It All Comes Back to Faith!
by Brian Mariani

Recently, after Dave Nutting’s presentation at the University of WY, I had an opportunity to talk with an engineer who claimed that there wasn’t much substantial evidence for the truth of creation science. He dismissed creationists because, in his opinion, we start with the answers that we are trying to prove and thus we aren’t objective and scientific. He said “Creation science is not science.” We discussed worldviews and I told him that creationists start with a Biblical worldview (using a consistent and confirmed, historical account) and we do science. Evolutionists start with a naturalistic worldview (which tries to find the best naturalistic explanation – excluding supernatural explanations) and do science.

I then suggested that both have faith in their worldviews. He seemed shocked and surprised that I claimed that he has faith and dismissed that outright. He then claimed that true scientists don’t push their agenda but instead gain knowledge through observation and experimentation (science). He said that a scientist takes a rock, holds it up a certain distance from the ground and then lets it go to see what happens. Scientists now have confidence that the rock will fall because they have done that experiment over and over with the same results.

Even though his example had nothing to do with the issue at hand, I suggested that he has faith that the laws of physics will continue to work so that the rock will always fall. He also has to have faith that he can trust his senses, his experience (“evidence”), his memories of his experiences, and the conclusions of others as well. He objected saying that this “faith” was totally different than faith in God. However, I suggested that it is still “faith.” I explained that we are so confident the rock will fall because we have so much evidence and don’t have to have as much faith.

He then stated that a new Christian has to make a leap of faith without evidence. (Many would call this “blind faith.”) I thought about that for a second, but easily realized that I did have evidence even as a small child that God was real because of the testimony of my parents, of those in my church, and from the consistency that I saw in the Bible. My faith in God and the Bible was founded on evidence – maybe not a lot of evidence, but some. He challenged me, “Do you have more confidence that the rock will fall or that God exists?” (Think about it … how would you answer him?)

I responded that I probably do have more confidence that the rock will fall, but practically the same confidence that God exists. He still seemed shocked by my perspective, so I used another example. From an evolutionary perspective, our thoughts are simply brain chemistry. If any of those chemicals or processes is incorrect, our thinking and logic could be way off from reality. Thus, an evolutionist has no real basis for trusting their thinking and logic. This is where the gentleman responded that he has evidence and confidence that his thoughts are correct because he and others can understand his thoughts. And this is where I added that he has faith that his evidence is what he thinks it is.

It was amazing to see that again and again it all comes down to faith. Everyone (creationists, evolutionists, etc.) believes something. I haven’t seen him since, but I pray that these thoughts and God’s truth are resonating in his mind and that the Holy Spirit might be working on his heart.

AOI
Considerer Logical Fallacies: The Red Herring Fallacy

Note: See previous editions of T&B for other articles in this series.

Sam: I think you’re wasting your time studying creation science… it contributes nothing to modern science.

Mike: Why do you think creation scientists can add nothing to modern scientific understanding?

Sam: Does any major university have a “Creationist” as the head of a science department?

Mike: I am not sure, but I think that would be due to other factors and not their ability to do good science, but that really doesn’t answer my question.

Sam: OK, when was the last time a “Creationist” won the Nobel Prize for any of his research?

Mike: I guess I would have to do some research to find out, but that is beside the point. You still have not given me a reason why, because of methodology, that they can’t do good science.

Sam: I think I have made it plain enough; it’s those religious blinders again!

Are you frustrated yet? You may or may not have noticed that Sam is avoiding the question – a very important one – using a logical fallacy known as a “Red Herring.” He has not shown us the inabilities of Creation Science; he has just given examples of the sociological state of modern science.

A red herring occurs when someone introduces an irrelevant point into an argument, sometimes under the assumption that it proves their point, but may really indicate their lack of a good argument. Their answers may be true, and they may believe them, but they are not supportive of the argument at hand. They may be good supports for another argument, but not for the particular one you are discussing.

Red herrings can be hard to spot, and if not detected, can seem very persuasive and misleading. Sometimes they are used intentionally to divert a discussion from a point that is hard to support, to one that is merely academic, or to an emotionally charged issue for which it is easier to garner support. For example, “Embryonic stem cell research has to be done; if you do not approve, then it is obvious that you care nothing for those who are suffering.” It’s unfortunate that it hurts, but this argument totally misses the topic of debate. Why does it need to be embryonic alone? Why not use adult stem cells (or something else)? It then moves to an emotional accusation that carries a terrible stigma. We have been diverted from a valuable discussion to being sideswiped by a powerful accusation that smells of empty rhetoric. It avoids the true issues and does not give any support that can be argued for or against.

Although salted and smoked herring (turning the fish a reddish brown) may be good for the belly, they are definitely not good for arguing your point! Make sure you keep your arguments, and those of your opponent, relevant to the question at hand. Do not avoid the real questions, and who knows, you may catch some fish for the Lord if you persevere.

