

OpenTheo

Responding to The Bible Says What!?

September 7, 2022



For The King - Rocky Ramsey

Go listen to the interview with Michael Wiseman at this link:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rorcjBke9DI&t=921s>

Every empire and form of government has fallen and crumbled. This is not evidence of a theocracy being an issue, this actually lends itself to the depravity of man. That is the common denominator. Some forms of government actually encourage human depravity like totalitarian dictatorship (characteristic of atheistic countries) but our constitutional republic (form of government) with God as our king informing our laws and ethics (theocracy) limits and mitigates the ability for human depravity to rear its ugly head!

Texts I responded to:

Rebellious Children: Leviticus 20:9 & Deuteronomy 21:18-21

Rape Laws: Deuteronomy 22:22-29

Who is God of this world: 2 Corinthians 4:4

Contradiction of Judas: Matthew 27:5-8 & Acts 1:18-19

Contradiction of Plants and Animals: Genesis 2:4-6 (plants) & Genesis 2:18-20 (animals)

Abortion: Numbers 5:11-31

Fountain.fm -> <https://fountain.fm/show/U78tm316mhRmq1LFZ6HS>

Website: forthe kingpodcast.com

Facebook page: <https://www.facebook.com/For-The-King-105492691873696/>

Gab page: <https://gab.com/ForTheKingPod>

Twitter: <https://twitter.com/ForTheKingPod>

Contact: forthekingpodcast@gmail.com

Donate Crypto: <https://commerce.coinbase.com/checkout/f63fd7db-919e-44f6-9c58-8ec2891f3eb5>

Kingly Clothing: <https://www.bonfire.com/store/for-the-king/>

--- Support this podcast: <https://podcasters.spotify.com/pod/show/rocky-ramsey/support>

Transcript

(music) Don't think I will even ask you to make Jesus Lord of your life. That's the most preposterous thing I could ever tell you to do. Jesus Christ is Lord of your life.

Whether you serve him or not, whether you bless him, curse him, hate him, or love him, he is the Lord of your life because God has given him a name that is above every name so that the name of Jesus Christ every knee shall bow and tongue confess that he is Lord. Some of you will bow out of the grace that has been given to you and others will bow because your kneecaps will be broken by the one who rules the nations with a rod of iron.

(music) And I will not apologize for this God of the Bible.

(music) Hey everybody, thanks for listening and tuning in to For the King. This podcast is dedicated to the king, and what we do on this podcast is proclaim the edicts of the king, namely and chiefly, that Yahweh reigns. So I was recently on a podcast, an agnostic atheist podcast called The Bible Says What with a question mark exclamation point, and the guy that runs the podcast, his name is Michael Wiseman.

And I was on the podcast to what I thought would be to, as I quote, to discuss your worldview, what it is, where it comes from, and how it ties into the Bible. So this is what he said. You can look at the cover image of the podcast just documenting what he told me we were going to be discussing.

So then I ask, just curious what your position is. Are you a Christian? What position are you coming from? I asked, am I defending my position or am I just describing it to you? And he never said anything in response to that. He can go on his podcast, on Apple Podcast, and look at the reviews, and there's many Christians that went on there that said, he didn't say what we were going to be talking about.

I just kind of went in and he tried to make me look stupid, and then he uploaded it anyways when I asked him not to. So I saw that, and I thought it would be fine. I didn't think it would be a big deal.

I was happy to go on there and talk about Christianity. And if you go listen to it, I'm going

to put the link for the interview with him. If you go check it out, obviously that's not what happened.

We talked about his worldview the entire time, the way he reads the Bible, the way he thinks about the world. He had a good question at the start when we were able to talk about something I had said on my podcast. That was good.

I should be able to defend something I publicly state, and we talked about it. But then he just started coming up with random stuff that I was not prepared to talk about at all. So you can see me in the podcast fumbling around and obviously not having good answers to everything because I didn't know what he was going to ask, and I don't have all knowledge.

So I wasn't able to coherently respond to some of his objections, but I hope to do that in this episode of the podcast. So when you go listen to it, maybe if I didn't give a satisfactory answer, I can do that now. Mostly on his textual variance stuff, I obviously stand by the things I said metaphysically about who God is and how I portrayed Christ.

I stand by all that. But I didn't really get a chance to talk about my worldview. That's what he said he wanted to discuss, and I didn't get to tell him at all really what I believe besides what he jerryrigged through the questioning to force me to make a statement about, yes, something I believe, but not the whole story.

So I kind of want to paint a broader picture with the story here. So another big, big ticket item I wanted to talk about before I get into it. He claimed to be an agnostic atheist.

That's somebody that lacks a belief in God, which is, that's his belief claim. But then he's agnostic concerning his knowledge, what he knows. Yet throughout our whole conversation, he knew enough about the knowledge of God, namely his lack thereof, that I also can't know.

So he wasn't really defending the agnostic atheistic position. He was saying that I can't know. How do you know there's a God? And I would tell him why.

And then he knew enough about that belief, which apparently he says he doesn't know whether there's a God or not, that that doesn't work for him. So he's actually positing a true belief about God. So I just thought it was inconsistent.

And whenever you talk to these people, that's kind of how it goes. So getting into some of the objections, I'm just going to walk through. I went back and listened to the interview, and I'm going to go, as best I can, through chronological order of the objections and the things we talked about.

So the first big item we talked about was theocracy. So theocracy is inevitable. That's my position.

I was trying to walk him through, and I didn't really get to explain really what I think about theocracy, what I think about politics from a Christian perspective. So what he was painting me as in the podcast, in the interview, was an ecclesiocracy. What I'm advocating for, what I think Christianity teaches, is not an ecclesiocracy, but rather a theocracy.

And we didn't get to get into that at all. I think it would have made for an interesting discussion. So there's been theocracies in the past that the person... Let's just think about Egypt.

You had a human claiming to be God, which, you know, that's the... God is ruling over the society as Pharaoh on earth, right? And that would be a theocracy. And that's happened before, but that's not what the Christian believes about the politics. When I say theocracy, I say God is ruling, but he's not a person.

