the time. This is just natural law, right? In fact, imagine if resurrections occurred routinely. What would the resurrection of Christ mean to us? Nothing. I mean, you go to somebody, and you go, Jesus rose from the dead to prove He was God. And the guy goes, so what? Uncle Pierre just rose from the dead two weeks ago.

Now, I've got to give the inheritance back. No, it's got to be a rare event if it's going to get our attention. And by the way, the only way we could recognize a miracle as a special act of God is against the backdrop of natural laws which do the same thing over and over again. And that's the only way we can recognize them. Yes, virtually everybody who dies stays dead. But let's say if 20% of the people who died rose again, then the resurrection of Jesus would mean nothing.

But when virtually everybody dies and stays dead, when Jesus resurrects, we go, got it. That's big. And by the way, the resurrections in the Bible aren't like the resurrections of Jesus. You know, they were resuscitations. Lazarus, others who were raised from the dead. Jesus raises a girl, I think Elijah raises somebody. I think there's just like four or five other resuscitations. Those people died again. Jesus didn't die again.

Jesus got a glorified body that was indestructible. So, He's the first fruits of the resurrection, I should say. So, I think if you really look into it, Sev, the Jesus twin theory just is so remote as to

**CROSS**  
**EXAMINED**  
**ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      **PODCAST**

say no, it's virtually impossible that that is the explanation. Let me also say something about psychology because your psychology will not tell you what's true outside of your skull.

The evidence will. We can have all sorts of psychological reasons for believing or not believing in something. But the evidence is what's most important, not our psychology. In fact, let me give you an illustration from aviation. The past couple of weeks, at least here in America, have been difficult for aviation. We had that tragic helicopter crash into the American Airlines flight coming into Reagan Airport. We had the Medevac flight in Philly go down.

We had a military, I think F35 go down. And you're probably thinking, wow, air travel is dangerous psychologically. Do you know how many thousands of flights have occurred just those days when all those events occurred that didn't have an accident? In fact, I put this into Chat GPT, so we know it's true, ladies and gentlemen. Anyway, I just asked it what are the odds of dying, say in a car crash versus dying in an airplane in the United States?

You know what the stats were? Your chance of dying in an airplane accident in the United States are 1 in 11 million. This is per mile traveled, I think. Your chances of dying in a car crash per mile traveled are 1 in 101. Did you hear that? 1 in 11 million versus 1 in 101. You should be far more afraid to get in your car than to get on an airplane.

Yet we think that airplane travel, at least some of us do, is so dangerous. And gee, I can't get on it. We're allowing our psychology to overpower the evidence. Please don't let that be you when it comes to eternity. Your psychology is not going to tell you what's true outside your skull. The evidence will. So, look at the evidence and follow the evidence where it leads. And if you do, I think you'll see beyond a reasonable doubt that Christianity is indeed true.

And Sev, the only thing you need, there's only two major facts you need to establish to show that Christianity is true. Number one, God exists. And number two, Jesus rose from the dead. If those two facts are true, the rest are details. What we call mere Christianity is true. So, everything else falls into place from that. You know, from our book, 'I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist' that we try and make that case that the Bible is indeed the inerrant word of God. Now, the Bible does not need to be the inerrant word of God for mere Christianity to be true, but I think it is.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**





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

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

In fact, I think if you say the Bible is not inerrant, you're disagreeing with Jesus, and that's never a good place to be. And we explain why we're not doing circular reasoning in the book 'I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist' because we're not taking the New Testament documents as if they're inerrant. We're just using certain historical tests to try and discover if what we read in the pages is generally historically accurate. If it is, Jesus thought the Old Testament was the word of God. He thought it was inerrant, and He promised the New Testament. So, let's continue with what your question is.

Sev, you go on to say, aside from this question, the question about miracles and Jesus rising from the dead, I have another even more pertinent question. How does one get to know Jesus? How do you pray? How do you get to feel a presence or a certitude? I envy those who have that. But my rational mind, which needs to see in order to believe, always brings me back to thinking they're fooling themselves because everyone is terrified of dying and can't accept the nothingness. I'm the same. Okay, first of all, let me back up here for a second.

