Is Old-Earth Creationism Anti-Biblical? Responding to Ken Ham

October 20, 2026

FRANK:
Ladies and gentlemen, we have a lot to cover today. There's a controversy over the age of the earth. Ken Ham has brought this up. Coming after me in a video, we'll get to that. Also, France is on fire. Why is it on fire? And we have a question from a listener, a skeptic to our show that's pushing back on some of the things I said in the last program. We'll get into all that, but before I do, I want to point out that I've mentioned this a few times, but here's the formal announcement: the update to the book *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist* comes out one week from today.

Here it is, completely updated. I've been working on it for a couple of years. I had my friend David Geisler, the son of my late co-author Norman Geisler, review the manuscript and give me some suggestions to the changes. So it's coming out on the 27th. We'll put the link in the show notes for the brand new copy of *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*.

Completely updated. Every chapter has been updated. There's a new chapter in it, and I want to point out that the argumentation, the logic of the argument for Christianity, is the same. In other words, the same 12 points that you find in the original, you'll find in this new update. However, there's been so much new evidence that has come to light to support all those arguments that we had to include them and wanted to include them in the new update.

And also, we deal with so many of the objections that have arisen since this book came out in 2004 for the first time. So take a look at *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*. We're blessed that this book, the original, sold I think to this point over 600,000 copies. So here's the new edition. It's a little bit longer because there's more evidence. There's a new chapter, as I said, and there is a lot more of these, or are a lot more of these objections that have been brought up since the first edition that we respond to in here.

And I'm gonna read from a section of this briefly here in a few minutes. Let's get to our first issue that we're going to talk about today. Ken Ham has come out with a video basically criticizing my view or my teaching on the age of the earth. Now let me point out that Ken Ham has done some absolutely fabulous work, particularly with the Ark Encounter.

I don't know if you guys have ever been to the Cincinnati area. It's in Kentucky, but it's just south of the Cincinnati airport. I was there four or five years ago. Had a great tour. I met Ken. I mean, it's just an amazing, amazing exhibit, the Ark Encounter, and they deal with all the objections that people have to Noah's Ark. It's all there. It's really well done. So I don't have anything against Ken personally.

But I will say this that he appears to me to make much too much about the age of the universe, and the people that disagree with him, he frequently calls them compromisers. Now the people that he disagrees with are not just myself, but people of far more higher pedigree than me.

People like Stephen Meyer, people like John Lennox, people like Jack Collins, people in history, Augustine thought that man was young, but he didn't think that the first chapter of Genesis was telling us how old the universe was. So Ken Ham is sort of picking a fight, not with me, I'm nobody, but some people of high, high pedigree when he tries to come out and say that only my interpretation of a young earth is correct.

Look, everyone I just mentioned all agree that the scriptures are inerrant, but it seems that Ken Ham believes only his interpretation of the Bible is inerrant. Now, so let's take a look at this from about 10,000 feet. This issue, and I know for some reason this issue is people feel really feel strong about it.

They want to pound the table with it. Let me point out right off the top that I don't think this is a primary issue. This is a secondary or tertiary issue. How old is the universe? In fact, there's actually three questions here. How old is the universe? How old is the Earth? And how old are human beings? Those are three different questions. Personally, right off the top, I'll tell you that I think the best evidence shows the universe is old, the Earth is old, but man is very young.

Okay, and we'll get into that here in just a few minutes. Now. I'm not saying that when you look at the Bible that the young earth interpretation is impossible. I actually think it might be correct. It might be. All I'm saying is that it is possible that the Bible leaves the age of the earth indeterminate, which of course would allow the possibility that the earth and the universe is indeed old.

And I think it's very important to look at what the text says. Okay, let's just go to Genesis 1, and I'm going to use the New American Standard Version here because that is widely recognized as one of the more literal interpretations. Here's what Genesis 1 says: "In the beginning, God

created the heavens and the earth." Okay, stop. When did God create the heavens and the earth?

In the beginning. Does it say when the beginning was? No, not in the first verse anyway. Next verse: "And the earth was formless and desolate emptiness." Some might say the earth was formless and void. Some translations. "And darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was hovering over the surface of the waters." All right, that's verse 2.

Now, notice if you want to take a very literal interpretation of Genesis 1, the heavens and the earth are created in verse 1. And then suddenly the text starts talking about the earth, and the earth was formless and desolate, or formless and void. Wait a minute, we've got the heavens and the earth, which was the Hebrew way of saying the universe.

We've got them created in verse 1. Then suddenly we're talking about the earth. How long did that take? Doesn't say. Then the third verse is when you start getting the days. Then God said, "Let there be light," and there was light. You know how it goes from there. Okay, so if you want to take a hyper-literal view of Genesis, the heavens and the earth, i.e., the universe, is created in verse 1.

The second verse is talking about the earth, and it doesn't give you any time indicators here. How long did that? It doesn't say. So people like John Lennox and Jack Collins and others will say that the Bible leaves the age of the earth indeterminate because the days don't begin until verse 3 and the days appear to be talking more about what goes on with regard, well, I'll get to it here in a minute.

Look, let's just do things in order here. Now Ken in his video said, "Oh oh, but you got to go to Exodus chapter 20 verse 11." That's part of the Ten Commandments when God starts talking about the Sabbath, and here's what this passage says: "For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea and everything that is in them, and He rested on the seventh day.

For that reason, the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy." So, here Ken will say, "Well, obviously, this means that God created the whole show in seven days." The problem is, is that when you read the text carefully, Exodus 20:11 doesn't say God created the heavens and the earth in six days.

It says God made the heavens and the earth. Different Hebrew word is used here in Exodus 20 than is used in Genesis 1:1. Does that have any significance? It might. Why? Because it appears in Genesis 1 God is creating out of nothing. In Exodus 20, he's taking what's already created and preparing it for use.

