

Proving Christianity: Homicide detective J. Warner Wallace discusses his updated and expanded *Cold-Case Christianity*

TRANSCRIPT



NOTE: This transcript was AI-generated and has not been fully edited.

Mark Turman 00:02

Welcome to The Denison Forum Podcast. I'm Dr. Mark Turman, Executive Director of Denison Forum and host for today's conversation. I want to remind you that what the Denison Forum Podcast seeks to do is to help explain today's culture to today's church so that today's church, people like you and me, can be the redemptive influence and witness that God has called us and invited us to be for him and with him.

I want to just remind you that we have this privilege to be partnered with Christ and to become, as Jesus talked about salt and light or salty, bright, as he said in Matthew chapter five. And we hope that today's conversation and all of our conversations help you to do that. So thanks for being a part of this conversation.

And today, we're excited for a conversation with Christian apologist J. Warner Wallace, or as we get to call him today, Jim. If you're not familiar with him, he has a master's in theological studies, but he is also an award-winning detective who has been featured on the news program Dateline more than any other homicide investigator. A former atheist, he's now become a popular national speaker as well as a podcast host. And he has been an a best-selling author for more than 10 years, with books like *Cold-Case Christianity*, which we're going to talk about the revised version of that today, the book *Person of Interest, Forensic Faith and God's Crime Scene*.

He is also an adjunct professor of apologetics at Biola University in California. He is a senior fellow with the Colson Center for Christian Worldview and is also a faculty member with Summit Ministries, all of which I would encourage you to investigate and become familiar with. Jim and his wife live in Southern California. And we are thrilled to have him as a part of our conversation today. J. Warner Wallace. Jim, welcome to the podcast.

J. Warner Wallace 02:02

Thanks for having me. I appreciate it.

Mark Turman 02:03

Yeah, we're glad to have you. Just for those who may not be regular Dateline watchers. That's a topic I want to chase out with you in a moment. But well, I guess I should say **congratulations on a book that's been having a lot of influence for a decade. What does that feel like?**

J. Warner Wallace 02:23

Surprising actually, you know, when you, when somebody comes to you and ask you to write a book. For me, that's really how it happened for me is that I was training high schoolers. I was a youth pastor for a number of years and work at the same time as a cold case detective. And I was helping with Sean McDowell, who is a well-known apologist in his own right, his dad is Josh McDowell.

And we were he was, at the time, just a high school teacher, he was speaking around the country occasionally. But he was really, for the most part, leading worldview classes at a high school here locally. And he asked me to help train his students as they're getting ready to take an immersive trip that I had done a number of times as a youth pastor at UC Berkeley. And so we were able to take these trips. Last time I went, I think I had as many as 50 people going on

this trip. And they would be the high schoolers, high schoolers who are Christians, would be put in front of other young people a little bit older, you know, freshmen, juniors, seniors in college. So they're like five to six years older than our group. And a lot of these folks were very committed atheists, we would bring in atheist professors, atheists, speakers in the Bay Area here and the UC system in California. Berkeley is our kind of epicenter of unbelief. So it's a great place to have young people kind of engage the issues for the first time, and kind of get their feet wet.

And the stuff they're going to see later on when they go to college anyway, so we take these immersive trips and put them through all kinds of, you know, struggles in situations where they can either proclaim the gospel or defend the gospel. And as I was training this group, Sean said, hey, you know, you should take this material you're using to train this group and write a book about it. And, and I, really, with the students, all I had ever been doing was tracing my own investigative journey back when I was a nonbeliever, and first encountered the Gospels. I was about 35. And I was working as a detective at the time.

And I just thought, well, if I'm going to look at these gospels and take them seriously, I'm going to have to test them first. And that really what started my journey. So I had been training students in this for a number of years. And that's really why I wrote a book it was because Sean said, Hey, you should write a book.

I really didn't think that this would have that kind of impact. You don't of course, everyone writes a book hoping it'll do well. But you don't really know what to expect. And it really has become until the last book I really did really was the kind of defining book for, for what we ended up doing for the next 10 years. When it's cold case Christianity that I think Person of Interest is is kind of that kind of book again.

And those two books together I think, are helpful books to kind of examine the person of Jesus. And all of the evidence you might uncover for the person of Jesus, I think is in those two books. And, and for me, that was really part of my journey was captured by both books. So it was nice to go back 10 years later and bring cold case up to where I thought Person of Interest was, in mostly from an illustration perspective, like I always wanted to illustrate the first book in a much deeper richer way, but the publisher, I think, was just not quite sure what to make of us, you know, and but you know, eight books, nine books later, they kind of figured it out and said, Yeah, go ahead and illustrate whatever you want. So we added 300 illustrations to cold case, wow,

that I would have put in there originally, if I thought I had the permission to do it. So now we've gone back and done that.

Mark Turman 05:54

Yes, as some, some people have said, you know, in part of my training is we, we may talk with words, but we think in pictures and having those illustrations as I work through the book really did, as I Okay, it just helps to be able to see what we're trying to describe with words, because the human imagination is probably the most incredible screen that there ever was, so as to be able to visualize that, as well as hear it verbally is just really a powerful thing.

But Cold Case Christianity really is your story. Because if I understand your testimony, you didn't grow up in the environment of faith yourself. And part of you reference the both Sean and his and his father, Josh, I remember years ago, early days of my own faith back in the 80s, learning about Josh McDowell and his his famous book Evidence That Demands a Verdict. And that approach to this topic. **What do you think was the benefit of you coming and working through this yourself with your investigative detective skills as a nonbeliever first as opposed to if you had written or if you had gone on this journey as a Christian?** What do you think the advantages of being as you work through this personally on your own using your skills, part of your story is about how you had a friend inviting you to church? What catalyzed your decision of Okay, now, I'm gonna go dig into this and what was it like? Kind of coming at this as a skeptic, as opposed to a believer initially?

J. Warner Wallace 07:33

Well, I do wish I didn't know that there was a field called apologetics. I don't think a lot of Christians know that anyway. And certainly you walk into a church for the first time. You don't even know what the Christians know, you don't know what books they're reading, have no idea what a Bible is what the Bible contains. I didn't know any of that. So I didn't realize what like efficient wasn't me, what do you think the contents of the New Testament are? I wouldn't have been able to tell you what they are. I just didn't know. Didn't have any upbringing in this area. I just knew that the idea of of any kind of supernatural explanations for anything, that all seemed ludicrous to me, it all seemed like mythology, just a category difference, a genre difference. I mean, if you're going to include more miracles in any ancient claim, you're not even doing history anymore. That's what I would have said, so.