He's not reigning... He's reigning on earth through his church in that sense, but I don't want an ecclesiocracy. I don't want the church to be our civil government. And I think that's what he was afraid of and what he thinks my position is.

That I think, you know, the Baptist church, you know, the Reform Baptist church, whatever that would be, the Southern Baptist Convention, I don't know, whatever, is what our government should be. The elders and deacons in the church are the ones that are ruling over society. I don't think that at all.

I think that that's wrong. The Bible has jurisdictional differences between those two spheres of government. The church being one sphere of government that is tasked with being the pillar and buttress of truth and administering the sacraments and proclaiming the gospel to the nation.

The state doesn't administer the sacraments or proclaim the gospel to the nations and do things like that. That's not the job of the state. But when I say a theocracy, I mean that God is ruling over it.

So concerning the principles of law that we're getting in our society, it's theocratic. And it's the same sense that we get in the secular, atheistic, usually communist, socialistic societies. They still have a theos, they still have a God, they still have metaphysical operating principles that produce the laws and ideas that trickle down into society in the way that they rule.

That's what I mean by the theocracies inevitable. So we maintain a separation between church and state, not a separation between God and state. So fundamentally, our nation was founded as a theocracy with the human form, the human organizational politics, was a constitutional republic.

And I think a constitutional republic is a perfectly fine and amazing way to do politics. I

think that that's good. I don't want to replace our constitutional republic with a ecclesiocracy.

I want the human aspect of our government to be a constitutional republic, because I'm a patriot and I love the Christian heritage we have in our country. But I want us to recognize, I want the state to recognize where its assumptions, its presuppositions, its metaphysical principles that trickle down and produce the laws or the constitution that we have is theocratically Yahweh as it's God, not secular atheism as it's God in the sense of where you're deriving your principles. So that hopefully kind of gets into more of what I really do think about a theocracy.

I don't want to change the structure of our government. It should remain a constitutional republic. That's great.

The Founding Fathers did a great job. I want us to get back to recognizing that we have inalienable rights from God, the rights that we have, the laws that are produced. Those come from God.

Those don't come from the subjective state. The state is just how we organize ourselves as humans. So I think that's a big point that I want to get across here of what I really believe about that.

There's all of our public offices. They would vow to uphold the Constitution with their hands on a Bible. They swore.

They had a connection to God through the state. I think that's what I mean. But now if we were to not swear on the Bible, then our atheistic overlords would be swearing on whatever system they have to develop laws or their ethical system where they produce their laws from, utilitarianism or deontology, whatever virtue theory, whatever ethical system you want to try to produce your laws from.

That would be your theos. That would be your starting, your all-inclusive principle that is governing how you do things, which sounds a lot like God. So, okay, there's that.

He brought an objection. Why has God not revealed himself to us? Why hasn't God said hi? I mean, I stand by what I said in the podcast, in the interview that God has revealed himself through his word and through natural revelation through all of creation. It is abundantly evident.

I stand by Paul's writings in Romans 1 that God has made himself abundantly clear in his creation, but not so clear that the humans are able to achieve salvation of their own merit. So God has revealed himself to us. And Mike is suppressing that truth.

That's what I was saying in the podcast. He suppressed the truth of the existence of God, even though it's evident and clear. But the kind of evidence that he wants to have is God

coming down and saying, "Hi." God has to prove himself to him.

But really, it's not about proving himself. We have tons of stories of obviously Jesus healing people and doing miracles, writing people's faces. We have God splitting the Red Sea, and there were still people that didn't believe even when those physical things happened.

So I don't think Mike would be appeased if God physically showed himself. He would say, "It's a hoax." Or he would say, "I just don't buy it. That's not enough for him." He brought up, you know, I said how atheism has produced way more deaths than religion ever has.

So he brings up the Crusades and the Salem witch trials. You know, those things happened in spite of, I mean, I don't know the history of them perfectly, so I'm sure it's been misconstrued to some extent. But, you know, Stalin's Russia and Mao's China, you know, those are necessary conclusions of atheism.

Atheism doesn't have the tools, and I push this a lot in the interview. It doesn't have the tools to provide an ethic that's binding on all humans. Because fundamentally, if you are an atheist, your best shot at trying to describe how life began on earth and what humans are is to say that we're animals, right? We see all these animals around, and we have similar things to them.

I have a canine like a dog has a canine, and I have a liver like a dog has a liver. Well, then we must be an animal, right? We share so many characteristics with it. And then we have Darwinism coming in, and this is their best attempt to describe what humans are in a purely physical way.

So if we are just animals, I kept pushing back with him at this, you know, I asked, "Is nature ever wrong?" He thought it was an odd question. My point in asking that is, "Does nature ever do anything wrong? Are we actually products of our environment? Are we really animals?" Because in the animal kingdom, there's lots of things that we would say are heinous if humans were to do them. Like I brought up chickens, you know, roosters raping hens.

That happens all the time. Are they doing anything wrong? You can't demonstrate that from an atheistic framework. If there is no God, there's no higher power.

There's not a belief in God, but you don't know. So you claim agnosticism, your knowledge. You don't have any basis to claim anything is true as an atheist.

You can't know anything for certain. I mean, I really didn't get to push as hard as I wanted to, but he was saying that, like, well, I'll get to his ethical system that he brought up. But concerning Crusades and Stalin and Zadong, Crusades and the Salem witch trial happened in spite of Christianity, in spite of what it teaches.

We shouldn't be burning people at the stake without due process of law. If they are found to be doing something wicked and evil that would, you know, be garnered, such a punishment could be garnered, you know. Is it loving for God's law to play out? So he claimed that God's law is unloving and it's wicked and God's a baby murderer, you know, and all that.

I'll get to some of those objections, but let's see if it's loving for God's law to be played out. So I have a bunch of his textual stuff that he brought up. So disobeying parents is as evil as murder is.

That's my claim. So let's look at Leviticus 20 verse 9. If there is anyone who curses his father or his mother, he shall certainly be put to death. He has cursed his father or his mother and has brought his own death upon himself.

And then we have a similar law in Deuteronomy 21, 18-21. If any person has a stubborn and rebellious son who does not obey his father or his mother, and when they discipline him, he does not listen to them, then his father and mother shall cease him and they'll bring him out to the elders of the city at the gateway of his hometown. And they shall say to the elders of the city, "This son of ours is stubborn and rebellious, he does not obey us, he is thoughtless and given to drinking." Then all the men of his city shall stone him to death, so you shall eliminate the evil from your midst and all Israel will hear about it in fear.

Why would God make a law like this? How can a loving God, how can a benevolent God possibly make a law like this? Well, he must have something in mind that he's trying to protect. Laws depict what should be protected in society. It depicts what the God of the society thinks is best.

So in atheism, we see a protection for abortion. We think it's really good to rip little tiny humans out of the womb, right? So if that law is there, then what it's teaching is that we need to protect the right for a woman to destroy her progeny. Okay, that's what that's teaching.

So this law is teaching that it's extremely problematic and damaging to society when you have a human that doesn't respect authority, that doesn't obey authority. Now, this isn't a one-time offense. This law isn't talking about a baby that starts crying when the mom doesn't give it what it wants.

Okay, that's not a stubborn and rebellious son. That's not what this is talking about. This man is thoughtless and he's given to drinking.

You know, this is not a 12-year-old that's acting like a little punk. This is a grown man that, a grown man in his young age, still a son and under his mother and father's jurisdiction, their authority. And he has cursed them, which is invoking, you know, this

metaphysical idea of another God to do ill to his parents.

He is rebellious and stubborn towards them. This is a great example of this is in the Yuvalbe shooting in Texas recently. This man did not have, he was rebellious.

He didn't have a dad in the picture. His mom, you know, he did not have good parents and he was a person that was rebellious in society. He didn't have a good family.

Therefore, lots of children died. So what God is protecting here is the sanctity of the family and how important it is to have a strong family where kids are raised up well and obey authority. Because then if that doesn't happen, you'll get school shooters.

So in an article I was reading on Calcedon, they were basically saying, you know, if the child is put to death, then the alternative, if the child is not put to death, then the alternative is then that society is then put to death. Civilization is put to death as, you know, you continue to have wayward children that are destructive in society, like we see in the Yuvalbe, Texas shooting. Okay? So that's what's happening in this law.

This isn't a one and done. This isn't a kid that's whining. This is somebody that's cursing their parents, invoking foreign gods to do ill to their parents.

They're stubborn and rebellious and it's a grown man is what this is talking about. And again, they come to the elders of the city to weigh the situation, to determine in a court of law whether or not this person is doing such a thing. Now I want to bring up here as we continue talking about these laws that people think are barbaric now in our society.

We take the general equity, because we're not ancient Israel, we don't, we don't want, I'm not an obligatory theonomist where we take these laws one for one and implement them in society. I don't think we have to do the death penalty for curses and a stubborn and rebellious son. I think it could look like he has to, you know, do service in the community.

A different kind of he has to pay this fine. He has to some other way to get across some other kind of chastisement to get the point across that he ought not to be doing this and he should repent. And if there is repentance, then he's turned away from this wicked act.

He's not committing it any longer. And now there has been damage done. But if he if there is repentance, then he doesn't have to be put to death.

But with something like murder, you can't take that back. You can't repent of that. It's the deed has been done and it's a permanent deed.

Now it must be, you know, the death penalty must be played out in capital punishment. So I don't think, you know, John Calvin talks about this in his institutes that we don't have to invoke the death penalty for some of these wicked things. We can if your society is

righteous enough to where you don't need that strong of a deterrent to keep people from doing it, you can do something like a fine or public service or some other kind of way of playing this law out.

So another another point he brought up is that God starves and murders children. I said, yeah, that's just like how Malin Stalin did it. Therefore God is evil.

The difference between Malin Stalin starving children is they had no right to God because, again, you know, Mike can't put this in his framework because there's no there's no higher power. There's no metaphysical. There's nothing metaphysical in life because the atheist has to claim materialism if there is no higher power.

So if, you know, there has been a if there has been a human that has rebelled against God, God has every right to take life. He gives life and he can take it away. God has the right and the prerogative to do that.

Malin Stalin don't. So Malin Stalin actually are evil and God is not evil for murdering. Sorry, not murdering a child.

He kills children. Murder is premeditated without just cause. God is perfectly just to allow a famine to come on the land and to starve children.

That's perfectly fine in God's world. He can do whatever he wants. He doesn't owe humanity anything.

And that's very clear if you believe that there's a creator that's given life. He can take it away. You might think that's evil because obviously you don't believe there's a God.

So obviously you're going to say that's evil. But in my framework, if you were to if you were to take on my presuppositions, then that that's not that's not an issue, right? It's not evil because we have wrong God. We've sinned against him.

So his ethical system that he lays out in the podcast was empathy, common sense and do no harm. I kept bringing up. There's people there are masochists in society.

There are people that like to do harm to themselves. That's honestly what working out is. It's you creating micro terrors in your muscles so that your muscles come back stronger.

Right. That's a small pain that you're taking on yourself so that you can be better. Right.

So he says to do no harm. Right. So that's his ethical system.

Now, if I came up and punched him in the face, you know, he would have to abide by his ethical system or he's a hypocrite. Right. He could do.

He would have to do me no harm even though I'm doing him harm. Now, I brought up

masochists and people that cut themselves and he said, you know, let's not talk about them. Let's keep this between us and I'll get to that later.

But that's kind of an odd statement that he doesn't want to talk about the real world. What actually happens in the world. And he wants to impose his morality of do no harm on the masochist.

And my point is how do you get such a thing as do no harm, which is an idea of not doing harm, not actually not doing harm. It's a metaphysical ethical system to not do harm as an idea. And it's played out in the real world by never doing harm.

So how does an atheist have any morality at all? I don't know. He never told us. He kept talking about common sense.

You know, common sense only goes as far as everybody agrees and can recognize it as common sense. There is laws of logic and reason. But not everybody abides by those.

Why must they abide by those? Even if they're real in the world, why? If an animal goes in, you know, if a chicken rapes another chicken, you know, did the animal do anything wrong? He did. In the animal kingdom, there's harm done all the time to other animals. If we're just an animal, why can't I cannibalize? Why can't I do harm to someone else? He says it's just self-evident and obvious.

Well, it's not obvious to the atheist because he has no morals. He has no there's no metaphysical framework to fit that in. That was my point in bringing up all my objections.

And obviously, he can't admit that his ethical system doesn't work as an atheist. That, you know, Fyodor Dostoevsky, a Russian author, claimed if there is no God, then anything is permissible. And I think that's correct.

That's, you know, there are so many atheists that recognize this. Your new atheist, your common modern-day atheist wants all of Christian morality without bending the knee to Christ. And utterly, it's, you know, it's theft.

They're stealing from the Christian worldview. So they can, you know, he thought it was so obvious that I don't think I should do harm to others. And he doesn't think he should do harm to others.

But it's not obvious for him because I have literally the golden rule laid out in Scripture by Christ, doing others you would have done unto you. So his ethical system doesn't work. He also talked about empathy and talked about how animals have empathy.

I don't know why empathy is good. Some animals don't have empathy like a jellyfish. Why is empathy better? So I don't know.

Those are poking some me attempting to poke some holes in his argument. Obviously,

he doesn't think it sticks. So here's another law that we were talking about why these these rape laws.

So we have if there is a girl who is aversion betrothed to a man and another man. I'm sorry, guys. I'm reading from Deuteronomy chapter twenty two versus twenty three to twenty nine.

And there's a girl who is aversion betrothed to a man and another man finds her in the city and sleeps with her. Then you shall bring them both out of the gate of that city and you shall stone them to death. That girl, because she did not cry out for help, though she was in the city and the man because he has violated his neighbor's wife.

So you shall eliminate the evil from among you. So why is she evil for this guy forcing her upon himself upon her? Because she could have cried out and called for help, but it seems like she wanted it and she liked it. Maybe she's seen this man around the town and she was hoping right that he would he would force himself upon her.

So that's why she's evil because this is a betrothed woman. This is a woman that is to be married. And in this in this society, being betrothed is not something you break off like we can in engagement.

It's an even stronger binding thing. She is essentially married. She's betrothed and that can't happen.

And because of that, because she she could have cried out, she didn't. Then now they're both stone because she was also wicked in her heart. Continue on in verse twenty five.

But if the man finds the girl who is betrothed in the field and the man sees her and rapes her, then only the man who raped her shall die. And you are not to do anything to the girl. There's no sin in the girl worthy of death for just as a man rises against his neighbor and murders him.

So is this case when he found her in the field, the betrothed girl cried out for help. The field, the betrothed girl cried out and there's no one to save her. So in this instance, she could have cried out all she wanted and maybe she didn't cry out because she knew nobody would hear her.

She's not wrong in this situation. He forced himself upon her and she didn't want it. He was violating her.

And that's wrong. And like I said earlier, the atheist doesn't have any framework to put into that because rape happens all the time in the animal kingdom. And their best attempt at describing what a human is is to say that we're just we're an animal.

There's very similar things to us in this world. We're an animal and rape happens often in

that system in the animal kingdom. So they don't have the tools to say that this is wrong.

I have a law. I just quoted you. That is God telling us that it's better to not rape a woman.

It's wrong and it's worthy of death. But then all of a sudden we have this odd law right after right on the heels of these two rape laws where you are. Capital punishment isn't an act on you if you do it.

In verse 28 and 29, if a man finds a girl who is a virgin who is betrothed that he sees her and has sexual relations with her and they are discovered, then the man who had sexual relations with her shall give the girl's father fifty shekels of silver and she shall become his wife because he has violated her. He is not allowed to divorce her all his days. So this is fornication, which is wrong.

However, the word completely changes from the preceding instances of rape where the word shazok is used and that is translated as forces her. But all of a sudden the verb changes here to tapas, tapas, which means to take hold of or to seize. So if a man finds a girl who is a virgin who is not betrothed and he takes a hold of her, he embraces her and has sexual relations with her and they are discovered, then he just has to pay her and then marry her.

So what this law is teaching is not this is not a woman that is resisting this man. This is a woman that likes this guy and wants to have sex with him, but they're not married. This is fornication and it's wrong and it's evil.

But this is expected between obviously young people who want to have sex and the punishment for this man is to pay the bride prize for her and to marry her, to be faithful to her, to marry her and to do things the way he ought to. Fornication in this instance isn't as destructive to society as a betrothed woman who has been forced upon and raped. That requires death, but this isn't a woman that is raped.

He has violated her chastity because she is not betrayed to him and is not married to him. Therefore, he shouldn't have sex with her, but this isn't a violation of rape. This is a woman that is consensual sex and God is protecting the sanctity of marriage by the punishment of this act to be that they ought to get married.

The man is responsible for captivating this woman, seducing her and wanting her to have sexual relations with him. She was consensual in this. That is what's being articulated here.

There's that law. Hopefully that made sense. Mike claimed he didn't know where the universe came from and he says that's a perfectly fine answer.

You cannot know. You can be an agnostic. It's okay to not know.

So my question is, why do science? Why are we curious as humans? Why do we feel like we need to know? But apparently he's perfectly fine with not knowing why the universe is here. I don't know why he's fine with that. That thought plagued me for a very long time when I was an atheist and I did not believe in God.

It made no sense why there was something rather than nothing. To say that nothing creates something is incoherent and illogical and that is the best shot that Mike has to account for the universe. So even from the get-go, some of the biggest questions, the most important questions we have as humans, he can't answer.

He can try his best to develop an ethical system, which is also very important to humans, while stealing from Christianity. So he just was perfectly fine with not knowing where the universe comes from. He says, "I'm positing a God of the gaps that I can't figure it out either, therefore God is my answer." Well, no.