Made, like, you know, if your mom says go make your bed, does she, if does she mean go up to your room and build a bed, create a bed? No, she means go prepare it for use. So it's possible here that Exodus 20:11 is saying that God is preparing the heavens and the earth for the use of human beings, even though the heavens and the earth, the universe was created in verse 1.

So you can't necessarily say, it's a possible interpretation. I want to be charitable here. It's a possible interpretation that the Bible here is teaching the universe is young, but it's equally possible it's teaching that the age of the universe is indeterminate. It's it's it's not teaching you how old the universe is here. That's a possible interpretation.

Oh, what about death before the fall? Again, the young earth people do not seem to read the passage clearly. They go to Romans 5:12, but they say, "Well, how could you have death before the fall? Because you know Adam had to sin before death could come." That's not what Romans 5:12 says. What does Romans 5:12 say? It says, "Just as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all mankind." It doesn't say all creatures; it says all mankind because all sinned.

In other words, Romans 5:12 is not saying that death to animals came through the sin of Adam. He's saying death to man came through the sin of Adam. Is it possible there was death to animals before Adam? Yes, that's possible, according to Romans 5:12, because it's not saying what the young earthers often think it says.

It's not saying death came to all creation. And oh, by the way, there was a fall before the fall, the fall of Satan. When did that happen? We don't know. It's all speculation, but it's obviously prior to Adam, because Satan is in the garden. So again, there are three questions going on here: How old is the universe? How old is the earth? And how old are human beings? I think that it's possible the universe is old.

I don't really care if it's old or young. I think the Bible is leaving it indeterminate. I think when you add up the genealogies and all that, I think, and I even think from science, science will show, properly interpreted, that mankind is relatively young, thousands of years, not millions of years. And it seems to me that some people, like Ken Ham and others that work with him.

They somehow think that suggesting that the Earth is old is providing evidence for evolution or an opening for evolution, but this isn't true, because I guess maybe Ken's not keeping up with what the latest research shows, because the latest research shows that evolution fails for several reasons that have nothing to do with time.

So granting millions of years doesn't make evolution possible. In fact, in the new book, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, we say this. There's a section in there. I think this is a chapter six, where we're talking about macroevolution. You know, from the goo to you via the zoo. And the headline to the section says, "Major evolutionists now admit that mutating DNA won't work." Why do we say that?

Actually, since the original writing of *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, there's been so much more research that has come out that the case against macroevolution is even stronger to the point that even Darwinists, evolutionists, are admitting, "Look, our theory doesn't work. We need a new theory." In fact, here's what Michael Behe, who wrote Darwin's Black Box said in 2020 when he wrote another book critiquing evolution, here's the quote: "Since the turn of the millennium," so he's talking about since 2000.

"Since the turn of the millennium, a raft of distinguished biologists have written books critically evaluating evolutionary theory. None of them think that Darwin's mechanism is the main driver of life." Unquote. None of them. These are Darwinists, ladies and gentlemen, that are saying, "Look, our theory doesn't work. We need a new theory." In fact, 10 years ago, in London, the Royal Society, a scientific affiliation that goes all the way back to Isaac Newton.

I mean, Isaac Newton was a member of this many years ago. They called a meeting in November of 2016, and the purpose of the meeting was to investigate other possible theories of evolution because the current theory just doesn't work, according to the Darwinists themselves. Now they had this meeting; they didn't come up with a new theory, but they're admitting their theory doesn't work.

And so whether you grant millions of years or billions of, it's not going to help the theory. Why? Well, in the new update, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist* we point out there are seven discoveries that show why macroevolutionary theory doesn't fit the evidence. I don't have time to explain them all here. I'm just gonna list them here in the context of this argument over does more time help evolution.

Here are seven reasons why macroevolution does not fit the evidence. Epigenetic information, that's the structure of a thing, and you can't get the structure that you need just by mutating DNA. That's number one, and we explain it in the book. I'm just listing them here. Secondly, there are genetic limits to change, and you just can't, from our own experiments, just mutate something into a new body plan.

There's always genetic limits. Thirdly, the changes that we experience in nature are cyclical, not directional. They don't go in the direction of a completely new type of creature. They fluctuate along a mean. Number four, irreducible complexity. You can't change living things gradually and still have function.

They will die if you try and do that. So irreducible complexity refutes gradualism right off the bat, and that is something Michael Behe brought to bear 30 years ago in his book Darwin's Black Box. Number five, there are molecular conflicts that we see in molecular biology that completely destroy the idea that there's a tree of life. The tree of life has been destroyed by molecular biology.

Number six, there's a non-viability of transitional forms. For example, they say that amphibians ultimately morphed into birds somehow, evolved into birds. But how could you have, say, an amphibian, which is kind of between a amphibian and a bird?

How could you have this intermediate creature survive if the scales weren't completely feathers? They couldn't fly, and they couldn't stay in the water if they didn't have the right aquatic qualities to it. This transitional form would be unable to survive. It couldn't fly. It couldn't be in the water. It would be prey immediately.

And oh, by the way, what evolutionists never tell you about is in order for something to evolve to a new type, you'd have to have a male and a female evolve together to get you that new type. And there's no evidence for that. And then finally, number seven, the big problem for macroevolution remains the fossil record. You don't see all these transitional forms. You see forms come into existence, and they remain unchanged, and then suddenly they go out of existence.

This is not what macroevolution predicts. So, regardless of how much time you have, you have these seven problems, which, and there's more problems than this, but these are some of the problems we cover in the new update to *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, so if you want to go further, you can. And by the way, I'm standing on shoulders of people like Stephen

Meyer and Doug Axe and other people who are much more qualified to deal with these issues than I am from an academic perspective.

I'm standing on their shoulders, so you'll see me quote them and quote what they're saying and quote their books in *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*. In fact, Doug Axe found that blind natural laws will never give you a new body plan. They wouldn't even give you a new protein fold. In fact, here's a quote from the book *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*. "Blind natural laws left to themselves won't even create one protein fold in trillions of Earth histories, much less life, much less a human brain." Trillions of Earth histories.