So for me, it was very much about trying to figure out like, like, what am I even take seriously in this text? And I didn't have a body of work that I was, like, I know that there was Evidence That Demands a Verdict, because I know he wrote that book long before I became a Christian. But I just didn't realize that there was stuff like that out there. So I had to go back to what I thought were a, by the way, I wouldn't have trusted it anyway, at that point. Because I would have said, well, we have so you have a book defending Christianity written by a Christian. I'm not interested in that, which is why it shocks me sometimes to hear today that there are nonbelievers who read Cold Case Christianity, and they at least are open to reading it I would not have been.

I was complete jerk when it came to Christians. The only Christians I knew I did not take seriously there were the people at work who didn't seem like they had any evidential basis for their religious beliefs, when in fact, they were entirely evidential on every other aspect of their professional work. And I just saw that disconnect. And I had no interest in this whole thing.

The other people we saw Christians were the ones we were taken to jail, who for the most part didn't seem like they lived out what they said they believed. So I just didn't have any room for that. So if I maybe had had access, so here's how I did it.

I said, Okay, I walked into that first church and the guy says that Jesus is the smartest man who ever lived. I'm interested in smart people. Not to say that they have, by the way, I would have been interested in a smart, fictional character if there was some piece of wisdom I could glean and call it my own. And that's just you know, so I didn't matter to me if I read the writings of bahala, as a high schooler Have no idea if bahala was even a real person didn't care. It's like fortune is

Mark Turman 10:04

really a sounds like, sounds like just a passion for the truth,

J. Warner Wallace 10:10

just a curiosity like what's healthy, like, I look bright look at it this way there was if it's ancient wisdom, let's say it's just ancient wisdom is this ancient wisdom from ancient writers making stuff up but it is wise in the sense that it's offers me some principle to live by, I would have been interested in them, I would have also rejected what I didn't find convenient. And I would have

embraced what I thought was I would have just kind of smorgasbord cherry-picked out the stuff. So I bought a Bible for that purpose really.

And as I was reading through the Bible, what got me started was, I just was unaware, like I thought the the New Testament or probably be like all the letters of Paul and James. In other words, I didn't realize they were going to be what claimed to be historical narratives. That allegedly had been seen by people, this guy had actually been caught his life had in some way been in chronic if that's something that I could test.

That is by that, by the way, that's not exactly what every other piece of scripture contains. There's a lot of religious scripture out there from different worldviews that is just are just repeated sets of proverbial claims. That's not what the New Testament is, it does contain claims like that. But it also contains a description of what is allegedly true about a region of the world in a period in history. When there's something a series of actions occurred, allegedly. So it's making claims about the past. And although I have no access to the writers and no access to the alleged witnesses, that's common in cold cases. So you don't have access to the detectives who wrote the reports and no access to the actual witnesses because they're now dead. So so it's the same kind of work. And so I just knew those principles would be applicable.

And to be honest, a lot of what I'm talking about as an investigator in this sense, is also common to historians. But I was not a historian. Okay, so So I didn't think of it that way. I just thought, okay, they're making claims, I know how to how to check those claims. I know that criteria for eyewitness reliability. But let me just apply that criteria to the Gospels and see how they do. And I only was interested in reading initially, because when I read through the Gospels, I said, wow, there's clearly some variations between the accounts, places where you might even say, Wow, how can one person reported one way and another person reported the other way? Well, that is so common of eyewitness accounts. No, two eyewitnesses ever seem to agree or reported the same way. So I thought, Okay, this is worth if it was a collusive kind of effort to lie, I think they would have harmonized this a little better. So I was interested in at least a first step to test it, given the fact that it did seem to have the level of variation between eyewitness accounts, that is common in reliable eyewitness accounts. And that's what got me started.

Mark Turman 13:02

Well, that, that idea of variation of testimony about the same and it reminds me of something I heard, guys, I think, but even before I was a Christian, that, you know, you put, you put 10 or 2,

10, or 12 people at an intersection when an automobile accident happens, no two of them are going to tell you exactly the story the same way or give you all the same facts, but they they were all standing at the same corner. They all saw the same automobile accident. But if they weren't standing in **even if they were standing in exactly the same place, they didn't experience it exactly the same, even though it was an objective event.** Right?

J. Warner Wallace 13:37

Yeah. And this is something I think we have to help people. And I think they people recognize this, just because if they think at all about the nature of their own observations, it's I think people sometimes think the only thing that separates two observers is their geographic location in the room that had they been in the exact same position, they might have seen exactly the same thing. But it doesn't really work that way.

In the sense that all observations, even your what you hear, the observations made with all of your senses are very selective. And the same way we experience sometimes tunnel vision. Officers often experienced this in a moment of crisis, the first time around as fire in their direction, they have a tendency to focus and narrow down on where they think the threat is, and they miss all the stuff that's outside that narrow tunnel. That kind of tunnel vision is very common, even when it's more common, of course, when stress is up when there's a crisis involved, but it's common even when there isn't, and so what is it the cause is your tunnel is different from person to person. Sometimes the tunnel is caused by your your wants, and your desires are what you are interested in. The things you always see in every scene. You're focused on those things because you're sensitive to those things. It could be your head History or personal history, you've had a series of experiences that makes you more sensitive to focusing in on similar experiences. That's often the case.

You know, for example, that everyone sees things differently based on their interests. If you if you've ever played slug bug, where you are, you know, you're driving down the street, if you see a little Volkswagen Beetle, Volkswagen Beetle you punish the other person who sees it. First is to say, Slug a bug and punch the other person. Well, if you start playing that game, trust me, you're not going to drive down many streets without noticing the Volkswagen Beetles. And it's because you have an interest now that high that heightens your sensitivity to Volkswagen Beetles, well, we carry the heightened sensitivities into every situation. And then when we see things, as eyewitnesses, we have a tendency to focus on them based on those sensitivities.

So in the end, that's a lot of what is happening in eyewitness accounts. And that's why if the event just happened a minute ago, you would still see a level of variation between accounts that might be shocking for some people, because they might say, well, how can that be we always just there? Well, that's what I was seeing in the eyewitness accounts of the Gospels. And I thought this is at least like it, even if they're, you know,

by the time of Tatian in early church history, Tatian made an effort to harmonize the Gospels to create one harmonized account that can be used by his followers, to kind of assess the story of what was I love about the Gospels is that that that didn't happen early in history, the earliest accounts, and even skeptics will admit that the earliest accounts we have of Jesus are the four gospels that are in your New Testament. And those early accounts have just enough variation between them that skeptics will even use those variations to claim they are not reliable.