What if it's actually very likely that it can't be figured out because God created it and that is the answer? He can't entertain that thought, which is actually pretty inconsistent with his agnosticism. He just says he doesn't know, but he doesn't want to entertain the thought because he doesn't have enough evidence. Yeah, it just all falls apart.

So let's move on to 2 Corinthians 4.4 he brought up. He said, "Who is the God of this world?" I said, "Yahweh created the earth. He is the God that owns the whole world." And he says, "Wrong! It is 2 Corinthians 4.4. In those cases, the God of this world is blind to the minds of the unbelieving so that they will not see the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ who is the image of God." So in the podcast I tried to walk him through that Satan had been given authority over the world in terms of the nations.

We can see in Luke 4 when Jesus is tempted in the wilderness, Satan says, "Look at all the nations of the world I can give them to you." Satan's not lying here. Some people say he's lying. But it's very clear that Satan really was the God of the world in that old age.

But that word "world" here, guys, is actually Aeon. It's not world. I forget what the word that's usually translated as "world" is, but it actually should be translated as, "He's the God of this age." This wicked age.

So the Israelites were tasked with proclaiming the gospel to the ends of the earth. They didn't do that. They didn't teach people the knowledge of God.

I can Habakkuk 2, then knowledge of God will cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. They didn't do that. So Christ comes and accomplishes what we couldn't do, and he wins the nations back to himself.

So that is what's happening here. Obviously you can't expect an agnostic atheist to use the scripture properly and to interpret it well. He wants the Bible to contradict itself, so he's going to interpret 2 Corinthians 4.4 as Satan being the God of this world.

And actually God is contradicting himself. Jesus says in Matthew 28, "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to him." That's what he had. But as this old age is passing away, the God of this age, in 1 Corinthians 7.14 and 1 John 2 says that the form of this world is passing away.

And the new heavens and the new earth come in in Christ. So that is what the Bible is talking about here, that Satan is, he really was the God of this world in the sense that he had this kind of authority over the nations, over the earth itself. He walked to and froth out the whole earth, and he was leading people astray and prying around like a roaring lion.

But now the God of this world, it says in the book of John, the God of this world is now cast out in Christ. So that's what happened at the cross, and 2 Corinthians 4.4 is talking about that passing away age of Satan's reign. Why did God create Satan? Satan is found with evil in him.

Is it bad to allow the bad guy out of jail? So Satan is, he was bringing up how, why would God even create evil? Why is it even, why is it even a thing? Why did God allow Satan, who's the bad guy, out and let him loose on the earth? You know, and the best I can come up with on the spot was just, obviously it makes for a good story, you know, and he found that ridiculous, which I mean, that's the best I can come up with. That is a pretty ridiculous answer. The best I can give for a theodicy to why God allowed evil, he, in the same sense that a cookie corrupts without, if I leave it on the table without me putting it in the fridge, it'll slowly break down and enzymes and bacteria will start to eat it.

By virtue of us being creatures, we have the ability to be corruptible. So does Satan. So God acted in such a way in his providence that he withheld his hand so that the cookie would crumble, so that the cookie would be corrupted.

So God, through secondary causes of, namely like the corruption of the cookie, God is still, he's the one ordaining that Satan would fall, but he's doing it in such a way through secondary causes that he's not the primary one causing it. So that's what I think the Bible teaches that obviously God ordains whatever comes to pass, even the evil things, even Judas. Judas was created just to go to hell.

God worked in ways while not choosing Judas, not regenerating his heart to keep him from doing the evil things that he did. So that's my best theodicy I can give, and I think that's sufficient for me. The problem is that he's so, he's like, why would God even create evil? Why is, you know, why is, why is there, why would God allow bad things to happen if he's a benevolent God? The problem with him asking that question is, there's, he has no ethical system to pose the question from.

At least my God is just and solves the problem of evil through his son and will make all

things new and wipe away every tear. The atheist, when he sees bad things happen, he says, well, nothing we can do, you know, whatever. That's, you know, it's not like we can really change much.

We can do the best we can. Eventually, we'll probably solve the problem once technology increases and we can control more things. But yeah, yeah, it's wrong and it's bad, but whatever, that's the best we can do.

So, so the same, sorry, not Satan. The atheist can't deal with the problem of evil either. And the Christian actually can because God triumphs over evil, light triumphs over darkness.

He continued to keep the conversation on us instead of talking about the real world. He kept saying that like, oh, me and you are both operating under a Christian worldview, so let's keep the conversation here. The only, the only problem is I'm being consistent.

He's being inconsistent. He didn't want to talk about the masochist or the person that cuts themselves or the mass murderer. He didn't want to say, you know, why, why do they end up like that? If it's so, if it's so obvious, if it's so self evident to humans that we should do no harm like his ethical system that he was posing.

If it's so self evident, obvious, you know, why are there so many people that do evil things? It might be because we have a sinful nature and it's not that obvious. And when you suppress the truth, here's another textual thing he brought up, Matthew 27 5 through 8. And this is talking about Judas. And he threw the pieces of silver into the temple sanctuary and left and he went away and hanged himself.

The chief priest took the pieces of silver and said, it is not lawful to put them in the temple treasury since it is money paid for blood. And they conferred together with the money bought from the potter's field as a burial place for strangers. For this reason, that field has been called the field of blood to this day.

So in this, in this instance, he Judas hangs himself. But then in Acts 1 18 through 19, the Bible contradicts itself in verses 18 and 19 of Acts chapter one. Now this man acquired a field with the price of his wickedness and falling head long, and he burst open in the middle and all his intestines gushed out.

And it became known to all the residents of Jerusalem as a result that field was called Hekaldahma in their own language, that is the field of blood. So we have some continuity here where both accounts are saying that it's called the field of blood. So there's some continuity.

But the difference is that one says he hanged himself. The other one says that he fell. He fell in this field in his intestines and he burst open his intestines gushed out.

So which one is it? Now, what I was trying to say in the podcast is, you know, this actually shows the validity of the historicity of the Bible. Because if you had a fabrication of multiple different eyewitness accounts and it was fabricated, you would have like all the exact same details. They would try their hardest to say the exact same thing lock step so they can appear as being genuine.

But that's near impossible to fabricate a story like that. This actually lends itself to the historicity of the Bible, the validity of the scriptures, that we have these seemingly contradictory accounts of what happens to Judas. And I think it is very likely that what's being articulated here is that he hung himself on that tree.

And eventually his body started to decay and it crumbled and the branch broke and he was starting to be eaten out by maggots and worms and flies were landing on him and eating out his body. And then when he fell, he burst open and all his intestines gushed out. So it's just a more information about the narrative of what happened to Judas.

It's not contradictory. It's actually just paradoxical if you add a supposition that reconciles the two things. This is a paradox and not a contradiction.

Okay, another apparent contradiction. He brought up Genesis too. So this is the account of the heavens and the earth when they were created in the day that the Lord God made earth in heaven.

No shrub of the field was yet on the earth and no plant of the field had yet sprouted, for the Lord had not yet some rain on the earth and there was no man to cultivate the ground. He says that mankind has already been created at this point in the narrative, in the second chapter here of Genesis, but actually vegetation was created before humans were in Genesis chapter one. And Moses, petting this probably in the same night as he was writing this, was stupid enough to screw this up just a few sentences later.

I don't think that that's the case. And the reason that that's not the case is because the word for plant is actually different in the two accounts. The word for plant in Genesis chapter one is just general, like plants in general, wild plants.

But actually the word shrub here in verse five is "saiach" and in Genesis one the word is "desse". And even the context shows what it's really getting out, "For there was no man to cultivate the ground." This is talking about agriculture. This is talking about cultivated plants for a human-produced cultivated plant.

That's what this is talking about. It had not happened yet. God had not sent rain yet for the man to cultivate the ground.

It was being watered through the mist that comes up through the surface of the ground, like the dew after nighttime. So that's what's happening there. And then he brings up that in Genesis two, 18-20, we have, "Then the Lord God said, 'It is not good for man to

be alone.

I will make him a help, suitable for him.' And out of the ground of the earth, the Lord God formed every animal of the field and every bird of the sky and brought them to the man to see what he would do." So mankind is created, which the animals came before mankind in Genesis one. And then all of a sudden we see here in Genesis two, he says, "Let's get a helper for this guy." And then it seems like God all of a sudden just creates the animals, which would be contradictory from the narrative of what happens in Genesis one. But actually in verse 19 here, it says, "For the Lord God had formed." It had already happened.

He had formed every animal. And then he brought them to the man. So that's actually past tense.

So it doesn't work there. God is bringing all the animals to show that he's going to make a special helper suitable for him made in the image of God, just as he was. And it was not, no helper was suitable for what his mission, his mission on earth to multiply and reproduce and subdue the earth.

So, you know, that kind of solves that problem. He talked about no one has seen Yahweh, yet there's all these verses of Moses seeing God and Jacob seeing him and wrestling with him. This is the pre-incarnate Christ.

This is God coming down and incarnating himself, unveiling himself in flesh to wrestle with Jacob or to come with Moses or to eat with Abraham and the oaks of Mamre. That's what's happening there. No one has seen Yahweh in his full glory, in his full unveiled glory because you would die.

Even the angels have to have wings. They can't even see his full glory. That's the claim of the Bible.

The claim is not that Moses and Jacob fully saw God. That's not what's happening. In the same sense that I could read God's word and truly know who he is, Moses and Jacob could see and be with God in a special way without having his unveiled full glory, in the same sense that Christ took on flesh and veiled his glory.

And during the transfiguration, his face shone like the sun, just like Moses' face shone when he was shown a glimpse of God. So that's what's happening there. The Bible's not contradicting itself.

So I don't have to – he brought up how like everyday life, I don't have to forgive people through bloodshed. So why does God have to? Why don't I require bloodshed to forgive my wife when she does me wrong? Why don't I require that? Because the Bible teaches that without blood there is no remission of sins. Well, what the Bible is teaching there is that without blood there is no remissions of sin before God.

Now concerning mankind, man doesn't sin against man in such a way where every single sin requires death. For instance, the sin of lying doesn't require death, or the sin of stealing doesn't require death. You're supposed to just make restitution and give back.

But the sin of murder towards man, man does require blood for that. So I don't require bloodshed for people that sin against me because I don't have the – it's not such a severe sin against me that I require bloodshed for it. But there is – all sin is so severe against God that bloodshed is required because again God is thrice holy.

There's a much bigger difference between somebody sitting against me and somebody sitting against God. That's the Christian position. He's again misconstruing and creating this – it's the fallacy of equivocation.

He's trying to equivocate the two – sorry, he is equivocating the two when they're not to be compared. But God is sitting against humans is much different. Does the Bible teach that life starts at first breath? Abortion is not taught in the Bible.

Okay, there's so many texts that literally – Paul says in Galatians that he was known before the foundation of the world. Psalm 139 says that you knit me together and form me my mother's womb when you knew me. Psalm 51 says in Iniquity was I born.

There's a Levitical law that says if a man kills – accidentally hits a woman in such a way that the fetus dies, then he used to be put to death I think or there's something that – I think he's put to death. And it's because there's life in the womb. But he brought up that Numbers 5, 11 through 31 actually does teach that abortion is fine.

And in this there's a woman – if a man becomes jealous and thinks that his wife has cheated on him, then there's this test given where this woman drinks bitter water. And what it says in 21 is then the priest shall have the woman swear that the oath of the curse and the priest shall say to the woman, "May the Lord make you a curse and an oath among your people by the Lord's making your thigh shrivel up and your belly swollen. And this water that brings a curse shall go into your stomach and to make your belly swell up and your thigh shrivel and the woman shall say, 'Amen, Amen.'" So this is a supernatural test that God is giving where this water is drank, this bitter water.

And the goal of it is nothing will happen if the woman has not committed adultery and if something has happened, then her thigh will shrivel up and her belly will become swollen. This in no way, shape or form is talking about aborting – it says a thigh. It's talking about her abdomen.

It's not talking about a baby being murdered. It's not talking about trying to pass and abort a baby or a miscarriage. That's not what's happening.