Sev, what do you mean by your rational mind? Can you explain where your rational mind came from? In fact, you don't even need to believe in a miracle like a resurrection to realize that naturalism or materialism is false. Why? Because you believe your thoughts, don't you? If your thoughts are completely natural, in other words, they're driven completely by the laws of physics, then why should you believe anything you think, including the thought that you can't believe in Christianity? You shouldn't be able to think or believe your thoughts if you're just a molecular machine, if you're just a moist robot, if every thought you have is merely the result of chemical reactions in your brain.

I've read this quote so much on this program, forgive me for reading it again, but I can't say it any better than C.S. Lewis. Here's what he said. He said, suppose there were no intelligence behind the universe. In that case, nobody designed my brain for the purpose of thinking. Thought is merely the byproduct of some atoms within my skull. But if so, how can I trust my own thinking to be true? But if I can't trust my own thinking, of course I can't trust the arguments leading to atheism and therefore have no reason to be an atheist or anything else. Unless I believe in God, I can't believe in thought, so I can never use thought to disbelieve in God. Boom.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

You can't say it better than that. The very fact that you're a thinking human being shows that this world is not completely natural, that there's a supernatural aspect to it. In other words, it's beyond the natural. You can't explain your own rational mind by just molecules bumping into one another. So, if that's the case, why can't you believe something else that's supernatural, like the creation of the universe or a resurrection from the dead? In fact, thought itself deals with things you can't see.

You said you need to see something in order to believe. You don't see the laws of logic, but you believe they exist. You don't see the laws of mathematics, but you believe they exist. You don't see your mind, but you're using it. You believe it exists. You don't see justice, but you believe it exists. You may see people treated justly or unjustly, but the concept of justice is not something you see. You don't even see love. Love is not something you see. You see its effects. You don't see gravity. You see the effects of gravity. In fact, that's how we know that God exists.

We know God by His effects. If there is a creation and there is, that's an effect. We're reasoning back to a cause, a creator. And if space, time, and matter had a beginning, the creation, that whatever is the cause of space, time, and matter must be spaceless, timeless, and immaterial. You see a design in the universe and design in life, that's the effect. You're reasoning back to a cause, a designer. If you have a moral law written on your heart, that's the effect. In fact, morality is something you don't see, but you know it exists.

That moral law written on your heart is an effect. You reason back to a cause, a moral lawgiver. Your mind is an effect. You're reasoning back to a cause. Who could cause a mind, a great mind, the mind of God? In fact, our mind is made in the image of the great mind. And that mind was set up so you can know truth. And the purpose of life is to know the ultimate truth, God. God has given you an apparatus to know Him and therefore then to make Him known. So, rationality can't be explained by materialism.

Rationality is better explained by a being like God. So, you say they're fooling themselves because everyone is terrified of dying and can't accept the nothingness. Okay, we might have different motivations for believing in God. Some of them may be good, some of them may be bad. We may have different motivations for believing in atheism. Some of them may be good,

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

some of them may be bad. But the motivation doesn't tell you whether something is true or not. You have to look at the evidence. Again, the psychology isn't the issue.

The evidence is. Anyway, Sev goes on to say, however, I think after reading your book, which has left me unconvinced, can-- How can one become convinced? I'm not against the idea. I'm open to it. I actually want to believe. I'm not unbelieving by volition. I've wanted to believe for years. Well, Sev, you ask how to pray. Well, Jesus actually tells us how to pray if you read the Gospels. You know, He talks about the Our Father.

He talks about His prayer, basically for us is in first or sorry, in John 17, where He prays for us, but He also says we ought to pray according to His will, not our will. The Psalms are prayers. Many of the Psalms are prayers. If you go through the prayers of Paul in the New Testament, you can see how Paul prays and how others pray. In fact, if you look at the Bible, most of the Bible is God talking to us.

Psalms are us talking to God. So, I would go through the Psalms, I would go through Jesus's prayer, and you can find that in the Sermon on the Mount, Matthew 5-7. I would look at Jesus's prayer for us in John 17. I would look at the prayers that are prayed throughout the book of Acts. Those are ways you can pray. And you can also pray that God reveals Himself to you in some special way.

He may do that, He may not, but His ultimate revelation is Jesus Himself and the Bible. And that's how God speaks to us normatively. He speaks through the Bible. That's His word. A lot of us want special communication from God, but how do we know it's actually from God? And how do we become, how do we know how to become Christians and disciples unless we have a written revelation which allows us to study it and allows other people to study it who maybe are further along than we are so we can understand it better based on their gifts when they write commentaries, or do studies, or you know, your preacher does a sermon.