But in fact, that was one of the earliest things I saw that tipped my hand a little bit that okay, we shouldn't be looking at these because these have, at least initially, on their face, they have surface superficially, they have the kinds of attributes I would expect if they were reliable.

So let's go ahead and test them. Now. I was not I didn't step out for many, many months in terms of I remember the process was slow. And I was the internet was brand new. And I remember, I was working undercover. And my sergeant was a great guy. And I did not have a home computer. Although I had one in college, I had one of the very first Mac when it first macs. And I remember thinking, I didn't have one at the time. But I would come in early to work every day. And I asked my sergeant hey, look, if I bring in the paper and the ink for the printer, can I print out stuff from the internet?

And so my first earliest investigations, I didn't know what books to buy, were from figuring out who the church fathers are like, who what is an ante Nicene church Father, those kinds of things, a lot of that work I did online, and then I would go out and buy the volumes. And in those days, there actually were bookstores, believe it or not, I mean, that's kind of a lost, kind of a lost business. But I would go out and buy the exact looking for anything I could find from the first century around the biblical record that I could use to start that process that we would use to determine if someone is reliable. And that was really what got me started and how that journey took off. And later on years later, when I had high schoolers, and I was a high school pastor. I just tried to transfer that information to them.

Mark Turman 18:31

Yeah, well, there's something ironically, humorous, as well as powerful about being a police officer or a detective and also working with student ministry. Yeah. Anybody that's ever tried to work with teenagers could see how those skills might come in handy,

but wanted to ask so much of your work, this book, *Cold Case Christianity* and other works that you have done, so much of your speaking has to do with this idea of evidential truth and evidential faith. We do a lot of work in this area at Denison Forum around the idea that our culture currently has rejected and objective truth as a reality and that you go back even some 100 years to a guy named Immanuel Kant and you start tracing this journey out to where we now have this idea that all truth is subjective and personal. We see that manifested in people's sexual decisions that hey, it's all subject and personal. So therefore whatever I do with my life, particularly, my sexual expression is fine because all truth is subjective, subjective and personal.

How how this undergirding you know, we've come to have these phrases now in our culture of fake news, and you can't really trust institutions. You can't trust leaders from just about any segment of society. We can't really know if anybody is telling us the truth about anything. So how does that intersect with your work? And with this idea of evidential truth that, then I get into these conversations sometimes with people about **the difference between evidence and proof?** Can you kind of so we get two or three things floating around here **the idea of objective truth,** **the idea of evidence** and the idea of Okay, does it come to the place where you can call that? Well, that's proof proof that God exists, proof that Jesus existed proof that Jesus was resurrected? Talk about how you handle those things?

J. Warner Wallace 20:33

Well, okay, so I don't often use the word proof in that way. I don't very often will very often say something like, I'm going to prove this to you. I'm going to offer you the evidence. And proof is the decision you make based on an inference, what would you conclude is powerful enough from the evidence I've provided in proof sometimes can be really relative to the person you're talking to is isn't enough to prove this claim. And when you select a jury, you're selecting people based on whether you think they are fair enough, because you're hoping that all of them make the same inference. If one doesn't, you're going to hang your jury.

So you're looking for people. So you do some testing in this in the board our process, to see if the jury is balanced enough, fair enough, less, not humble enough, for example, to be able to, to listen to the evidence and make a proper inference from evidence. And so again, I've been

looking as I watch cases nationally, and I'm still involved in several cases where I'm helping them to present the evidence.

And I've been looking to thinking at some point is the culture going to shift so far, from notions of objective reality, objective truth, that everything is going to be considered just a matter of subjective opinion without even flinching. So even, you know, jurors will have a hard time accepting that something objectively happened.

Now, here's what we have to do, I think, I think we have to be very careful about our definitions, and help the culture see, because I still see people use things like questions like absolute truth, when they would they really probably mean as objective truth? And what is the definition of objective truth compared to Subjective Truth? And if we don't get that definition, right, everything else collapses?

So we would say that claims that are grounded in subjects, the subject makes the claim true. Chocolate chip cookies are the best dessert. I make that true, if I believe that, but is that objectively true? Is that true for everyone? Not necessarily. You might say that the best deserves something else, I get a beat. We all by the way, possess subjective, we all make Subjective Truth claims all the time. There's nothing wrong with doing so. We all make those kinds of claims. Okay.

So how about the claim that Isoniazid is the cure for tuberculosis? Well, I that's not a matter of my personal opinion, I don't make that true. That's true. Whether I knew it or not, it's true. Whether I like it or not, is true, whether I think it's true or not. If that's the cure for TB, that's the cure for tuberculosis, I can't change it by changing my mind, I might think, Well, my opinion NyQuil is the cure for tuberculosis? Well, my thinking is, so will not make NyQuil the cure for tuberculosis that's not grounded in me as the subject of recall those kinds of claims, Subjective Truth claims, that's grounded in the object known as Isoniazid. If it is the cure, it's the cure. And that's why we call that kind of a claim an objective truth claim, because it's not grounded in me as the subject is grounded in the object known as Isoniazid. Now, why is that important?

Well, because all kinds of claims have to be determined whether they're objective or subjective. And this is true of all different kinds of categories of claims. So So for example, if I said, my car is white, well, that's a claim that is grounded in the object known as my car, I cannot make my car blue, I'm not going to go out in the driveway and suddenly blue, because I've changed my

mind. It's not grounded in me as the subject, it's grounded in the object as a car. So that's an important physical claim about a physical object known as a car.

But even the claim that Christianity is true, or God exists, let's say, that's a claim that is not grounded, in my opinion, I cannot make God exist. If he doesn't, by simply changing my mind, I cannot keep God from existing if he does, by simply changing my mind is grounded in the object known as God. Now, here's the thing about objective claims, they can be false in a way that subjective claims cannot be. You can say, well, I don't agree with you on a subject of a claim. But you cannot say that, Jim, you don't think that the chocolate chip cookies are the best dessert? Yes, I do. You cannot falsify that claim. Because it's an it's an opinion.

But the claim that God exists, it can be falsified. I could say, you know, my Hyundai automobile will take can fly you to the moon. Well, that's a claim as an objective claim. It's about my object that a Hyundai automobile but it's a false claim. Now, why is that important?

Well, it turns out that it's in Moral for me to force upon you a subjective claim as though its objective. So for example, if I said, my view is that NyQuil will cure your tuberculosis, if I was to force you to only take NyQuil, and then you die of tuberculosis, that would be wrong. Because I'm treating the object of claim the cure for TB as though I get to decide it subjectively. It's immoral to force on somebody else a subjective claim as though it's an objective claim. This difference is huge, because I might, for example, I might identify as something subjectively, I feel this way, I this is how I personally identify, I got no problem with that that's a subjective claim, everyone is allowed to their subjective opinions, but to force others to embrace as objectively true, something that is only subjectively true, that's a move too far. And I think in cultural machine right now.

Mark Turman 26:02

Yeah, so let me just clarify that what you're saying is a lot. And I want our listeners to really take a deep breath here, because what you're explaining is, is fundamentally important to the way that we think as well as the way that we later on, we're going to talk about being pacemakers for Christ. And this is fundamental to that conversation. So this kind of backup to one of your previous examples.

So if I say, chocolate chip cookies are the best dessert ever. That's my subjective claim. But if I turn around and say, you are required to believe what I'm telling you about chocolate chip cookies, and we're actually going to pass a policy or a law, that everyone must eat chocolate

chip cookies, because they are the best dessert ever, then **we have taken a subjective claim and imposed it upon others in an immoral way in an inappropriate and immoral way. am I tracking with you?**

J. Warner Wallace 27:00

Right? You are and and what how that applies to us examining the evidence for Christianity, I think is interesting. Look, the claim Christianity is true, is not a matter of subjective opinion. This is the difference. People think, well, this works for you. Good that works for you. This is working for me. Now, that's not the kind of claim this is, this might be false, it might not be that Christianity is true. All that's left to do once you determine that a claim is objective, rather than subjective. The only move left is to determine if it's true or false. That's important for us to know.

So if I say God exists, welcome that claim is not a subject not grounded, in my personal opinion, because I cannot change it by simply changing my opinion. That's one way to test it. Okay, so I all that's left to do is determine if the claim is true or false. Does God exist? Okay. Jesus is the only way to the Father to Christianity is true is the only truth it well, that's a claim that's objective. All it's left to do is determine if that's a true or false claim. That's what I was setting out to do. By looking at the evidence for this.

First of all, is this a claim? There's just a matter of opinion, so that now, if it's false, then what you're saying basically, is, yeah, there's a lot of false ideas about the nature of reality that people embrace for whatever reason. And you know, let them do that, because they're all false anyway. And I think a lot of folks that we talked to about Christianity see it that way. They don't care if you're a Mormon, a Hindu or Buddhist or a Christian because they feel like they're all wrong. They're all false. They're all just useful delusions. So whatever useful delusion you want to pick good for you see later.

I needed to know, is it true or false, because I knew it was an objective claim about reality. If it's false, I'm out. That was one when CS Lewis wrote that years ago, and I found it years after I became a Christian is exactly captured how I felt about it. If Christianity is false, it's of no importance. If it is true, it's of infinite importance. The only thing that cannot be as moderately important, either it's not important at all, or it's the most important thing you're ever going to know. And I knew that that was because it's an objective claim about reality.

Mark Turman [AD] 29:08

Denison Forum has just released an online resource that we pray will spur your love for God and others. It's a five week online course, for individuals or small groups, called the greatest commandment, how to love God and others with all your heart, soul, mind and strength. This course is based on Mark 12, where a scribe approached Jesus to ask a seemingly unanswerable question of all God's commandments, which is the greatest price reply is short and to the point. Jesus says, Here, O Israel, the LORD our God, the Lord is one and you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind and with all your strength and adds, you shall love your neighbor as yourself. But what does it mean to love God and our neighbors, as Jesus describes, starting with what the Bible means when it calls us to love. In this study, we will take those concepts and apply them to understanding how we are to love God and our neighbor, with the goal of learning to do both more reliably, and in accordance with His will. We pray that this resource draws you closer to God and reveals what loving your neighbors and truly looked like visit DenisonForum.org/courses to sign up today.

Mark Turman 30:42

Right, and you see this kind of thinking even in the Bible itself, you get it in the book of Acts, and you you see this, you know, you have religious leaders who get upset about the person of Christ, then they get upset about the movement of the church and the story of the gospel. As you get you know, you get in I can't remember if it's somewhere around chapter 16, Chapter 18. And Christians are testifying to what they know and have experienced of Jesus, and the religious leaders who don't believe get riled up about that. And then one of them I believe his name is Gamliel says, Now guys, just calm down, just just come down. If it's all false, it's going to fall apart anyway. Yep. And if it's true, then we better be careful, or else we'll find ourselves fighting against the living God Himself. And so we just need to back up and understand that right. Yeah, and that if it's true, that is true.

Before you before you go on one other thought I have tell me if again, I'm thinking with you, this idea of okay, now. Now, if it's objective, we just simply need to determine if it's true or false. Is there one more step beyond that, which is, I have to then decide if I determined that this is a true objective fact that Jesus Christ is real, that he was raised from the dead, that he's the only way into a right relationship with the Living God, if I examine the evidence, which is what your book is, so does so well, then I have to decide, **am I going to align my life to that truth or not? Is that the is that the next response that I have to make?**

J. Warner Wallace 32:17

Well, yes, but that requires another step of understanding how you think about this, because the question then becomes, well, are you the kind of person who wants to align your life with truth? Not everybody is a lot of folks can go their entire lives. And if Christianity is true, we know there's lots of folks who aren't Christians. So they've lived their entire lives, aligning their lives to something that's not true. So the question is, how much regard do you have? How much reverence do you have for truth?

Is it something that because there's going to be many points in your journey as a Christian, when this is not going to be comfortable, it's not going to be convenient is not going to produce the results. If you know, Job is in the Old Testament, you know, that this is not the kind of thing that guarantees a prosperous life doesn't work that way. It's not as simple as if you love God and obey God, He blesses you with all kinds of good things. It's not quite that simple. There's a nuanced complexity to the Christian worldview, which actually reflects the nature of reality. That's what I love about Scripture. It actually describes the world the way it really is.

Now, a lot of us don't read deeply. And so we kind of miss misinterpret, or to fail to even read to learn for the first time what it is scripture teaches about our x, what we should expect from reality, on this side of the fall, on this side of the Garden of Eden, we're in between gardens were in between the Garden of Eden, and the new creation. And in this period of time in between, we have certain next I think we have to have certain appropriate expectations.

And I think so again, it does come down to Yeah, once you know something is true. Well, do you want to live your life according to that truth, that's still a second decision you have to make. So it's not that, you know, I decided this was true, and I wanted to be all in on it. And you know, I just finished writing another book, which comes out next year, which talks about, basically the nature of humans, and how it is that if you wanted to flourish as a human, if you just were focused on all of the stuff that helps humans to flourish? Well, if you throw that Dart at the bullseye cause human flourishing, you're gonna hit a biblical worldview every time whether you like it or not, because it turns out that the Bible also describes humans the way they really are.

So I wanted to live in that truth, but I could never have stepped off into what might be a useful lie. So I needed to know are the Gospels telling me the truth about Jesus? Are they telling me the truth about his teaching? Are they telling me the truth about the most important fundamental issue the rise from the grave? You know, can I trust the gospel? I wasn't gonna get to the gospel if I couldn't trust the narratives in the New Testament.

So for me, this was all part of the journey. Is it objectively true? Did it really happen? The way the scriptures describe it, because if they're telling me the truth about Jesus, I can begin to trust them for what they say about me. And that'll shift you from belief that something is true to putting your trust in something as true from belief that to believe in, that really requires a shift that occurs once you start to trust what the Scripture describes about you. And that's for me was I wasn't gonna take that step, unless I knew first it was describing the truth about Jesus. Because it lots of folks make claims about humans. Doesn't seem true.

Mark Turman 35:34

Right? So yeah, so **unpack that a little bit more from belief about to belief in**, what explain that, that process, that step that we need to understand because that's, that's really, I think you're really unpacking the decision of faith that we would sometimes called the decision of salvation. clarify that a little bit more about that, that process?

J. Warner Wallace 36:00

Well, you can believe that Jesus is a first century sage who did everything that's in the New Testament Gospels, including rose from the dead, yet still not trust Him as Savior says the demons even believe, but they're not saved. So they know the truth about Jesus, but they haven't submitted their life. And that's the biggest decision you're gonna make, but you nobody's gonna miss their life.

One of the tricky things about Christianity is it's, it's grounded in an attribute of human flourishing. That is highly overlooked. It's an attribute of human flourishing that is surprising in what it does to, to help humans to thrive. And if you look at the sociological studies on this in the last 25 to 30 years, you'll see that on every metric of human flourishing from better degrees, better education, better grades, better leadership, as a boss, better employee behavior, deeper relationships, more committed relationships, longer relationships, better mental health, or physical health, longevity, living longer lives. It's a weird little attribute known as humility.

And embrace humility. If you weren't a Christian, you'll still discover that all of those attributes of human flourishing are available to those of us who are humble. And the Christian worldview begins with an act of humility, that there is a God that you recognize and you're not him. And that act of bending your knee, and recognizing your knee for need for a Savior, is the first act of submission, which requires humility. And for a lot of us why we resist the Gospels is because we pridefully think that our way is better. We even pridefully judge what we see on the pages of the

New Testament and call it evil, or we'll call it an important or what it's all from a position of of pride, that we begin that kind of a move.

So what's difficult about Christianity is it begins with an act of humility, and it's something that's not native to our, to our, our kind of our human condition. It's something that I have, and by the way, you can't even pursue it. You cannot pursue him already, because then the pursuit becomes a point of pride. You know, Michael and Mike Adams, who is a friend of ours, who passed away a number of years ago, he used to always teased that he wrote a book called, you know, how 10 Easy Steps to Becoming humble and how I made it an eight, you know, like, you can't, you can't and

Mark Turman 38:26

I think that's why you can't pursue I think that's why I think CS Lewis may have been the one who said that humility is like the cardinal virtue of all virtues. Yeah, it is the core of every virtue,

J. Warner Wallace 38:37

And how do you how do you get humility? Well, you don't, it's not like you go through a series of steps. Because if it involves a steep series of steps, the steps become steps of pride. So So instead, humility is realized. It's it's an honest assessment of your own nature. And that's where the Gospels and the letters are helpful.

If you start to believe that the Gospels are telling you something true, well, then you can begin to believe what the letters in the New Testament say about who you are, you can realistically assess your condition. And when you do that, you'll come to a position of humility that allows you to take the step of of submitting your life in a way that you wouldn't I wouldn't have done otherwise because I needed to, I didn't trust anything these these these books said. So I needed to do the reverse work first. So I can do the second work second.

Mark Turman 39:31

So humility to me in that way, it comes to the place of saying, perhaps a starting place of humility is I'm going to I'm going to seek to understand truth and reality as it is not as I wish it were. Absolutely not as I would try to make it but as as I discover and experience it to be, and as I discover evidence for I'm going to I'm going to accept and align my life with that reality and truth as it is, but not as I might want it to be.

J. Warner Wallace 40:07

And this is why humility is the Yeah, this is why Humility is the first attribute we're looking for in jury selection. Because if you you know, you're not you don't want people who want to want to come back with a decision, that's how they want the world to be or how they want the case to be or how they want this suspect to, because this suspect resembles somebody in their family or the suspects of a certain race or a certain whatever that they favor, that instead you want them to be humble enough that hey, I'm not going to look for an answer that suits my my predispositions, I'm going to let the evidence lead me where it leads me. And that requires a level of humility.

Mark Turman 40:43

I've never heard anybody in the judicial arm police arm note that I've been, I've been on a couple of juries, I actually was the foreman of a jury in an assault case. I never, I never knew that behind the scenes that what the what the attorneys were most looking for was humility, right is a willingness to

J. Warner Wallace 41:05

Yes. In passion, you want people who are passionate, because people were passionate, they want to do the right thing. So you're looking for a combination of things, right. But like, I know, for example, this is why we don't put experts in a certain field on our jury, if we think we're going to call experts in that field, for part of the case, because you don't want somebody getting puffed up and think they know more than the expert you're going to call. So you're always battling well. Okay, so this person, you know, at least knows the field generally. But you're out you're trying to assess in advance, do you think this person would listen to an expert that we called? So that is really an issue of humility?