So even if our Earth is 4.5 billion years old, as many scientists say. If you multiply that by a trillion, you're not even gonna get a new protein fold, much less life. So when Ken Ham and others say, "Oh, if you say it's possible there are millions of years that somehow you're providing some sort of opening for evolution." No, you're not, okay?

Because trillions, trillions of Earth histories are never going to give you an evolved creature into something other, into some other type of creature. It's not going to happen. The math doesn't work, and Doug Axe has found that. And so then we ask in atheist or in *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist* why do atheists insist that we got here by natural processes?

Because they've ruled out intelligence and assume naturalism is true. They just assume it. So the only game in town is evolution, and by the way, Dr. Geisler pointed this out years ago, when we try and say, when evolution is trying to say, well, just give it more time. You know, if you give us more time, we're going to get a new form of life.

Not only does that not work from the biology and from the math that you have to apply to that, but just from a conceptual perspective, it doesn't work either. Geisler used to say this. He'd say that more time leads to more randomness in a non-living thing, not organization.

So, for example, suppose you're flying a plane over your house and you've got red, white, and blue confetti in it. If you drop the red, white, and blue confetti a thousand feet over your house, what are the chances it's going to form the American flag on your front lawn? Not very good because nature randomizes things. Okay, let's take it up to 10,000 feet.

Let's give it more time. Is that going to help? No, it's going to be even more random, more spread out. So, and James Tour has pointed this out when it comes to initial life. James Tour, who is an expert on this, and he teaches at Rice University in Houston. He points out that

nobody knows, and we quote him at length in here on the origin of the first life, and the more time you give these chemicals, the more random, the more time there is to break down any kind of reaction that could possibly bring forth life.

So, when evolutionists or let me put it another way: when young earthers try and claim that you're somehow giving an opening to evolution because of time, it's it's just not true. It doesn't work. Also, I want to point out that in order to interpret the Bible, you have to bring certain assumptions to the Bible, just like any text, because God hasn't just written one book, the Bible; He's written another book.

And that is nature. In other words, you have natural theology. This is sometimes called prolegomena, the study of what you need to know before you can understand the Bible. Like you need to know logic, you need to know grammar, you need to know certain things about the world in order to interpret a text, not just the Bible, but any text. And I don't know if Ken Ham is aware of this, but you're always bringing assumptions to any text, including the Bible.

So we might say that God has written His Word, but He's also written His works, and that is creation, and that is conscience. And we need His works to interpret His Word. In fact, let's just take the first verse of the Bible: "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth." Okay, what does that assume? First of all, it assumes you know language, right? Assumes you know logic.

It assumes you have some idea of who this God guy is, right? God, what does that even mean? He's some kind of agent, and it assumes you know something about cause and effect. God created the heavens and the earth. How do you know that? You know that from just living in reality through observation. You know that every effect has a cause.

So when you come to the text, you're bringing those assumptions with you. It's not explained in the text. In fact, in order for you to get everything you know from the text, this is where people go wrong when they talk about sola scriptura. Sola scriptura does not mean you get everything you know from the Bible. That would be impossible anyway, because in order to get anything out of the Bible, you have to bring certain tools with you to the Bible, including, as I mentioned, logic and grammar and cause and effect and reason and all these things.

So. Keep in mind that sometimes what you learn outside the Bible helps you understand what the Bible is saying. In fact, Richard Howe, Doctor Richard Howe, who is helping teach our philosophy course right now, he's the main instructor during the Zoom sessions.

He is personally a young earther. He teaches at Southern Evangelical Seminary, but he had a dialogue many years ago with Ken Ham at the Southern Evangelical Seminary Apologetics Conference, and he was just trying to point out that you need to bring certain assumptions to the text to understand what it means. And so he asked Ken, he said, "Ken, how do you know from the Bible alone that the earth is going around the sun, not the sun going around the earth?" And I don't think Ken ever answered the question, because it would give away what he was trying to say or what or the point he was trying to make that I get all my I just read the Bible and I get I just know what it means and no, you're bringing assumptions to the text.

If you want to take a wooden literal interpretation of the Bible, you would have to say that the sun goes around the earth because it talks about sunrise and sunset, right? Yeah, well, if you're going to take a wooden literal interpretation, but you know from God's works that it's actually the earth going around the sun.

And so when you read a passage like sunrise, sunset, you know that the Bible isn't being technically precise. It's using observational or phenomenal language, phenomenological language, just like we do today in our scientific age. When you say watch a meteorologist, on the news and the meteorologist says sunrise tomorrow at 6:42, he's using observational language.

He's not going to be technically correct and say Earth rotation will become apparent at 6:42. No, he's using observational language. Now you need to bring that to the text to know what the text is trying to communicate back to you. And so, I think we need a little bit more humility when we're trying to say that my view of the age of the earth is the only possible view.

I mean, it seems like people like Ken Ham and others, and by the way, I like Ken. He's done some great work, as I said. I just think he's trying to make this a first-tier issue of salvation when it's not a first-tier issue of salvation. No matter how far back you go, you need a being like God to create the universe, fine-tune the universe, create the first life, and create subsequent life forms.

No matter how far back you go. So you're not giving an opening to the atheist by saying maybe the universe is old. You're not giving an opening at all because no matter how far back you go, you're going to have to have a cause. A being like God, a spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, intelligent, personal cause, who created and sustains all this.

Now, I know Ken Ham thinks that people are leaving the church because you know we don't teach the young earth view. I actually think the opposite is true. How many people won't even consider Christianity because they think in order to be a Christian they would have to believe the universe is only 6,000 years old? There's far more people like that in my view.

In fact, I know some of them. A very good friend of mine actually left the faith because he was going to a fundamentalist church that would pound the pulpit and say there's no other view than the earth is 6,000 years old. And him being scientifically minded said, you know, I know God has written His Word. But he's also written his works, but he didn't know much about the works.

He just came from a scientific background and said, "There are so many different evidences that seem to point to an old universe. How can I believe the Bible is true? This is really, this is really causing me to doubt the Word of God." And then when he ran into people like Hugh Ross and John Lennox and others who were saying, "Well, if you read the text carefully." It doesn't necessitate a young view.

Let me go back and say the young view is possible. I'm not saying it, it might be right from from reading the text, but I'm also saying that it might be right it's just leaving that question of how old the universe is indeterminate. It's not a test for orthodoxy. Look, I got no problem with somebody believing or advocating the young Earth view, but apparently the young earthers have a problem with me advocating maybe an indeterminate view.

I do have a problem with tarring people who disagree as being compromisers, when a viable interpretation of all the texts leaves one thinking that the Bible teaches the age of the earth indeterminate, or the age of the universe. Remember, there are three questions: age of the universe, age of the earth, and age of man. I think man is young. Stephen Meyer thinks man is young too, but how old is the universe?

How old is Earth? Indeterminate at this point. If from a scientific perspective, if the science is right, maybe it's not, but if the science is right, it appears the universe is 13.8 billion years old. The Earth is 4.5 billion years old. And that has to do with the speed of light and some other issues. You say, "Well, why couldn't God have created it all, say, the light already in motion or already in existence, or like Adam was you know, born of age." Well, that's all possible.

It's certainly possible. But is God trying to deceive us in that way? I mean, if God created the entire universe static, like He just created it all completely static and in place, we wouldn't have

any scientific evidence that it had a beginning. But if he created it out of nothing from a single point and it expanded out like it appears he has, now we can look back in time and actually see evidence of the creation event.

And we cover that again in the book, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, if you want to go further into that. So by actually creating what has been pejoratively called the Big Bang. He is actually giving us scientific evidence the universe had a beginning. If it was static and eternal, we wouldn't see it. Now, I think there's other ways of showing the universe had a beginning, like the Kalam cosmological argument.

If we talked about that, you can't go on an infinite regress of causes, and you can't have an infinite number of days before today. Why can't you have an infinite number of days before today? Because today never would have gotten here. So there can only be a finite number of days before today. For today to get here, and if there's a finite number of days before today, that means time had a beginning, and whatever created time must be outside of time, timeless.

In fact, all the evidence that we cover, and *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, shows, I think, beyond any reasonable doubt, that the universe had a beginning, and whatever created the universe, space, time, and matter came into existence, must be beyond space, time, and matter. Whatever created the universe must be beyond space, time, and matter.

So the cause must be spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful to create the universe out of nothing, personal in order to choose to create, and also intelligent to have a mind to choose to create. Now, those are the attributes of God: a spaceless, timeless, immaterially powerful, personal, intelligent creator. Now, we don't know if this is Jesus, the Christian God, until we look at evidence for the resurrection, and once we see the evidence for the resurrection, then we can go back and say that the same being that created the entire universe out of nothing is the same being that walked out of the tomb 1,993 years ago.

In his divine nature, however, he created the whole show out of nothing. So, God, by doing it in a way that expands from a single point, is actually giving us evidence that there was a creation, scientific evidence that there was a creation. Now, again, I'm a nobody when it comes to credentials. I don't even know what credentials Ken Ham has, but from scientific credentials, I'm a nobody.

I'm standing on the shoulders of other people, but there are many more people who are Christians, who are scientists, who believe the Earth and the universe is old, and they have good

reasons for it. Maybe they're in error. Maybe they're not. I don't think the scriptures demand a young earth, a young earth interpretation.

I think it leaves the age of the universe indeterminate. And look, everybody is a believer in this little discussion. Ken Ham is a believer. Stephen Meyer, myself, John Lennox, many other people. We're all believers and we all agree the Scriptures are inerrant. But it seems like Ken believes only his interpretation is inerrant on this non-essential issue.

At best, this is a Romans 14 issue. It's a disputable matter, and I think we ought to be changing the tone here. I mean, we shouldn't be engaged in friendly fire, calling people compromisers, but spending our time refuting unbelievers and making disciples, because when you get to heaven, God isn't going to say, "Did you think it was old or young?" He's going to say, "What did you do with Jesus?" That's the real issue.

This is not a salvific issue, but some people, I think, make it, they raise it to the level of that in their tone and their tenacity, even though they might say, "Well, it's not an essential issue." Well, if it's not an essential issue, then stop making such a big deal out of it, because it's quite obvious that the Bible can be interpreted to leave the age of the universe indeterminate.

So, with that said, look, I didn't bring this up. Ken Ham did. So, again, Ken, nothing against you. You're doing great work in many areas, but I think that your level of tenacity on the age of the Earth is misplaced. There are much more important things to be tenacious about. It's not how old the universe is.

So let's move on now to this situation in France. Who is behind all this? Well, have you noticed some Palestinian flags? Have you noticed some Tunisian flags? There's even a Tunisian trade union involved. These are leftists. This is part of the Red Green Alliance. Red Green Alliance, leftists and Islam. The leftists are siding with the Islamicists.

And we've talked about this before here on this program. Why are they doing so? As we point out, I hate, I'm bringing up these books because they just came out. *The War on Reality*. We cover this in *The War on Reality*. We talked about the fact that cultural Marxists view people according to what they say are either oppressed or oppressor categories or identities. And who's in the oppressed identity group?

Anybody that is a Muslim, a non-Christian, anybody that is, say, LGBTQ, anybody that's a leftist, basically is considered oppressed. And anybody who's heterosexual, Christian, citizen, these

people are oppressors. And what happens is, is that the leftists side with the Islamicists because they're both considered oppressed. It seems to me the leftists, the leftists never seem to learn that as soon as the Muslims take over they are the first ones who are persecuted.

It happened in Iran 47, 48 years ago, when the college leftist college students in Tehran, which was a monarch at that time under the Shah, when Jimmy Carter greenlighted the Ayatollah to go take over Iran essentially, the reason he greenlighted him was because so many college students and others in Iran wanted the ayatollah to come and give them free healthcare and give them free education and all these things.

Well, as soon as the ayatollah showed up, what did he do to the college students? The leftists. He executed many of them. They said, "Wait, wait, wait, wait! No, no, no! We're on your side. We got you." Doesn't matter now. You're an enemy. You're an infidel. People don't see this. This is, by the way, where you get gays for Gaza. Gays for Gaza. Are you kidding me? Really, I mean, do you know how crazy that is?

In fact, there was a gay activist last year who said, "I'll give a million dollars to anybody that goes to Gaza right now and organizes a pride parade." Nobody took him up on it because the gays would be thrown off buildings there. They would be murdered. Because the Islamicists are simply using the leftists right now as what we call useful idiots.

I think that term may have actually arisen from the Iranian revolution. These leftists are useful idiots. There's a red-green alliance, but the folks who are the Islamicists are going to break that alliance once they take power. And they're trying to take power in France right now.

This is what happens when unmitigated immigration, uncontrolled immigration, takes place because not everybody believes the same in their culture as, say, the French do or as we do in the United States. We believe in rights. We believe in individual freedoms. The people coming from Muslim countries don't necessarily believe that.

And oh, by the way, let's critique multiculturalism while we're at it. Multiculturalism is false and self-defeating, logically and practically. Multiculturalism says like all cultures are essentially the same, and you can't really morally judge one from another. I mean, to say that all cultures are equally moral, it's false on its face. Are you telling me the Nazis are just as good as, say, a free country where we don't murder people?

Are you saying the jihadists are just as good as, say, the Amish, right, or the Quakers? I mean, are you saying Islamic cultures are just as good as free Western democracies that we have here, at least for the time being? Are you saying that the Hindu caste system is just as morally equivalent to saying that everybody is made in the image of God and everybody has rights regardless of their social status.

Are you saying that atheistic regimes which murdered a hundred million people in the last century are just as moral as, say the United States of America, which again treats everybody as if they're people with rights made in the image and likeness of God. Doesn't mean we've always carried that out perfectly; don't get me wrong, but in our laws we agree with that.

Do you think slavery, a culture of slavery, is just as good as a culture of freedom? No, multiculturalism is nonsense practically, morally, because all cultures are not the same. That's why Winston Churchill had to rally Europe in order to defeat the Nazi culture, because the Nazi culture was not morally equivalent to the British culture or to the Western culture of France and Italy, and, well, Italy had gone fascist, but you get the idea.

Free Europe. And it's also logically self-defeating or self-contradictory, because multiculturalism says that a culture that doesn't believe all cultures are equally moral is morally wrong. So a multiculturalist will say, "Well, if you're an American and if you think that America has better laws than say Iran, you're wrong." Well, that's not multiculturalism.

You're excluding my cultural view that not all cultures are morally equivalent. So a multiculturalist would say that we're all morally wrong if we believe our constitution is morally better than Sharia law, or if we say loving our neighbor is better than a jihadist inspired rioting like we see right here. We'll put a little rioting from France here on the screen.

It's mostly peaceful, though. You see how peaceful that is? Yeah, it's mostly peaceful. Thanks, CNN. Yeah, yeah. No, look, multiculturalism is just relativism applied to cultures. But by what moral standard are you saying that all cultures are morally equal? You have to have a moral standard to say that, and an objective standard shows that it's obviously false.

As we've just pointed out, a relative standard can't make any real or binding moral judgments. So multiculturalism is false either way. It's false on its face, and it's also false just logically, because multiculturists think people who think certain cultures are better than others are wrong, and so they're saying that culture's wrong. So either way, it doesn't work.

And what does it result in? It results in a lot of death. And a lot of destruction, as we're seeing in France right now, and they better get their immigration under control, or they're not going to be a free country very much longer. And the same thing is true here in America, ladies and gentlemen. You just can't put your head in the sand and say that everybody that comes here is coming here with good motives and agrees with us on our values of, say, the rights in our First Amendment: freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of association.

Freedom of petition. We agree with all that, right, here in America. But not everybody outside of America, and even some people inside of America now, like many of the Democrats, it seems, don't believe in that. So, if you want those freedoms, and you want to maintain those freedoms, you're going to have to put people in power that agree with that, or you're going to lose it, and you're going to have to prevent people from coming into this country that do not want to assimilate and take away your freedoms.

I always, as we pointed out in the last show, you know, people will say, "Well, no, I don't get involved in politics. I just preach the gospel." Do you realize that politics affects the gospel, as we pointed out? There's no, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an atheist show in Iran. They don't allow it. There's no Calvary Chapel in Tehran. There's no First Baptist Church in Tehran. I've been there.

I checked. They're not there. They don't allow it politically. So it's crazy for people to say, "Oh, it doesn't really matter." No, it does matter. And by the way, I don't know if you saw this that Rasmussen Reports, Scott Rasmussen was a pollster who sold Rasmussen Reports not long ago. He's not involved with it anymore, but it still bears his name. Did you see this last week? We'll put it in the show notes.

Hard to believe this is true, but in our country, check this out. I'm quoting from this survey. Positive views of Sharia law are much higher among younger voters, including 43% of voters aged 18 to 24 and 39% of those ages 25 to 29.

By contrast, just 16% of those 40 and older view Sharia positively. I can't even believe it's that high. 16% of 40 and older. Who made that famous statement? You know, if you're not a liberal when you're 20, you don't have a heart. If you're not a conservative when you're 40, you don't have a brain. Okay, Sharia. Do you know what Sharia law is, ladies and gentlemen?

Apparently, these voters don't. Even these 18 to 24 voters don't. We had a clip that got well over a million views when I had Bill Fetterer on the show several months ago, and I described, from one of Bill's own writings, the historian Bill Fetterer, what Sharia law is.

What does Sharia law say right now in Iran? We're going to play that clip right now. If you don't know what Sharia law is, here it is. Check this out.

[**VIDEO**]:
There were no freedoms that we would expect here in the West. There's no freedom for liberals, leftists, or feminists. In fact, the first woman to serve in Iran's cabinet was executed by firing squad when the Ayatollah Khomeini took over.

Sharia law permits no women to leave their homes without their husband's permission. No women can leave their house unless accompanied by a male relative. A woman must obey her husband in all matters, or else she has no right to clothing, housing, or food. A man can have multiple wives in Iran as young as 13. A man may physically discipline his wife for disobedience. In fact, the Quran, Surah 4, talks about that.

There is no right for a woman to divorce her husband, but men possess the exclusive right to divorce and can divorce a wife without her knowledge, consent, or formal proceeding. Only two male witnesses need to hear the husband's announcements, and children then automatically become the custody of their father. No dogs are allowed as indoor pets in Iran. Tattoos are frowned upon.

No alcohol, Western movies, or dances. No music, including on radio or television. No men and women swimming or sunbathing. Men are punished for wearing shorts. All homosexuals in Iran are exterminated. The execution of drug addicts and prostitutes occur there. There's no freedom of speech, and a fatwa is declared on those who say things that insult Islam.

That's an assassination, What a fatwa is, a declaration of an assassination. Anything that is not Islam insults Islam. There's no freedom of assembly. There's no right to a general for the general public to own weapons, which might cause trouble for the populace to want to rise up and take over that government. There's no meaningful right for people to petition their government.

All education must be Islamicized. Youth are encouraged to martyrdom for Islam. There's no right to a public trial by an impartial jury. There's no right to be secure from arbitrary arrests,

home invasions, or property seizures. Your four fingers are cut from your right hand if you steal, and if you steal again, your left foot is amputated.

Torture is systematically used against political prisoners, and there's a death penalty if you convert to Christianity. Outside of that, Sharia law is a great thing. No. This is what has been going on in Iran for 47 years, ladies and gentlemen, and it mystifies me There are people here in America who actually think the takedown of this regime is a bad thing.

Did they know what's going on with regard to Sharia law? Do people understand that if Sharia law is put in place here in America, nobody is going to like it? Yet that's where we are right now [END VIDEO].

Oh, oh, do you want that here after seeing that? 43% of voters, 18 to 24. Look, please, I, it amazes me how people they just have to be ignorant over this stuff to actually think that's what they want here in America.

And this is one reason why, by the way, voting matters. Are you going to put policies in place that protect human rights or not? Are you going to put policies in in place that protect Western culture or not? Now, if you don't know if you're registered, if you if you don't know where the candidates stand, we've got a website for you. Go to voteyourfaith.net. Voteyourfaith.net. It'll tell you whether or not you're registered.

It'll tell you where all the candidates stand. It's nonpartisan. It'll just tell you where they stand. It'll also, if you click on a certain link, it'll send you a reminder to vote the day before election day. Now you can vote in many places early now. And unfortunately, 50% of Christians won't vote. 50% of Christians won't vote. If Christians voted and voted biblically, our country would be in much better shape, and so would our freedoms to preach and live the gospel.

And fewer people would be murdered, fewer kids would be mutilated. It's not hard to vote. Go out and vote. Check votelyourfaith.net out. In fact, Winston Churchill said this. And I think it's something a lesson that we all need to take. Here's what Winston Churchill said. He wrote this in a book he wrote right after the war called *The Gathering Storm*, but he may have said it earlier than this.

He said this: "If you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed, if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly. You may come to the moment

when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance at survival.

There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory because it is better to perish than to live as slaves." Unquote. Winston Churchill, ladies and gentlemen. And when he says, "If you're not willing to fight for the right, when you can easily win without bloodshed," you know what that is? That's right now.

You can easily win without bloodshed. Enough Christians get out there and vote and vote properly. You can make sure that legally you don't lose rights, so it never comes to bloodshed. So you never see the kind of riots that they're seeing in France right now, where too many people have come into that country that don't agree with the freedoms that the French have had for many years, and they want to take them away.

So now is the time, ladies and gentlemen. Now, we had a an email come from Mike, who is our resident skeptic, nice guy, smart guy who writes in frequently about the show and the show we did last week about the top 10 reasons Christians ought to be involved in politics. He took a little consternation with, so let me read some of this.

He says, "Frank, you made the case that Christians should be engaged in political discourse and absolutely vote. I completely agree. All eligible American citizens should take advantage of their right and fulfill their civic duty to vote, regardless of their particular religious persuasion, as guaranteed by the Constitution." I agree, Mike. I actually said that. Even I think all Americans should vote. All citizens should vote.

I agree, all right. And then Mike said this: "You argued that it was Christians who so engaged and put an end to slavery." Let me stop right here. Not only put an end to slavery, but Christians were the ones that founded the country, of course. All right. When people say, "Well, we ought not be involved in politics," you know, you wouldn't even have America if it wasn't for Christians involved in politics. But I digress. Anyway, so Mike says that I said that Christians put an end to slavery.

And then Mike says, "You failed to mention that it was Christians, many of the Southern Baptist variety, who established slavery and fought a civil war to maintain it." Unquote. Mike, slavery was in existence in every culture long before Christianity. It wasn't Christians that established slavery. Okay, it wasn't the Southern Baptists that established slavery.

Oh, I'm sure there were some who erroneously fought for slavery. In fact, there was a slavery Bible. Oh no, what did they call that? The slave. Oh, what's I think I can't. The slave Bible. Yeah, I think it's called the slave Bible, where they actually took all the passages out of the Bible that talked about freedom and tried to say to slaves, "Hey, this is the Bible." Because there were so many liberation passages in there, all right.

Just because people claim to be Christians and then support something unchristian, doesn't mean that's Christianity. In fact, that's the abuse of Christianity. Only Christianity got rid of slavery, and you don't judge a religion or a philosophy by its misuse or abuse.

You judge it by its proper use. Slavery is the illogical outworking of Christianity, but the logical outworking of most other worldviews is slavery. Islam, you're not a, you're not a citizen, a equal citizen in Islam. In fact, in many Muslim countries, they still have slavery. Maybe not officially, but unofficially, it still goes on.

Hinduism, caste system, not everybody's equal. Atheism, there's no way to ground morality on atheism. It's survival of the fittest, as we saw in the atheistic regimes of the last century. So, just because Christians, some Christians erroneously maybe supported slavery, that doesn't mean that's Christianity.

As I pointed out before, when Christians are hypocrites, you ought to ask the question: When somebody plays Beethoven poorly, who do you blame? You don't blame Beethoven. So when somebody plays Jesus poorly, you don't blame Jesus. Look, just because I'm not true and beautiful doesn't mean Jesus isn't true and beautiful. Just because some people who claim to be Christians actually have sinned egregiously, even against the Scriptures, that's not Christianity.

Newsflash: Christianity is not Christians; Christianity is Jesus. So we need to keep our eyes on Jesus, and we're all fallen, and we all need a Savior. So even when Christians do evil, you're, we're demonstrating we need a Savior. It's demonstrating the reality that we're all fallen, and only Christianity got rid of slavery.

All right, back to Mike. Mike says, "You made the tired case that people don't leave America; they flock to it." Tired. I haven't heard many people making that case, Mike, unfortunately, when I said, yeah, how many caravans you know, going from Texas to Venezuela? None. They're all coming in the opposite direction. Socialism. I mean, what? Socialism. Really? How many people do you know in Florida getting on rickety boats to escape to Cuba?

None. There's no better life in Cuba. It's here that it's better because we're not socialist. How many people when the Berlin Wall was up went from West Berlin to East Berlin? We're trying to get into East Berlin. None. They're all coming in the opposite directions. And so Mike goes on to say we have an obligation to be critical of America. And all this when it goes wrong, okay, okay, but I'm seeing that the left really hates America.

They want to tear it down. We point that out in the book, *The War on Reality*. I don't mean you're trying to tear it down, Mike. Maybe you're not, but I see a lot fewer people on the left being patriotic for the ideals that we have in America. They think everything needs to be torn down because you see, the white heterosexual Christian male citizen is an oppressor.

And everybody opposite that is oppressed. This is poison. And unfortunately, the Democrat Party, not that the Republicans are perfect, they're not. The Democrat Party buys into this. And then Mike goes on to say this. "And listen to you and others on AFR, the American Family Radio Network. I wonder if you have any political concerns other than abortion and transgenderism." Well, actually, Mike, we do.

I don't know if you've read the book, maybe not, but we've got a whole list of political concerns. But let me continue with your with your questions here. You say, "I never hear concerns about continued lies about the 2020 election being stolen." Mike, that would not arise to the level of murdering or mutilating children. But since you brought it up, how do you know that they are lies?

Oh, Frank, it hasn't been proven, that's why. Mike, eh Mike, yeah, we have to admit that millions of ballots were mailed out, and it's really hard to know what actually happened. In 2005 there was a nonpartisan, or let's say put it this way, bipartisan commission talking about election security and the one major takeaway that the commission came up with was that the worst thing we can do is do mail-in ballots when we don't have to, because they're easily used for fraud, easily used for fraud.

And yet, what happened in the 2020 election under the cover of COVID? Well, we're just going to mail ballots to everybody. Biden certainly got more ballots. Did he get more votes? You know, there's no way of knowing. There really is no way of knowing because the controls were so loose. There's no way to prove the election was secure or fraudulent, and so when Trump says, "I think it was stolen," it might have been stolen.

You can't rule it out. In fact, you really think a guy, Biden, who could hardly put two declarative sentences together and was campaigning from his basement, got what was it, 84 million votes legitimately? You really think that? I can't prove he didn't, but I don't think you can prove he did either. And it's not that big of an issue anymore. Trump may talk about it all the time because he's Trump.

We know Trump. Trump lives everything loudly, whether he says something smart or dumb, he lives it loudly. We all know that. He's been in the public political life for 10 years. If that still irritates you, you need to get over it, okay? Because Trump is Trump, right? And he, well, I'll get to what I'm going to say about him here in just a minute.

Anyway, you go on to say "the ongoing corruption on a daily basis, that is going on in this administration daily." You don't give any specifics, so I don't know what that means. "The fact that over 70 percent of ICE detentions and deportations are not the worst of the worst, but have no criminal record, and in many cases are people who have been productive members of our society for many years." Mike, let me ask you this.

Are you suggesting that only illegals who have committed other crimes should be deported? Is that what you're saying? Are you saying that we ought not enforce our own laws? I mean, even if you're right about that stat, I don't know where that stat came from. Are you saying that ICE can't deport someone who's an illegal alien unless they've committed some kind of additional crime? Is that what you're saying?

Because that's what the sentence here seems to imply. And then you go on to say "the Iran war and tariffs which have accomplished nothing but higher prices." How do you know that, Mike? I mean, what is, what is the number one priority of government? The number one priority of government is to protect innocent people from evil by punishing wrongdoers. Protecting the United States from a jihadist government from getting a nuke should be a number one priority of our government.

Now, whether this is doing it or not, Mike, I agree with you. I don't know if it's doing it. I mean, this might be a bad move. I don't think blowing up their nuclear facilities are a bad move. I don't know what's going to happen, but at least Trump is trying to neutralize the threat. And every president, Republican and Democrat, all eight presidents since Carter have said, Iran can't get a nuke.

And I think if you're a reasonable person, you would agree with that. Iran cannot get a nuke. Whether this is the way to prevent them from getting a nuke is another question, but at least Trump is trying something. Let's blow some stuff up over there. Let's prevent them from getting the enriched uranium, which will allow them to get a nuke because they're jihadists, Mike. They will use it. And then you say, "Hegseth's focus on testosterone levels as if that matters." I'm sorry, Mike, it does matter.

We need more testosterone in the military, much more than cross-sex hormones, which is what we had under Biden. The military is designed to protect innocent people from evil by punishing wrongdoers. They have to be tough. I applaud what Hegseth is doing in the military. I'm a military guy. My family's been in the military. Son's been in the military. I was in the Navy.

And this idea that we're going to feminize the military or put DEI in the military is a disaster. Hegseth, you might not like his style, but he is moving the military toward its main mission, and that is to always be ready to put lethal force on shore to protect innocent people from evil. That's what he's doing.

You might not like him. I get it. But that's what he's doing. And then you say "the incompetence of administration officials, most recently exemplified by the recent appointment of a press secretary who spouts conspiracy theories because Trump liked what she said on his favorite news channel." Mike, so you're saying that making a bad hire that was quickly corrected is a worse crime than murdering and mutilating children.

So we should be focusing on a nice lady, Katie Zachariah, who maybe just. It was a bad hire, maybe, and you're saying that we ought to be talking about that more than murdering children and mutilating children as Christians. You might not think it's murder, but it is, Mike. You might not think it's murder, but we're pulling body parts out of women, and the Democrats not only want that to continue, they want you as a taxpayer to pay for it, and they also want to mutilate children.

So. Again, the main purpose of government is to protect innocent people from evil by punishing wrongdoers. And my question for you, Mike, honestly, has the Trump administration done that better than the Biden administration? Now, you have to have Trump derangement syndrome to deny that the Trump administration has done better in punishing wrongdoers and protecting the innocent. They've secured the border.

They're deporting people who have committed crimes and even people who have are just here, as you mentioned, illegally. It's our law that they should be deported. Trump, I mean, under Biden we had 300,000 missing girls in this country, probably sex trafficked. We had drugs coming over. We had terrorists coming over.

We had all sorts of difficulty at the border. We've had people dying trying to get across the border. They're not dying anymore because you can't get across the border. Look, when you don't punish the guilty, you wind up punishing the innocent. So, Mike, I appreciate you listening. I appreciate you writing in. But I think that there are major issues that we need to be concerned with and minor issues.

And I'm going to choose to major in the majors just like Jesus did. Jesus said to the politicians of his day, "Woe to you scribes and Pharisees." You're tithing your spices, but you're neglecting the more important matters of the law: justice, mercy, and faithfulness. You should have practiced the latter without neglecting the former, you blind guides. You strain out a gnat and swallow a camel.

What's he saying? He's saying that in politics we have to major in the majors. We have to be concerned about murder and child mutilation and border security and getting people who are on the streets who are criminals off the streets. And protecting innocent people from evil. That's the main role of government. If government doesn't carry that out, and it wasn't being carried out well under the Biden administration, you don't have a good government.

In fact, you don't have anything else, because the foundational vocation of civilization is law enforcement. If you don't have law enforcement, you don't have an economy. What you have is a bunch of gangs, because you're not gonna you're not gonna risk your capital in a lawless environment where anybody can take your capital from you without any recourse on your part, you need law enforcement to protect innocent people.

You need law enforcement to have commerce, fair commerce. You're not going to go out to dinner if your family's going to be mugged. You're not going to, you're not going to put yourself out there. You're going to wind up hunkering down and you're going to basically have poverty and fear. You need government, good government, good law enforcement, and that's what law enforcement does. So, Mike says we need to be concerned more in America about abortion and transgenderism.

I agree, Mike. And in our book, *The War on Reality*, we have one, two, three, four. Let me just list them: abortion, transitioning children, men and women's sports, the fact that there are only two sexes, religious freedom, judges, racism, sexism, identity politics, trans service members and DEI in the military. That's an issue. Border security, support for deportations and ICE, benefits for illegal aliens, that's an issue.

How about defund the police? How about sexualization of children in schools? How about school choice? How about requiring welfare recipients to work if able? We lay out where both parties stand on all of those issues on page one 318 to 319 in *The War on Reality*. I'm not just concerned with abortion and transgenderism, but they're two of the biggies. Because murder and child mutilation is pretty high of a moral issue in my book, and I think in Jesus's book too.

If you mislead or harm any one of these little ones that believe in me, it would be better to have a millstone hung around your neck and be thrown into the sea, Jesus said. So we've addressed many of these issues, and by the way, abortion and transgenderism are issues not that the church brought up, that the culture brought up and imposed on us and told us that we need to get in line.

In fact, in California right now, they're telling, they're telling churches that they have to do LGBTQ tolerance training. Look, it's not the church. The church hasn't moved. It's the culture that's trying to impose itself on the church and the rest of society. And so when the church talks about it, it's not the church bringing it up; it's the left trying to impose it on the church.

So again, go to voteyourfaith.net for more. Also, want to point out one of the best books ever written on economics is a book by Jay Richards called, what's it called? Oh, I'm forgetting it all of a sudden. I'm going to have him on next week. Oh, Money, Greed, and God. Money, Greed, and God. Jay is going to be on next week. He's brilliant. You're going to enjoy this particular session we're going to talk about communism, socialism, economics.

Make sure you're a part of it. Look for it on the next podcast. Also want to mention that Brady Blevins is going to be teaching Conversations With the Faiths, where he's going to help you better able or going to help you get better at evangelizing Jehovah's Witnesses, LDS, Mormons, and Muslims. So check that out on our website, crossexamined.org.

Click on online courses. You'll see it there. And don't forget the new *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist* is coming out this Tuesday. We're going to put the link. It might be hard to find on Amazon. We're going to put the link in the show notes in case you can't find it. And also, *The*

War on Reality is out as well. So thanks for being here, ladies and gentlemen. God bless you. See you here next time.