If we're all getting individual communication from God rather than a common communication that we could all look at and study, it seems the common communication would be a better way to make a group of believers rather than all these individual revelations. In other words, we have a standard when it's written down. We don't have it when it's just individual

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

revelation. So, prayer, Bible reading, discussions with others, meditating on the Scriptures is important.

These are some of the disciplines that we talk about and worship, actually going out and thanking God for all that he's provided for you and interacting with other people who are like minded believers and acts of service, serving with other people. All of this can help you know what it's like to at least have some feeling that God is there.

But I'm actually not a very feeling person myself. I don't, I think I've said this on this program before. I've never had God tell me anything directly in an audible voice. Looking back, I see how God has worked in my life. But His primary way of communicating to me is through His Word. Might He give me little impressions that I ought to do something He's already told me to do in the Bible? Yeah, that's the Holy Spirit working. Hey, talk to this person about me, that kind of thing. But I don't get special revelation from God other than the Bible.

And most of the people in the Bible didn't get it either. In fact, if you're interested in this Sev, my friend Greg Koukl has written a series of three articles called 'Does God Whisper?' If you Google that, you'll probably find it, 'Does God Whisper?' In fact, we'll put it in the show notes. There's three parts to it, and Greg does a good job of talking about how God communicates to us. And it's not all these hints and impressions and putting out fleeces and all that like so many Christians believe, but it's much more standardized through His Word, and I think for good reason.

So, check out that. You go on to say, but it would seem like believing in Santa Claus, flying in the sky, delivering presents all over the world at the same time, it would feel like it's kind of ridiculous or silly because I don't sincerely feel that I truly believe. Well, you know, there's a difference too, Sev, between belief that and belief in. Belief that is just believing that God exists, that Jesus rose from the dead, that the Bible's telling the truth. But all the belief that in the world doesn't move you to belief in. Belief that is just intellectual.

There are no reasons for belief in. If you know beyond a reasonable doubt that Jesus is the Savior, it's a volitional step on your part to respond to the Holy Spirit and trust in Him. And then when you do trust in Him, you should get engaged with other Christians. As I mentioned earlier,

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

you should pray, you should read the Bible, you should perform acts of service, you should meditate, and hopefully then the feelings will come. But do not run your life on feelings.

In fact, Natasha Crain points out that's what secularists do. It's all feeling. It's all feelings. Feelings are the ultimate guide. Well, feelings come and go. In fact, Martin Luther said something I thought pretty profound. He said, feelings come, and feelings go, and feelings are deceiving.

My warrant is the word of God, not else is worth believing. Yeah, feelings can change. You can get feelings for all sorts of different reasons, but evidence will lead you to the truth. And believing in Santa Claus, yeah, I think without a miracle, obviously it would be impossible for one guy to give presents to everybody.

In fact, that's when I was a kid, I'm like, this can't be true, right? There's no way you could do this in one night. All right? And reindeer don't fly either. Okay? But that's not the kind of sort of unnatural thing that happens to Jesus. Jesus isn't a being that flies around in a sled with reindeer that don't fly to begin with and delivers presents all over the world in one night. Jesus solves the biggest problems that we experience as human beings.

In fact, if you look at his miracles, they occur in four categories. And those four categories correspond to the difficulty we have here in this fallen world. And the four categories are sin, nature, sickness, and death. Sin, nature, sickness, and death. Those are the four things, the four areas, the four categories that cause us trouble in this fallen world.

We sin, that causes us difficulty. So, what does Jesus do? He's sinless. Nature can hurt us. So, what does Jesus do? He has power over nature. He can calm the storm. He can turn water into wine. He can walk on water. Sickness, that can hurt us. What does Jesus do? He heals the sick. And finally, death. That's our ultimate problem. What does Jesus do? He can not only raise the dead, He can predict and accomplish His own resurrection.

So, Jesus isn't doing tricks or sort of unnatural things that have no referent or no correspondence to the difficulty we have in this fallen world. He's not delivering presents all over the world in one. Jesus is solving our four biggest categories of trouble, our problems. Sin,

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

nature, sickness, and death. And by the way, Sev, you pointed out, you say simply because I have never seen or witnessed anything supernatural.