Mark Turman 41:41

So let's get into the book a little bit more deeply. In the first part of the book, you give 10, tools, skills that you have spent a lot of your life learning and perfecting and honing of being a detective. So why did you put those things in there? And how, how much how important it is for the reader to grasp what those tools are? Would you go so far as to say that most of us have some sense of these tools, we don't have them to the degree that someone like you and the profession of of investigating crimes would have. But talk about why you started with those 10

tools as an investigator, and how they can be helpful to us as we become case builders for Christianity in our own testimony.

J. Warner Wallace 42:32

Yeah, I think part of the problem is when you have a lot of at least when you start talking to people about the case for Christianity, some of it's just a matter of not understanding how evidence works, like what are the rules of evidence, what are these basic principles? And if they understood the basic principles, they would not, we wouldn't really be struggling because their expectations are unreasonable to begin with. And what they think would count as evidence, they don't know what counts is evidence they don't.

So actually, understanding the basic principles of investigation can do a lot for people to help move them before you ever even start talking about the evidence itself. Like now they have at least a concept of how to assess the evidence. And that's a huge part of what we do. In other words, it's really about epistemology. How do you know what you know? How do you how do you get there? How do you get from not knowing anything to knowing something?

Well, I knew before I start just going through the second section of the book, which is, you know, the four attributes of reliable eyewitness testimony, I was going to first have to do some teaching about the nature of life. For example, direct and indirect evidence of the danger of presuppositions how we determine if there's a conspiracy is that once you understand how to work conspiracies, you'll never be persuaded that this is a large conspiratorial story about Jesus if you understood how conspiracies are broken. So those are the kinds of benefits that

Mark Turman 43:53

yeah, that's worth reading the book, right? They're just in the in the world that we live in right now, where conspiracy theories run amok everywhere, just understanding **how conspiracy thinking works** and how to see through that right.

J. Warner Wallace 44:07

Yeah, and I'll tell you, that's something that I think we're guilty of as a church is that we often favor the most ridiculous conspiracies. And a lot of it is is not that conspiracies don't occur. They occur all the time. But successful conspiracies have certain characteristics. And if you don't know what those characteristics are, you start to fall into all kinds of silly thinking, like how many

people are going to be involved in this conspiracy the number of people involved in a conspiracy matters and if you don't if you have too many, it's becomes an unreasonable conspiracy.

This is how, by the way detect those break conspiracies and often our murders are involving more than one person, right. So so we can add that on charge, we can add a conspiracy enhancement or conspiracy charge to our filing, if we've got more than one person so you get in the process of working conspiracies and breaking conspiracies.

And once you know How to break them. It helps you to kind of look for the attributes. So there are it is possible if the only for example, if this was a lie between two people who are writing the Gospels just to others, nobody else saw this, nobody else reported it. Well, then that's a lot more reasonable conspiracy than the number of people that allegedly saw Jesus and for years reported him across that part of the Mediterranean. So I think that's why we had to kind of understand the nature of conspiracies before we begin, and I'm just not a big fan of of conspiracy theories for that reason.

Mark Turman 45:32

Right. I can it makes me think of the old story of Chuck Colson the Watergate conspirator has, right. Who who talked about this in his own testimony that, you know, he was, he was in the circle of the deception of Richard Nixon. He's like, look, we were 12, 13 men with everything in the world to lose. And we still couldn't keep a secret.

J. Warner Wallace 45:53

Yeah, he actually said his experience in Watergate was one of the reasons why he did he rejected conspiracy theories related to the New Testament and, and that, I think, is something worth doing. So.

So we tried to do in the first part of the book, is just to spend time kind of going through some basic tools. And I think people, for the most part, are interested in those tools anyway, because they are interested in how we work cases. And so they are interested in like, you know, how, because you can use those tools on any investigation of any claim from the past, even if it's just what your kids said they did last night. So you can use those tools. But then we wanted to turn it my focus more distinctly on, like, what are we looking for, in the gospels themselves. And that really comes down to the reliability of eyewitnesses. And that's why I think this book, at least for people who have talked about in the last 10 years, I think, has been helpful for people.

Because if they said, Well, how do I know that something a claim about the past is reliable. That's a pretty vague kind of word. And any number of people will give you a different way of trying to figure out how do I determine if something is reliable. And we have a very specific template in criminal trials. And it works every time. So I just thought, well, this is the only skill set I had. So I simply applied it.

And here's why I think it's helpful is helpful, because historians don't get the luxury of applying their process practically in front of a jury over and over and over and over again, on any number of historical events, even though the historical event maybe only happened 25 years ago. The point is crimes are all historical events. And when we do this in front of juries, we discover what, what is what works and what doesn't work, what leads to a sufficient inference of reasonable inference, what doesn't lead to a reasonable inference.

So in other words, courtrooms are the one historical epistemological laboratory in which we can test our theories about knowing something is true. And how do we communicate it? And then we can look at this, take that what we've learned and apply it to anything. So that's why I thought, in some ways, that was a reasonable approach to take. It's not that it was for sure, it was the only thing I knew to do. But it turns out, I think it's actually appropriate for the for the case under investigation.

Mark Turman 48:15

But there's so so that's a distinctive, right, between the work of traditional historians, where, and that's another area that's being greatly challenged on multiple fronts these days that even I mean, you know, one of the things I want to do eventually on this podcast and have a conversation about just the practice of history, because even history itself has has come under great challenge. But that's, that's a, that's a different it's an overlap, obviously, with history, because as you said, every, every crime, every murder is a historical event. But because it is the loss of life, even if we were just looking at this not from a spiritual impact, but just simply from the **if we were just simply investigating the death of Jesus, it would be an event that could be analyzed using these rules, right?** And that operates differently from just trying to evaluate it in the context of the tools of history.

J. Warner Wallace 49:19

Have you ever met anybody who could come outthink themselves in other words, they, they will start to think about this in such an abstract way, that they start to lose the time of direct kind of

simplistic access to truth. And this is what people, we don't want people to do in jury trials. As a matter of fact, when we're asking them to assess any number of claims made by the defense or by the prosecution, we don't give them abstract formulas. The jury instruction is that you now are to use your common sense.

So what we're looking for we take a very common sense accessible approach to describing the evidence and offering what The best inferences from the evidence. And I think that in some ways that protects you from becoming such an, taking such an academic approach to assessing claims from the past that you now are you just okay? Look, if this happened in your own family, what would you say? If your son made this claim last night, you wouldn't be taking this Bayesian formula and trying to plug in all the variables and is trying to assess you just say, No, you're lying to me. It's a very common sense, simple kind of response to the preponderance of evidence.