It says her thigh and her belly will be swollen. It says nothing about a child. This is not what's happening here.

It's not an abortion. Moving on, another objection he brings up. Does God speak to us? He said Spider-Man speaks to me through my comics.

What's the difference? Why is Spider-Man not - why can't I claim Spider-Man is - I have a relationship with Spider-Man if he speaks to me through his comics. Now, again, he's misconstruing and he's - I didn't even - I wasn't even able to actually say what Christians truly believe about our relationship with God. He says nobody has a relationship like that where you just pray and talk to the air and you read a book.

You know, you read a biography about - that's not a real relationship. No, it's not. It's not a real relationship, but that's not what happens.

When you read God's word, he sends - we believe that God sends his spirit to indwell us. And there is an internal witness of the Holy Spirit and we truly get to know who God is through his spirit opening our eyes and ears. So it's a spiritual relationship which actually, for the Christian, is a much better and a more powerful relationship than a physical relationship.

That's the difference. He's not understanding. He has no metaphysical understanding at all in the world.

Therefore, he thinks it's foolish that we would say that you can have a relationship with God by reading his word and claiming to be dwelt in the spirit and speaking out loud into the air. And you can't even hear him speak or do anything. And it's actually because I think I have a better relationship with him than I can have with any human.

That's the claim of the Christian. He brings up, "Does God feel pain in the atonement to Christ?" I maintain the hypostatic union, the dual natures of Christ, two natures, fully man, fully God. That is how we reconcile, you know, "Did God feel pain?" No, he didn't.

But concerning Christ's human nature, yes, he did feel pain. And the curse was laid on him. That's where we have the two natures of Christ, where Christ can actually, truly represent us in barer sin.

Is God's eternal judgment loving, right, to throw babies into hell forever that are not guilty? Again, if you are a Christian and you believe that there's such a thing as sin and sinning against God, he's perfectly right to do that. If you believe there is no God, then you think it's stupid that a Christian would believe such a thing. So, yes, God's eternal judgment is loving because he has to, in the same sense that he wants to not harm his neighbor and he wants to make things right.

You know, Mike wants to, you know, live as a Christian. God will make everything right. He will give a full judgment, an eternal conscience torment in hell to make all wrongs right.

So, the atheist can't account for laws of logic and reason. We brought this up a few times in our discussion. He can't give an account for where the law of non-contradiction comes from.

He's an atheist. He doesn't think that they're... Again, if he wants to accept that there's a metaphysical reality to the world, that there's non-physical things, well, then he's going to have to... he's not an atheist anymore. He's going to have to rethink.

If you are an atheist, then you must be... if you don't believe that there's a God or any higher power, then you must be a materialist. That's all there is. That's all you can appeal to because you're just... there's no God.

There's no spiritual nature to anything. So, if he wants to use the laws of logic and reason and the law of non-contradiction, he's going to have to at least not be an atheist anymore. He could try to be another religion, like a... he could even try new age spirituality and try to give it an account for where laws of logic and reason come from.

But these are metaphysical principles that he abides by on a daily basis that make it very abundantly clear that he's not an animal, that he's made in the image of God. So, he made that clear the whole... our whole conversation. He's made the image of God.

I respect him for that. I don't hate him. In his humanity, at all.

I want him to know Christ. I want him to repent and to turn to Christ, to bend the knee. And, obviously, I wasn't ready for the conversation.

I thought I was going to just talk about what I believe, which I know very well, like I just went through, you know, talking about some of these things. But instead, he wanted to talk about a bunch of random textual things in the Bible and bring up, you know, just... There were some things I was able to respond to that I stand by, but I wasn't... hopefully the textual stuff, you know, you feel satisfied and how I was able to respond to that just now. So, he doesn't have the tools that he thinks he has to claim the things he claims about not doing harm to his neighbor and empathy and common sense.

He can't give an account for where these things come from. History, attached to itself time and time again, that to believe that there's no God makes you a fool. You can't live as a human.

You can live as an animal, a human animal, and be an atheist. But you can't live like a human... humans have lived for thousands of years and not believe in a God. It's instrumental to the human experience because God created us.

We are made of his image. Our souls cry out to him. So, yeah, go check out the interview with him and if you want some... have some fun, go look at the YouTube comments for the video.

It was very hateful and spiteful and people were calling me mentally challenged, you know, that I'm an idiot, you know, which is fine. I mean, of course they're gonna think I'm an idiot because of what I believe. But again, they have no... they can't say I'm doing anything wrong because they don't know... they're agnostic.

They don't know anything. They can't say anything for certain and I didn't even get to... I didn't even get to talk to him about solipsism, the problem of the brain and the bat problem. How can he trust his senses? How can he trust that the future is gonna be like the past? How can he... how can he solve the problem of solipsism that the only thing that he can prove that exists is his own brain? He can't... he can't solve these problems.

He doesn't have the tool. He must become a Christian to solve the most basic problems of human existence. So, yeah, I mean, he kept calling me a scary man that I believe in very scary things.

I believe in justice, love, righteousness. I don't believe at winking at sin that when evil things happen, I think that we should actually right the wrong. That's what I believe, but he was laughing at God's law that God would actually put the death penalty on such minor infractions when really... it's not a minor infraction when you get... you've all day school shootings, right? It's a big deal.

The family is a big deal to God. Rape is a big deal to God. Fornication is a big deal.

Adultery is a big deal to God. These death penalty laws actually just show how important and integral these things are to society. They're not to be... we're not to be ashamed of these things.

We're not to be ashamed of God's law at all in any way, shape, or form. Yeah, I think that's all I have to say. So, go check out the podcast.

Go check out his podcast and it'll help equip you to how to defend God's word. I wish I could have had a more fruitful discussion with him. I think he was extremely dishonest and the way he kind of misled me about what we were going to be talking about.

I wasn't ready for half the things that he was going to be talking about. If you go back and listen to my... I had an agnostic atheist on my podcast, my friend Keegan. And I gave him the whole first episode of a three-part series to just explain his worldview.

I didn't push back. I didn't actually talk about anything. I let him explain everything he believes and guess what? And then after that, for the next two parts, we actually talked about it and we had a great discussion.

It's a good discussion. But this discussion with Mike was just to, I think, probably roll up his audience to call me mentally challenged and to make me look like an idiot. Because if we actually prepared, he wouldn't be able to answer my objections because I wasn't

even able to actually get to them and tell him what I actually believe about the world.

So, I hope that makes sense. I don't want to... Again, I don't think we should be just stoning people all willy-nilly. I think there's a measure of repentance that comes.

I don't think it even has to be stoning. I think that we should just have some kind of law that shows how important certain things are in God's world and in human society. I don't think individuals should be doing this.

I don't want to stone anybody. That's not my desire. I want justice and I want society to thrive.

I want to live according to God's law. I want to please God. And the civil government is the one that dishes out these.

Not the church. Notice how they were brought to the elders of the land, not to the priests. The elders of the land determine these things.

I think the civil government is how these are to be dished out. Punishments, just like we do it today, obviously. When people go to jail, it's the civil government.

You don't have the church going around and policing and creating a vigilante militia where they go out and arrest people. It's not what happens in Christian circles. It's not what people want.

I don't want to spread Christianity through the sword, but I do want the civil government to recognize the existence of God and our rights that come from God and the laws that come from God. And I want us to live according to that because I think society would be much better off that way and not in a secular, atheistic society because we're going to get all the wacko craziness we get now. Where the government really does think itself, God, that it can create currency fiat, can create value out of nothing, that abortion is okay, to trample upon what's right, righteous and noble, to be able to lie to the public.

As we've seen all the CDC and NIH walking back all the COVID stuff, it's okay to lie to the public. It's okay to push through experimental vaccines. We have so many wicked things happening because a lot of our society is a secular, atheistic society, which is a theocracy.

All the laws that you're seeing, all the things that are allowed are because of the religion of atheism. So that's my claim with theocracy. I don't want the church to be, I don't want an ecclesiocracy.

I don't want the church to be the civil government. I want the civil government to be its own jurisdiction, but I want it to recognize that God is the lawgiver and God is the one ruling. So concerning all the metaphysical things, I want to live in the theocracy and I do

live in a theocracy now, but not a good one.

Not one that's under the rulership of Christ. And I want a constitutional republic through and through. I love our form of government.

It's amazing. So that's not my problem, okay? So that's not what I mean about theocracy. That's what I believe.

I don't think it's as scary as he was painting it to be out. I think it's much scarier what he is supporting in terms of a secular, atheistic society where there's no problem ending up in communist Stalin or Mao's... Right, sorry. Stalin's communism in Russia or Mao's communism in China.

Those are allowable under an atheistic worldview. But under a Christian worldview, that's not allowable. So I am scared for our society as they are afraid that they love doing their wickedness and what they're afraid of is Christians getting power and actually saying that lying is wrong and committing adultery is wrong and fornication is wrong and rape is wrong.

They don't want to be exposed like that. And that's why it's so scary for them what I am teaching. But it's equally and it actually is scary what they're teaching that there's no such thing as morals.

That's what atheism comes down to. And that's why your most consistent atheists, like Richard Dawkins says, there's no meaning in the world, just blind, pitiless, indifference. And I don't know how you get from a thought like that to that you should do no harm because who cares, right? So your consistent atheist will be like Nietzsche or Richard Dawkins.

You'll get those people. But then you'll get the inconsistent atheist like Mike where he wants all of Christianity's morals besides the laws he thinks are ridiculous. But he wants stuff like, you know, doing to others as we had done unto you and show so well, he thinks empathy, but you should show sympathy and common sense and rationality and reason.

He wants all that stuff, but you don't get that atheism. Richard Dawkins, his leaders, the people that lead his movement, the new atheist, like totally understand that. Maybe not Sam Harris, but at least Dawkins does and Nietzsche and a lot of these guys.

So one of the scariest things about atheism is the idea of rights. If God does not give us our rights that are binding on all men, regardless of who you are, what station of life you're in or even who you're talking to, we're all being all of us being made in the image of God. And for the atheist, rights come from some kind of organizing force in the world, which is usually the state for the atheist.

So again, he wants to assert it throughout this entire interview, his ethical system. But his rights can only be established by some power, either himself and what he thinks is right or by the state. So I think one of the scariest parts, the reason my worldview is not scary is because all humans are bound by something outside of themselves.

What's scary about atheism is mankind, usually organized in the state, is going to be the final buttress of truth. Your rights will come from the state. And we know what happens when your rights come from the state.

That means they're arbitrary and humans hate arbitrary rulers and the oppressed cry out in instances like that. I think that's all I got for you. Thanks for listening to the For the King podcast.

Go listen to that interview. I hope it's edifying. I tried my best.

Go look at the YouTube comments. It's very scary. People are calling me mentally challenged and I'm just a stupid idiot.

So yeah, let's respond in love. Let's pray for our enemies. We want them to repent and to turn to Christ.

Let's not answer a fool according to his folly. Let's show him his folly. That's what I tried to do the whole podcast where I kept saying he doesn't have any morality to stand on.

He kept saying, "Your God is a documented child killer." That's a very pithy way for him to try to make me feel bad for the God I worship. And I don't at all. I have no shame for worshipping Yahweh.

And he's perfectly right to kill children that have inherited guilt from Adam. They're not innocent little doves. They are concerning us.

They haven't done any wrong to a human yet. They're innocent concerning us, but they're not innocent concerning God. And that's why God has allowed those things to happen.

So I hope that makes sense. There's still more things to talk about about why God would allow certain things like why did he command the Israelites to go in and to wipe out whole people groups? Why did he allow slavery? Things like that. Maybe I can address that in another episode.

But as you could see from this episode, there's always answers to these kind of hard things. And really, when you understand it, when push comes to shove, it's actually not as hard as you can get things done to have a good answer for these things. So thanks for listening to the King of the Ages, a moral, invisible, the only God, the honored and glory forever and ever.

Amen. So we Dale. Thank you.