You're witnessing it when you're writing this very email, Sev. Your thoughts are beyond the natural. They, they weren't com. They weren't created completely by the laws of physics. You say simply because I've never witnessed anything supernatural. Anything that could help me be convinced that miracles and hence God exist.

Well, by the way, you can almost witness something supernatural if you have the right equipment. You can look through the telescope and see the expanding universe. You can actually see the effects of creation and we can get back to, I think about 300,000 years according to their dating after the Big Bang.

In fact, I'm happy that God created from a single point. He created out of nothing, and it expanded out and it continues to expand. If God had created everything instantaneously from nothing that suddenly everything's in place, it's static, how would we know the universe had a beginning from looking through our telescopes? We couldn't.

But you can look through it. And when you look through your telescope, you're looking into the past. Yet, you know, I see so many people claiming that they won't believe something unless they see it with their own eye. When in fact, their own world view they believe things they haven't seen.

Let's just take atheism for a second. They believe that the universe came into existence of nothing and by nothing. Have you ever seen anything come into existence of nothing and by nothing? No, but they believe it. They believe the universe is fine-tuned. Even atheists will admit this, but there was no fine-tuner. Have you seen anything designed that didn't have a designer? Something so extremely designed, like the universe, the fine-tuning of the universe. Like 1 in 10 to the 40th precision or even more?

No, you've never seen anything designed unless there's a mind behind it. Yet, somehow, they believe it happened without a mind. You believe that life came from non-life without any intelligence. You know, we're using all our intelligence today to create life and we can't do it.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      PODCAST

And yet, we're believing that a non-intelligent process brought forth life. They've never seen it. And no, the Yuri Miller experiment didn't even get them close to life. They got biologically interesting chemicals, amino acids.

They didn't even get the right kind of amino acids. And amino acids are a long way from life. You need to string amino acids together to get proteins and proteins aren't even life. No, they, they didn't get life. And by the way, if you ever create life in the laboratory, it'll prove creation. Why? Because it shows that it took a lot of intelligence to create life. Yet people who've never seen this, they say, oh yeah, that's how it happened. You've never seen animals evolve into other completely different animals.

You've never seen macroevolution take place. We don't even have transitional fossils. Oh, we have some possibilities like *Ariopteryx*, but that's a possibility. If macroevolution is true, the fossil record ought to be filled with transitional forms. We don't see any of that. Even Darwin admitted it. We see most of the major body plants just appearing without fossil precursors in the Cambrian explosion instantaneously. Yet what do we hear?

We hear, oh no, that's how it happened. They haven't seen it and yet they believe it. They haven't seen any of these. You don't see history. All you can see, unless you're looking through a telescope, then you can see history. But in history, all you can do is take eyewitness testimony and look for artifacts left behind, like say through archaeology. That's how you know history. You haven't seen it. In fact, you probably haven't seen most of the world, yet you believe it exists.

You haven't seen the subatomic particles that make up your body, yet you believe they exist. You haven't seen hardly any of history, hardly any of the world, hardly any of the universe, yet you all believe it exists. So, so many. I'm not saying, I'm not just talking to you, Sev, I'm talking about atheists. So much of what we believe we take on authority. In fact, even scientific experiments that are repeated in the lab, have you repeated them in your lab yourself? No, you haven't.

Yet you believe the results of what some scientist did, a guy or gal you've never met, and you haven't seen the results. They just told you what the results were, and you believe it. Haven't

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      **PODCAST**

seen it. You can't even recreate what they've done, yet you believe it. You get on an airplane, you haven't seen the pilots trained, you don't even know who's up in the tower. Are they trained? You didn't even see the guys put the fuel on the plane or even put your bag on there.

You all believe it. You haven't seen it. You haven't seen your spouse every second of your life. You don't know if they're cheating on you or not, yet you believe they're not. You have maybe good reason to believe, but you haven't seen every-- It's impossible. We could go on quite obviously but let me go on with Sev's email. Oh, I gotta say one other thing. This is one of my frustrations in dealing with people who take shots at the Christian worldview.

They say, well, you haven't proven your case. Okay, let's say that's true, I haven't proven my case. But what is the evidence you have for your worldview? And have you proven your case? I mean, many of those things I just mentioned, if you're an atheist, the universe came into existence out of nothing, by nothing, it's fine-tuned by nobody. There's a multiverse out there we haven't seen. First life came from non-life without intelligent intervention.

Haven't seen that. Haven't seen new life forms evolve into other new life forms. In fact, all the experiments we do on it show that they can't do that, yet you believe all those things. What evidence do you have for those? I think if we're going to say that a certain worldview is true, we ought to have evidence for what we believe, not just saying well, your case is wrong.

Okay, give me some reasons why my case is wrong. And by the way, why are there reasons? Why is this a rational world where we can even discuss what's really true outside of our skulls? How do you even explain the ability to reason? We mentioned that earlier here in the program.

In other words, everybody has the burden of proof to show what they believe is true. Everybody does. Christians, non-Christians, atheists, whoever. We all have a burden of proof. Yet, I don't see the atheists or even the agnostics saying here's the evidence for why I believe in atheism or agnostic.

Oh, atheism's not a worldview. No, it is. You believe there's no God. Okay, what follows from that? Well, the universe must have created itself out of nothing then, right? It must be fine-tuned because that's the evidence we see, must be fine-tuned without a fine tuner. The moral

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**





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

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

law must have just evolved in our head somehow. But there's not really right or wrong, we just think it's right and wrong. Life must have come from non-life without intelligence. The natural laws, who created those? Oh, they're just there. We don't know why. Laws come from lawgivers in all our experience.

Messages come from minds. We see messages all throughout life, DNA. At least the Christian has reasons to believe what he believes. I don't see those same reasons coming from many other worldviews. In fact, it seems to me that in many cases, atheists don't have positive reasons why materialism can be true or why macroevolution or abiogenesis or the fine multiverse.

Whatever they're believing, they don't have evidence for their worldview. They just have complaints about the way God is running this universe. That's too much evil. He doesn't appear to everyone. I don't like what He does in the Old Testament. I don't like what His sexual ethics are. These are complaints. Look, it's easy to smell a rotten egg. It's hard to lay a better one. What evidence do you have for your position? The Christian has to establish two primary facts: God exists, and Jesus rose from the dead.

Everything else falls into place after that. Anyway, Sev goes on to say, I agree, we all have an inner moral code. We intuitively feel what's wrong and what's right. I totally agree there. But the miracles resurrection idea is really hard for me to believe. Sev, if it was easy to believe, in other words, if they happened again all the time, maybe that's what would make it easy to believe, right? They happened all the time. But then if they happened all the time they wouldn't, they wouldn't be special acts that would say oh this is the guy I ought to follow, Jesus.

You go on to say, Sev says if there was a way in which willing open-minded atheists could be convinced via proof, that would seem to be a believable tangible to them. What would that be and how do we get our proof? First of all, why is there proof for anything?

As I mentioned, because this is a rational world put together and sustained by a mind and we, our minds are made in that image. And you go on to say it would make me a true believer and I would be more than happy to spread the word the rest of my life if I was convinced myself.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

You know, I don't know. Have you ever read 'Mere Christianity?' Because Lewis, I'd have to look it up right now, I don't know if I could find it. But he says something like this. He says that there were times when I was an atheist that Christianity looked all too true. And there was a time, there's a time now when I'm a Christian when wow, it looks like maybe it isn't true, maybe atheism's true. But then he goes on to say this is where faith comes in.

In other words, after you've established by evidence that Christianity is true, faith, meaning trust is where you have to tell your feelings to get off and your doubts to get off. Because if there's ample evidence that Christianity is true, that evidence isn't erased because you have emotional or psychological problems believing in where that evidence points. That evidence is, it's like the hiddenness of God.

People go, well why doesn't God reveal Himself more overtly? Well, He certainly could if He wanted to, right? And we've talked about maybe some reasons why God might not do that. But even if you can't answer the hiddenness of God question, the hiddenness of God question doesn't negate the strong evidence we have for God, like the cosmological argument, the design argument, you know, the fine-tuning of the universe, the design of life, the moral argument, the Old Testament prophecy, the evidence for the resurrection. It doesn't negate all that evidence.

If God exists and Jesus rose from the dead, then Christianity is true. Even if you can't answer every objection to Christianity, you can't, in fact you can't answer every objection to any worldview. There's always areas you go, I don't know if I have a complete answer there. I may be able to apprehend an answer, but I can't completely comprehend an answer.

Where there's some things we just don't know, the secret things are left to the Lord. But there's enough so we can make a confident decision that Christianity is indeed true, and then it's up to us whether we go from that belief that it's true to belief in it's true.

It's like getting married. You know, you can get evidence that somebody would make a good spouse, but it's up to you, after you get that evidence, whether or not you're going to trust in that person to be your spouse. And that takes a certain amount of faith, a certain amount of not blind faith, but not complete knowledge. You don't have complete knowledge about that

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      **PODCAST**

person. You have enough knowledge to maybe make an informed decision, but not complete knowledge.

And of course, in a marriage, to the best of your ability, once you believe that it's true and trust in your spouse, you're supposed to work through there to the best of your ability, asking for the grace of God to get through any difficulty. And as you point, as you say, you know you've been divorced. Divorce is like cutting up a living body, as C.S. Lewis said. It's got to be so difficult. I don't know the circumstances of what you went through. It's difficult.

But you didn't have complete knowledge when you got married, yet you made a decision. You went from belief that to belief in. Of course it would be foolish, I think, to go to belief in without any belief that, yet a lot of Christians do that. And by the way, a lot of atheists do that. A lot of people in all sorts of different worldviews, they just trust in whatever their parents told them or whatever the spirit of the age is. They don't get evidence. We ought to get evidence. Sev, you go on to say, I realize that no one knows how the universe came to be.

Let me point out, well, not completely, but we have really good evidence it's got to be a spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, personal, intelligent creator. And then you say, nor how humans really came about. Not sure about the whole descendant from apes thing. Yeah, you shouldn't be sure of that because it didn't happen.

And to be fair to evolutionists, they don't believe we descended from apes. They believe there was a common ancestor, maybe with apes, that we shared. But look, even if macroevolution were true, it doesn't mean Christianity's false, and we've talked about that before. And Stephen Meyer has done some great work in that.

In fact, if you want another book to read, you might, if you're scientifically minded, Sev, I might recommend you get 'Return of the God Hypothesis' by Stephen C. Meyer. Also, I highly recommend you read 'Mere Christianity'. Anyway, you go on. But not knowing doesn't mean, at least to me, that a supernatural being is the cause of all this. Let me point out, Sev, that it really seems to me that if space, time, and matter had a beginning, it's got to be something beyond the natural. Nature had a beginning. So, whatever created nature must transcend nature.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

And as I said before, whatever you're thinking right now isn't completely natural. There's a supernatural aspect to it because your thoughts are not, first of all, your thought is not made of molecules. And the thinking process while using molecules isn't completely controlled by molecules because again, if it was, you couldn't trust anything you thought. You go on to say it could just mean that we're too limited to figure it out, right? Yeah, well, we're too limited to figure it out completely.

And by the way, that makes sense. It would be strange if an infinite God wasn't strange to us, Sev. That would be strange if we had God completely figured out. We don't. We know enough about God to know He's a creator, a sustainer, and someone who intervenes on occasion when he's trying to get our attention in a special way. We know that God exists, and we can trust in Him even if we don't completely comprehend God. Look, you can stand in front of an ocean and apprehend there's an ocean in front of you, even if you can't completely comprehend what's in that ocean.

And God is even bigger and more complex than an ocean. Complex? Not, not in His essence. He's simple. He's not made of parts. But I mean, what He knows. He knows all things. And since He knows all things and we're limited, we don't know all things, He's going to be somewhat of a mystery to us. You say maybe the natural world isn't as simple as we think. It's not. You look into the natural world. I've never seen a molecule, or an atom, or electron, or a proton, or a quark.

But scientists, although I haven't seen them, they tell us they're there. Yeah, it's not as simple as we think, but it still needs a cause. You say your book immediately assumes that if the world is finely tuned and no one knows how it was made, it means it was a creator, that God exists, and therefore miracles are possible. I struggle with that conclusion, no matter how tempting it is to want to believe it. Why? Why struggle? What if it's true? Again, Sev, you're talking about a psychological state that is independent of the evidence.

Psychology will not tell you what's true outside of your skull. The evidence will. Oh, sometimes your psychology may be right about what's outside your skull. I get that, but what I'm saying is if your psychology counters the evidence, then it's your psychology that's wrong, not the evidence. You say I'm reaching out to you for help and answering these questions. I'm truly

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

being open. I appreciate that, Sev. This is a great question. Yeah, I mean, you're just bearing your heart here. I so appreciate that. I hope what I've said is helpful.

You go on to say, I would love nothing more than to have certitude that life never ends, and that the soul exists and persists. Oh, let me throw one other thing in here. Do you know about near death experiences, Sev? Because there are veridical near death experiences. What do I mean by that? They're verifiable. In other words, somebody flatlines on the table and they don't come back and just say, I saw my grandmother. You can't verify that. But they come back and say stuff like, I just saw an accident on third and Main, and it was a blue Ford Explorer and a Tesla, just happened.

I was above the hospital. You know, the doctors, you know, bring the guy back and he says, I just saw it. And then the doctors check it out and that's what happened on Third and Main. The guy was on the table the whole time. How could he know that? Because there's something known as remote viewing. He actually was. His soul was separate from his body and somehow, he could see something remote from his body. That's just another line of evidence that shows materialism's false.

I mean, we know for other reasons it's false. I think Sean McDowell; I just saw a YouTube about it. He said he just did a YouTube on the top five near death experiences. I haven't watched it yet, but Sean always does a good interview. You may want to check that out, Sev. Also, we have shows in the past here on this program probably with Gary Habermas, the world-renowned expert on the resurrection because he's also an expert on near death experiences. If you go and get the Cross Examined app, two words in the app store, you can actually see or go back and listen in the archive to those shows.

But you say the soul persists. But much like I remember nothing before I was born, I have a panic inside of me when I think of the inevitability of death. It really petrifies me. Well, you ought to go to somebody, Sev, who's actually conquered death and that's Jesus Himself. And I think the evidence is there for that. So, you say thank you for reading this. I hope this finds you well. It does Sev, especially when there are people out there like you, who are open and are seeking the truth. So read, just read the Gospel of John. Ask yourself, who is this Jesus and what does He expect of me?

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

He expects you to trust in Him. In fact, John even says these things were written down so that you may know that Jesus is the Savior, that Jesus is the Messiah, and that by believing in Him you may have life in His name. That's the last verse of chapter 20. That's why that biography we call a gospel was written Sev, so you may know who Jesus is and you may have life in His name. You can trust in Him even when you have doubts. Look, everyone has doubts. I don't have it all figured out. Nobody has it all figured out. But I'm sure beyond a reasonable doubt that Christianity is true.

So, I trust in Jesus and that's true no matter what worldview you take. If you take atheism, you have reasonable doubts that's true too. Nobody has it completely figured out. The problem with atheism, of course, it makes your reasoning capacity unreliable. Again, if you're a molecular machine, you shouldn't believe anything you think. But you can believe certain things you think, which means materialism, materialistic atheism is false.

So, what's true? Christianity appears to be true. And by the way, you know we do this on college campuses friends. Tomorrow night, if you're listening to this on the 11th of February, we're going to be at the University of Nebraska for I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist in Lincoln, Nebraska.

Everyone's welcome. Go to our website. Watch it streaming live I think it's 7 PM Central Time. And then next week we're going to be at Lord willing, at the William and Mary University in near Williamsburg, Virginia. That'll be streamed live as well, 7:00 PM Eastern Time, the 20th of February. Also going to be out in California coming up at Revival Christian Fellowship. I want to say that is the last weekend in February. It is. It's the 23rd of February. We're going to be talking about does science conflict with Christianity out there at Revival Christian Fellowship.

That's Menifee, California, Southern California. Everyone's welcome there too. We'll be doing the morning services and Sunday night at 6 PM. Then I'll be in Dallas at a conference of Southern Baptists that's on our website and also be at the NRB National Religious Broadcasters Convention. So, if any of you there, hope to see you there. A lot more coming up on the calendar. Check it all out. Also check out our online courses. Expedition to Reality with Shanda Fulbright is coming up. Seventh to ninth graders for the premium version, but for everybody

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

else, you can take the self-paced course whenever you want, and I think even adults should take that course.

It's a great worldview course. Also, Online CIA is coming up. You want to check all that out. If you want to be instructed on how to present better by either me, Greg Koukl, Alisa Childers, or Natasha Crain. And then you get the value of all the other instructors, including J. Warner Wallace, Alan Parr, David Wood, several others. Go to [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org). Click on online courses. You will see it there. And Lord willing, friends, I will see you here next week. God bless.

**CROSS**  
**EXAMINED**  
**ORG**