And so I think, when we try to do a jurors is to throw the ball in a way that can be caught. And that's what this book tries to do. There's a great I used source documents, other books that I really, really love, like Richard Bauckham, evidence, and the, the New Testament eyewitnesses, the Gospels, the eyewitnesses, what's the name of his book, now I'm kind of forgetting what was called great book on the eyewitness accounts, the Gospels as eyewitness accounts. And what I always tell people, you gotta read that book. It's a great book.

But for a lot of people, they're like, Yeah, you know, I tried to read it. It's just a little bit dry. And they'll say, Well, you know, we did push ourselves, first of all, as a church, if you think it's dry, it's because we're not trying hard enough. We're not even like raising our level of discourse, Jesus, and the eyewitnesses to what it's called. And that book is such a powerful book, I think. And if you think, well, it's a little bit above my interest level or my skill level, then raise your interest bubble and raise your skill level, because we should be reading these kinds of books.

But I knew that I was teaching high schoolers, and I was already raising the bar way higher than anyone ever had for them. But I didn't need it to be so high that they would check out. And this is also true in juries, we have to be careful that we haven't abstracted this thing based on the DNA. Like in the end, we will have a witness or an expert come up and talk about the probability that this DNA belongs to somebody else or belongs to our defendant. And if they're not careful, they can lose the entire jury. And we can see it. And we'll stop it. And we'll see. Okay, that sounds a little bit technical. Can you just make it simpler for our jurors? We'll just say it, because we know that he's already speaking or she's already speaking over the head of our jury.

So I knew that when we were writing this book, I needed it to be as high level in terms of his research as I can make it yet accessible in a way that is common that that if you've got a high schooler, that's why illustrations help, right, because you originally, you're sometimes getting illustrated books you are reading from illustration to illustration, there are 400 Plus illustrations in person of interest. Now, there are 390, in cold case. And we've rewritten the book significantly to incorporate some of the things we've learned from the stage where we're trying to teach the principle to groups. And I've discovered that, hey, you know what, this is a bit, there's a better way to throw this ball that is clear, more direct, answers the question quicker. Well, we've gone back and rewritten those into the book, because we want this to be even more accessible than it was before.

Mark Turman 53:09

So we think are there go ahead? Yeah. And in addition to the, to the inclusion of so many new visuals and that type of thing, 10 years of watching this resource being out in the world out in the public and being used in such many What are there other than Hey, visuals will really help this as you as you talk about, Hey, how are we? How can we pitch this ball? So that if there's a nonbeliever coming at this with the same kind of motivation that you had, or that I might have had, or others might have had about, okay, I've got to go figure out this thing about Christianity for myself.

So if a skeptic is picking up this book, or a believer is picking up this book, because they're like, I just need to be able to talk about my faith in a more effective way. **What are the things have you kind of discerned over 10 years? Besides the inclusion of visuals, are there other things that prompted the revision and the re-release of the book?**

J. Warner Wallace 54:05

Yeah, I didn't want to write a book, that would not be appealing to anyone who already had the first copy. So there's not a single page of this book that hasn't been edited or updated in some way. And there are several places in the book, several sections of the book where they've been completely rewritten. And several places where they've been completely updated.

So for example, in the corroboration section, when we're talking about archaeology, that's an entirely new section. Because that stuff changes, you know, and in 10 years, you'll find out some new things pop up, and you want to make sure you include them. I also organize that in a way that I think is easier to catch. We have a completely new afterward with 12 objections to the

book that are answered there and illustrated. We've got a new foreword to the book. And we've included new ELA not just ice illustrations not that shouldn't say illustrations, like new parables, new ways of describing the evidence that are from the stage presentation that I think are more accessible so that yeah, this is a complete major rewrite. It's, and I think that that was the goal.

The goal was that I'm not going to rewrite a book that, that I don't need to rewrite. And I felt like this was one that now it is taking the shape and the form that it probably should have had from the beginning, in the sense that it is much, much more I think, influential is a word I'm looking for. It's, it's accessible, and it's visually accessible in a way that I think is even easier.

So and a lot of people think, well, you sell you sell a bunch of books, and you think well, that everyone's already heard about this. It's not true. This is people think that Holic Christian apologetics, sadly, is a small niche. There is nobody other than maybe Lee Strobel, who is getting tons of volumes, their books out there.

And the reason why is because number one, the number of Christians in the country is shrinking. And the West is shrinking. And of those Christians who claim on a Christian identity, sadly, very few are even interested in the evidence. And that's the if you are somebody who likes Christian apologetics and you're listening to this podcast, you already know that's true, because you're having a hard time getting your own pastor, to be interested, likely, depends on where you are. But it's not something that you find in the Christian experience.

So you're in this small little percentage of what now is about half the country who's even interested in Jesus. And so So what are you trying to do? Well, we're trying to write something that the entire church is interested in, because we feel like the church has not been interested. And that is why young people are walking away. That's why we have less and less influence. But worse than that, it's why we really aren't that committed to our Christian beliefs. And we're willing to compromise them so easily. Once the culture changes its view on some moral teaching. Because we're thinking, Well, you know, it's not, it's, it's not true, like science is true. So I can modify my beliefs on this, who's gonna really, you know, now we have to be committed to believing that every word on the pages of the New Testament can be trusted, and ought to be taken seriously.

Mark Turman 57:23

Oh, absolutely. and is and is not only as true as science, you if there's such thing as saying is more true than science is really not the best way to say that, but certainly as true as anything in

science, but, you know, we, we, and, you know, we seem to be intimidated by the world at times. Yeah. And

J. Warner Wallace 57:39

you know, it is Mark it's, it's, let's face it, this is, it's similar and how we approach it. But so in science, we uncover certain facts. And then we make a proper of what we hope is a proper inference from those facts. We're doing the same thing here, we want to uncover certain historical facts, we want to make sure they're facts. And then we make it what we hope is a proper inference from those facts. So we're collecting data and then making proper inferences from the data.

And that process works in both directions. It may this is why you see that there are times when I wrote a book called God's crime scene, for example, where I collected the data, the same exact data that atheist would say, demonstrates one inference. And I try to show how actually that same data is better inferred in the opposite direction. So so what we're trying to do is the same data is not like I've got my set of facts, and they've got there's no, we're looking at the exact same evidence on the other side of the yellow tape, we're just coming to two different inferences. While we're trying to do the same kind of thing here. Only the data is historical data rather than scientific data.

Mark Turman 58:43

What Jim, I've got, I've got 12 more questions, but not that much time. So I'm going to, I'm going to try to pare this down to two, okay. So that so that I can be respectful of your time.

One of those is, there's an appeal of a very important appeal, particularly to Christians, you've already alluded to, it's about **the problem of being an abbreviated Christian**. That is somebody who has come to the place where the first part is, they do believe it, and they are humble enough to submit themselves to Christ personally. But then you talk about the abbreviated Christian being one who doesn't make this second decision to say, You know what, I'm not just going to investigate and and align myself to the belief and reality or the truth and reality of Christ. I now have the privilege of being a witness and an advocate and an ambassador. Can you talk about that appeal that comes at the at the end of the book, where you're saying, Look, do not allow yourself to, to accept the status of being an abbreviated Christian?

J. Warner Wallace 59:52

Why right because we're called to make two decisions, right? The first decision is a decision of trust, where we say, Okay, this is true about Jesus and I'm going and to trust Him as my Savior. And that decision, if you're in the church, and you call yourself a Christian, you probably have made that decision. But what we often then don't do is make other decisions that could fall as a second Domino.

And you see this in first Peter three, where Peter doesn't say, Well, look, you know, you don't have to do this, because not all of you are going to be called to be evangelists, Paul kind of says that. Some are called as evangelists, some as pastors, some as teachers, which means by inference, that some of us aren't those things. This is not for everyone, this is for some of you. So that's great. But that's not what Peter says in first prayer three, he says that all of you need to be ready to give the reason for the hope you have in Jesus with gentleness and respect.

Okay, so that's not something that's assigned to a certain position within the church. And sadly, that's what we have, we have that second decision you need to make if you haven't made that decision to do what Peter says, To defend what you believe, then you're living in an abbreviated Christian life, you're you made the first decision, but not the second. And we need to be to decision Christians need to make both decisions, otherwise, we will be abbreviated in some way.

And I think what we see, may just end on this point. So I think this is the most important point is that that we have an entire industry, within the church of people like me, who are Christian apologists, when in fact, there's not the position of Christian apologist described anywhere. On the pages of the New Testament, you have pastors, and evangelists. But it turns out, the only description we have of case making of defending the gospel is a description that Peter uses for all of us. Not as a special like leader of the church, but just as a believing Christian.

So now we've done is we've kind of assigned our responsibility as Christians to a select few, and we buy their books, there shouldn't be any books like this written, there shouldn't be a need, because all of us should be doing this work personally. But I get it. What we're trying to do right now is to transition from that, that position to where you've got a church with 1% that can make a case for this to a church where 99% can make a case for this. And the only way to get from here to there is for us to share what we've learned to share what we know.

But I'll tell you, the goal of every Christian apologist, quote unquote, should be to put themselves out of business, because this should be the thing that every Christian adopts as part of their

their life. And now, I can't even get every Christian pastor to adopt it. As part of a strategy, let alone congregants. So we've got a long way to go.

But in the end, what I hope is that a book like cold case, Christianity is going to take a step for people. Because once you can do this, and by the way, you've already you're doing this for so many other aspects of your life. I know people who are better apologists for the Dallas Cowboys than they are for their own their own beliefs as a Christian, you know, is Dak gonna have a better season? Should Mike McCarthy be calling the plays, I mean, we like I'm a sports nut too. But if we get to a place where we know that roster and every move of that team, but yet we don't know the ins and outs of our own Christian worldview, we've dropped the ball. So I think it's quite important for us to shift our attention and spend time making the case.

Mark Turman 1:03:22

Yeah, and a great a great word a great call to action. And, and I would even go so far as to say you know, what, if you if you've been a Christian for a while and you find yourself being bored, it may be because you didn't make this second decision. You guys right? You you're not in the game the way God would want you to be in the game as and make it clear to people hey, it's not your job to convert or save anybody, right? Nobody, no human being can do that. You know, Dr. Denison that founded our ministry says, Look, human, human words can't change human hearts. That's the work of the Holy Spirit's right.

But you get to be a part of the process. God has ordained that the process is that we get to be his case makers and his apologists, we get to be the ones that share what we have seen and heard and touched and known as John talks about right. All right, I'm gonna I'm going to ask you for one quick bonus question just because you have expertise in this area. And I'm curious about it. All right. **Why is it that as people we are so addicted to crime dramas on television, why is it that people love Dateline, and every time we turn around there is a new crime show that comes on and we get addicted to them so quickly? Why is that?**

J. Warner Wallace 1:04:36

Okay, I've got two less than two minutes to answer this. Here's here's what it is. It's a pride issue. What we love are shows that that demonstrate that there's somebody out there who's more evil than we are. And we love to relish other people's dark side, because it helps us to feel better about us. And go wow, look at how much evil is out there by comparison. We look pretty

good. We feel pretty good and the more you watch people who are fallen doing Stupid things, the less you feel fallen, the less stupid you feel.

So I honestly think that larvotto would be interested in watching bad people do bad things. It's good. It helps us to feel like we're something other than bad people doing bad things. So I gets a lot of it. And we are inclined toward evil, we are fallen by our nature. Just this is another chapter of the next book I just wrote. I think that the statistics and the studies demonstrate this, we are drawn to bad boys and relationships, we are drawn to the dark side of movies. We even like our humor to be darker is is just the nature of who we are. Well, why I think it's because we love the comparison. We'd love to sort of peek into the dark side of our nature. So we can say, well, we're not like that. I think that's a lot of it. For sure. No, yeah.

Mark Turman 1:05:46

Well, thank you for that. So, folks, the book is cold case, Christianity, the revised 10th anniversary edition with lots more illustrations and a very, very thorough reworking of the book. If you have missed the first one, or even if you have and are a big fan of the first one. This one is going to help clarify things even more and equip you well. You can find it in Amazon, you can find it everywhere. And we encourage you urge you to do that. And along with that this podcast if it's been helpful and encouraging to you please rate and review us share it so other people can find the Denison Forum Podcast with Jim Wallace. Jim, thank you again for taking some time to be with us. Thank you for the larger work of what you're doing to equip us to be great witnesses and testimonies for Christ in this culture. We need more people like you like said we want to put you out of business by becoming apologist ourselves. Thank you for taking some time with us today.

J. Warner Wallace 1:06:47

And thanks so much for having me. I appreciate it. God bless you.