Inspired Evidence: Only One Reality

This is a wonderful way to get great creation teaching in small, daily bites. Each day, there is a short (one page) article focusing on a particular aspect of creation, and a corresponding scripture on which to meditate. Daily readings are taken from various categories: Christian Truth, Geology, Design, Biology, Biblical Accuracy, Paleontology, Cosmology, Botany, Anatomy, and Microbiology.

The book asks, “If the Bible is wrong about scientific issues … why believe any of it?” and then says: “God wants us to be inspired by what he has made. He wants us to clearly understand the REAL history of this universe. Come along on an adventure to explore how strongly observation confirms the straightforward statements of the Bible.”

This daily devotional makes a great gift for families, students, or anybody else who wants to learn more about God and His creation. We highly recommend it. (Available from AOI for $12.00. Free S/H through 1/31/15)
Imperfection or Creative Design?

by Dave Nutting

University students frequently parrot evolutionary professors who advance arguments against God based on what they consider to be “imperfections.” The argument goes like this: “I could have designed it better. If God exists, He did a lousy job. Therefore there must not be a God.”

Two such examples of supposed “imperfections” were brought up while I was speaking recently at the University of Wyoming. One involves a nerve which services the larynx. The other is our breathing and swallowing system.

Right Laryngeal Nerve

You will note in the diagram that there are two nerves which service your larynx. One of the nerves takes a fairly direct path to the larynx while the other takes a much longer, presumably “inefficient” route. Atheists argue that a better design would have the RLN taking a shortcut rather than traversing clear down around the aorta at the heart. This arrangement is even more pronounced in the giraffe which has a similar design, but traverses a much greater distance due to the length of the neck.

On the surface, this argument for “imperfection” or “poor design” seems logical. However, rather than forming a quick judgment, one should ask if there is a reason why our Creator would have used such a design. Here are some considerations.

1. The design may have been necessary in an earlier embryonic stage of life. In order to state something is poorly designed, one would have to research every stage of development.

2. The RLN efficiently branches off of the vagus nerve which services other important areas and organs. After it branches off, rather than only going to the larynx, the RLN also services the heart and esophagus. That clearly shows a reason for its path.

3. Its location can save your life! Pressure on the RLN due to an aortic aneurysm distorts your speech. This is a clear warning sign to get to the hospital! We could probably come up with other reasons why this seems like a good design, but the point here, is that there may be good reasons that proponents of the “imperfection” argument have not considered.

Chance of Choking

Another “imperfection” brought up at the university to disprove the existence of God, was the fact that since our windpipe and the esophagus share the same entrance, choking to death is a possibility. When asked how it could have been more efficiently designed, the student answered, “I don’t know, but certainly not that way.”

This weak atheistic argument was addressed in the Autumn 2004 issue of Think & Believe. It is true that you can choke, but this usually results from misuses of the system such as running, talking, or laughing while eating. Alternatively, consider the impressive multi-functional design of this system, which allows for eating, breathing, coughing up food stuck in the throat, as well as polite disposal of mucous buildup. Consider the fact that this system also allows you to talk. Since the airflow works in unison with the teeth, tongue and mouth opening for effective speech, we would have to have repetition of tubes, two mouths, and two sets of teeth. Where would you put the second ones?

The Swiss Army knife has been heralded as a master design as it has so many functions built into one tool. I think God’s creation of the mouth, tongue, teeth, windpipe, larynx, esophagus, etc. all working and functioning together is also a master design – even better than the Swiss Army knife. I find it ironic that atheistic evolutionists will herald this system as a marvel of evolutionary achievement but still call it a poor design in reference to God and creation! Is someone’s bias showing?

In any case, who are we to say that a biological system is poorly designed? We know only a tiny fraction of all there is to know. Our Creator God is so much wiser than we are. When I view all of the marvelous systems in our body, I can only agree with the Psalmist: “I will praise thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvelous are thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well.” (Psalms 139:14)
As I write, I am staying with a family that is part of the ministry at the University of Minnesota where I am speaking. I enjoy watching these dedicated parents teach their young children (including a 2 year old) to have a cheerful heart and to be thankful to the Lord and to each other. I am sure that example is going to affect their view of life forever!

What a contrast to so many university students who have adopted a secular or atheistic viewpoint. I wish they could be like these children and learn to appreciate the fact that they were created. Their Creator would love to have them stop their attempts to explain Him away! I’m sure God would much rather hear them say, “Thank you for being an awesome God!”

Even though it is heart-wrenching seeing people cling to ingratitude and unbelief, I still give thanks for the opportunity to be able to show students and others overwhelming evidence of His existence, the Truth of His Word, and greatness of His love. Hopefully these truths will take root and many will be able to say, as one student said this week, “Thank you for coming. What you shared [a couple years ago] was the turning point in my life.” He is now active in the ministry at the university! I just pray there will be many more like him!

In turn I say “Thank you” to the supporters of AOI who make it possible for us to share the important message of Creation and the Gospel. Most of all, I thank our great Creator God who gives us life and breath and brings fruit for our labor. “Give thanks to the Lord for He is good; His love endures forever.” Have a blessed and grateful holiday season as you celebrate Thanksgiving and the birth of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ!