



**WORLDVIEW MADE PRACTICAL**  
**Volume 14 Number 35**  
**September 18, 2019**

**A Conversation about Faith and Science**

By Freddy Davis

In July of 2019, I recorded a short video for the MarketFaith Ministries website that dealt with the topic of science. Specifically, the video addressed most Atheist's false assertion that science and Christianity are incompatible. (You can view the video at:

<http://www.marketfaith.org/2019/07/science-misunderstood>)

While these videos are posted on the MarketFaith website, they are hosted on YouTube. There are various viewer settings people who post on YouTube can use. It is possible to make one's videos hidden so people searching the site can't see them. I, however, chose to make them public. When videos are public, it is also possible for people who view them to comment or dialog about the video. I allow them to be public in order to actually promote that kind of dialog.

When I posted this video, sure enough, an Atheist jumped in to attack my point of view. We then proceeded to carry on a short dialog.

As we began to dialog, another person jumped in, as well. The second one was quite vulgar, but I engaged him anyway as a means of sharing a witness. (Note: While I allowed some of the "potty-mouthed" comments to remain in the dialog, many of the vulgarities were strong enough that I felt compelled to alter them to cut down on the offense. As you read, it will be evident where that took place. Additionally, I did not make corrections in spelling or grammar. Also, there are a few places where I felt needed a little bit of explanation for context. Those places are marked off with brackets [ ].)

Following are the two dialogs. While they did intertwine somewhat, I have treated them separately for the purpose of making them easier to follow. Additionally, the second guest started several strings by himself, and I have also separated those in order to make following the discussion easier.

It is my hope and prayer that as you read these interactions, you will find them to be a useful resource for you as you deal with Atheists you know. It is my desire that it will help you as you attempt to deal with the various arguments they will try to throw your way.

---

**JH**

The Bible teaches we all came from Adam and Eve. But science teaches us that we are just an evolved ape species [homo sapiens] and provides overwhelming of evidence for it. So yes, Science and religion do work against each other. [and this is just one of many examples]

Atheism is not a belief, its a lack of belief.

We atheists don't have to prove there is only a natural universe as we don't make that positive claim. We atheists just recognise that the evidence that there is something else outside of the natural universe [the supernatural] is zero. So until anyone can provide any evidence of the 'supernatural' we don't believe there is a supernatural.

We don't know how mater came into existence and maybe never will [1:50] and that includes you sir. But just saying 'God did it' is a claim without evidence or the 'God of the gaps' argument that we get from theists all the time.

### Permission to Reprint

If you wish to reprint this article in your own print or electronic newsletter, please include the following text:

*Reprinted from **Worldview Made Practical**; a free e-zine produced by **MarketFaith Ministries** featuring practical teaching and life tools to help Christians become more effective in their faith life. Discover **MarketFaith Ministries** at [www.marketfaith.org](http://www.marketfaith.org).*

### Speaking Schedule

If you are interested in having Freddy Davis or Tal Davis present one of our **Worldview Seminars** or to share about worldview and its practical implications at your church or organization, please contact **MarketFaith Ministries** to schedule your event. All contact information is at the bottom of this e-zine.

### Worldview Resources

It is one of the primary purposes of **MarketFaith Ministries** to provide resources to help Christians understand the practical implications of worldview. You can find many free resources that will help you in your quest at <http://www.marketfaith.org>.

We can prove that life came from life. [2:07] We know that this planet was once unable to support life. Now we have life in abundance. So life did come from non life. But we don't yet know how abiogenesis happened although scientists are getting there. Of course you could go back to the God of the gaps argument again and just say 'God did it'?

I then got to the bit were you claim scientists can't show any evidence for evolution and realised I was dealing with another Ken Ham! :)

With respect for you sir, but not for your awful attempt at attacking us atheists.

JH.

PS your video will go down really well with your fellow believers so not all bad?

### Freddy Davis

Actually, science does not teach that we are an evolved ape species. Naturalistic philosophy teaches that, but naturalistic philosophy is not based on science - though it claims to be. That is the entire point of the video.

You can assert a negative statement about your atheistic beliefs if you like, but that does not negate the positive belief inherent in your Atheism. Atheism is an affirmative assertion that the natural universe is all that exists. Your assertion that Atheism not a belief is simply not true on its face.

You have actually done quite a nice job of affirming what I said in the video. 1) You have made the claim that the natural universe is all that exists without any scientific evidence at all. You have made your claim based on your "belief" that nothing exists that cannot be veri-

fied empirically (and, interestingly, you have actually stated that in your argument). 2) You have made the claim that since life exists (even though we "don't yet" know how it came into existence), that fact by itself proves naturalistic evolution is true (another claim based on faith, not on science). You cannot demonstrate using the scientific method that it is possible for less complex life forms to evolve to more complex forms. Any assertion to the contrary is based purely on a philosophical belief, not on science.

I find it quite interesting that you insist that I prove the existence of God based on YOUR naturalistic presuppositions (which my belief system doesn't require), yet you give yourself a pass when you can't prove the natural origin of the universe or the origin of life using your own presuppositions. Your argument is totally meaningless until you can prove your own point of view using your own beliefs (which can't be done).

So actually, my argument is not as awful as you have claimed, but yours does not even stand up to your own standards.

As for evidence for the Christian faith, there is so much more than what you have been willing to acknowledge. God does exist and there are various kinds of powerful evidence to support it. (You do realize, right, that not all evidence is empirical in nature?) The fact that you dismiss that evidence out of hand [and with no science to back up your assertion] says nothing about the actual validity of the evidence.

There is a way reality actually exists, and it doesn't exist any other way. If you want to assert a naturalistic worldview, then I insist that you prove it to be true using your own beliefs. Until you do, no objection you have to my beliefs is worth anything.

My deepest respect for you, as well. Please recognize that my video was not

## Subscription Information SUBSCRIPTION NOTICE:

A subscription to **Worldview Made Practical** is complementary for anyone interested in receiving it. If you received this email as a forward from a family member or a friend and wish to subscribe for yourself, you may do so at [www.marketfaith.org](http://www.marketfaith.org). If you wish to unsubscribe from this newsletter, simply follow the instructions found at the bottom of each edition.

## Contact Information

If you wish to contact us directly, you may do so by the following methods:

321 Anton Dr., Tallahassee, FL 32312

E-mail:

[info@marketfaith.org](mailto:info@marketfaith.org)

Phone: 850-383-9756 (Tallahassee, Florida)

Fax: 850-514-4571

You can order our products and examine our services at <http://www.marketfaith.org>.

This issue of **Worldview Made Practical** is a production of **MarketFaith Ministries**, © 2019. All rights reserved.

an attack on Atheists. Rather, it was a critique of the arguments Atheists use when trying to validate their point of view. My deepest desire would be for you to recognize the objective truth that God does exist, that he has revealed himself, and that you can know him in a personal relationship.

**JH**

@Freddy Davis

'You have made the claim that the natural universe is all that exists'  
Did I say that?

Sorry, I thought you could read.

I am done here.

**Freddy Davis**

@JH Nice attempted dodge, but your comments leave no other possibility. You have set up a scenario where the only evidence you will accept is empirical evidence, yet you propose a solution that is based purely on faith. Perhaps you don't understand the implications of your comments.

**JH**

@Freddy Davis

I did not 'set up a scenario'

I did not 'propose any solution'

I did clearly allow for other possibilities.

I made no faith based claims.

*'Atheism is an affirmative assertion that the natural universe is all that exists'*

No, atheism is just 'A' theism. A disbelief in a God or Gods. That's it!

Again, atheism makes no positive claims. If you are genuine here in your assertion that atheists make positive claims regarding God, the after life, there is no supernatural and so on then either you simply do not understand the definition of the word atheist as used today, or you are not being honest sir.

*'Actually, science does not teach that we are an evolved ape species'*

What are you talking about? Almost without exception the worlds scientists today claim evolution to be a proven fact and present the evidence for it. Biology, palaeontology, molecular biology, genetics, anthropology, and many more sciences all prove evolution.

Sir, just stick to preaching to the converted my friend. You are hopelessly out of your depth here when dealing with any intelligent atheist. [Not that I am particularly intelligent myself by the way]

PS sorry for the other rude atheist here. We atheists are not all as rude as him sir. [Note: This was a reference to the other Atheist that jumped into the conversation. You will see his discussion below.]

PPS you say *'Nice attempted dodge'* It seems that the other atheist is not the only one being rude? You are questioning my honesty here sir.

**Freddy Davis**

JH, perhaps you don't realize the implications of what you are advocating. You have directly accused me of ignorance, but I'm afraid the ignorance comes from your side. Let me quote you directly and share with you some of the implications of your arguments.

*"The Bible teaches we all came from Adam and Eve. But science teaches us that we are just an evolved ape species [homo sapiens] and provides overwhelming of evidence for it."*

Actually, science does not teach that we are an evolved ape species. There is no science that can prove that point. Your assertion that "the worlds scientists today claim evolution to be a proven fact" is not itself a scientific claim. If you would like to point me to the actual science that shows how less complex life forms can naturally evolve to more complex forms, I would be delighted to read it.

However, it doesn't exist. Naturalistic evolution is not a scientific fact, it is a speculation based on naturalistic presuppositions (which is why the Theory of Evolution is still referred to as a theory). If you want to prove me wrong, then prove Naturalism to be true. (You can do that by answering the four questions I posed in the video using empirical science.) Until you do that, your claim that science proves evolution is nothing more than a religious assertion, not a scientific one.

*"So yes, Science and religion do work against each other. [and this is just one of many examples]"*

You seem to not understand what science is. Science is not a belief system, it is a methodology. Science does not work in the realm of belief. The scientific method can be used to demonstrate how the natural world works, but can say nothing about anything beyond that. Your entire argument is making an assumption that science can account for everything. If that were not your premise, you would never have made that statement.

*"Atheism is not a belief, its a lack of belief."*

Your definition of Atheism is incorrect. The word comes from the Greek "A" (meaning no or not) and Theism (meaning God). It actually is a positive assertion that God does not exist. You seem to want to dwell on the negative implication of the definition (lack of belief), but you have ignored the positive side. The truth is, you do have a positive belief, even if you are not consciously aware of it. All of your arguments have begun with the presupposition that if something cannot be demonstrated using empirical science then it is not real or doesn't exist. You can't make that argument unless you believe that the natural universe, operating by natural laws, is all that exists. Your assertion that you have made no faith claims is simply false. Your entire argument is based on faith.

*"We atheists don't have to prove there is only a natural universe as we don't make that positive claim. We atheists just recognise that the evidence that there is something else outside of the natural universe [the supernatural] is zero. So until anyone can provide any evidence of the 'supernatural' we don't believe there is a supernatural."*

If you want to dodge making a positive claim, then you are disavowing your own arguments. Your assertion that empirical evidence is the only kind of argument you will accept requires a belief that natural laws are the only kind of evidence that exists. Yet you can't prove that using your own beliefs.

Hopefully you are starting to get the idea by now. Your claim that "I did not 'set up a scenario'," "I did not 'propose any solution'," "I did clearly allow for other possibilities," and "I made no faith based claims" is simply not true. You have done all of those things.

So no, I am not out of my depth. I do understand what I am talking about. It is you who does not understand the implications of what you are proposing.

Finally, when responding to your post, I had no idea who you were or anything about you. There was more than one possibility. You could have simply been a liar. I didn't make that assumption and answered you based on an assumption that you honestly believed what you wrote. Another possibility is that you could have been a troll – just out trying to get some jollies. I also didn't assume that and replied as if you really wanted a dialog. The other possibility is that you were sincere, but simply mistaken in your beliefs. That is actually what I have assumed and have replied explaining the problems with your atheistic assumptions. I do respect you as an individual and did not mean disrespect when I said "nice dodge." However, read your reply and you will see that it was an attempt to simply cut me off – which is itself disrespect.

What I hope is that as you read my responses, you will begin to grasp the implications of your arguments. You are making assumptions about the nature of reality that you don't even seem to recognize, and are not able to back up using the assumptions you are building your arguments upon. If you want to argue "as if" the natural universe is all that exists (requiring me to prove the existence of God using natural laws), then you must prove to me that your assumption is indeed true (I have directly told you how you can do that). Until you do, your attacks on my faith do not hold water.

### **Test Test**

@Freddy Davis Well this is a f\_\_ lie. Biology is science, evolution is perhaps the best supported theory of biology. So yes, evolution is science you f\_\_ liar. Not only that but evolution theory works in tandem with zoology, anthropology, genetics, geology, paleontology and all other relevant branches of the natural sciences you f\_\_ moron.

Your stupid ass would not last 1 day doing science so you retreat here to spread lies, so from now on shut the f\_\_ up unless I tell you to speak boy.

### **Freddy Davis**

@Test Test People who are not able to make a cogent argument tend to resort to insult. And you have not made an argument that makes any sense at all.

Theory of biology? What in the world is that? Please explain to me the "theory of biology."

So, if you really believe that there is actual science that demonstrates that less complex life forms have evolved based on naturalistic evolution to more complex forms, I am open to your explanation.

---

### **Test Test**

1) [Point 1 related to my comment that Naturalism requires that Naturalists must explain the origin of the material that makes up the natural universe using natural means.] NO we don't you stupid fat asshole. There is no requirement for anyone to do that. It's like saying you can't say forests exist unless you can show me proof that every tree grew from a seed in all of the existence of the world. Why the f\_\_ would anyone need to do that? Get your thinking straight you stupid fat ass. We don't need 100% certainty or 100% of all questions answered before we can do science you stupid f\_\_ moron.

### **Freddy Davis**

Still can't give any science, so you feel you have to put people down using vulgarities. It is a rather childish approach, but if you are that insecure, then feel free to continue.

I'm not really sure what you don't think you have to do. You have not connected that statement with an actual thought that I can respond to.

As far as proving every tree grew from a seed, do you think that there are trees that didn't? It seems that is what you are saying. I don't believe that, as science doesn't support that idea.

Actually, you don't need any certainty to do science. Science is a methodology that has as its goal to learn things that are not currently known about the natural universe. Your comment here doesn't really make much sense.

### **Test Test**

@Freddy Davis No you fat f\_\_ asshole that's not what I'm saying. I'm saying, you retard, that science does not require 100% certainty to work. Science can address questions about any subject in discrete chunks. We can observe the fossil record and see the development of complex life over billions of years. Scientists did that before they even knew the absolute age of the earth and the rocks the fossils were in, but the progression was obvious EVEN THEN YOU F\_\_ MORON.

So we don't need to show how life started to know that evolution is fact, we don't need to explain how consciousness arose to study and examine it.

For f\_\_ sake this is middle school science you are getting wrong you fat sh\_\_ head.

## **Freddy Davis**

@Test Test Do you realize how sad you sound with your profane rants. It is very unintelligent.

You really don't seem to understand the nature of science. Science doesn't "work." It is a methodology. It is the use of experiment and observation to attempt to come to an understanding of how the natural world works. The results of the experiments and observations are then evaluated to try and draw conclusions about the nature of the natural world. If an experiment, for instance, does not result in 100% certainty, all that means is that the scientist still can't draw a final conclusion.

But there is something else that must also be taken into account that you seem to either be unaware of or are intentionally ignoring. The results of experiment and observation generally don't speak for themselves - they must be evaluated through some kind of philosophical lens. Naturalistic evolutionary theory is the attempt to evaluate the fossil record and various other observations through a naturalistic lens (actual experiment to prove macro-evolution has not yielded any results). That is fine if Naturalism can be demonstrated to be true. But it can't (for reasons I shared in the video). And until you prove Naturalism to be true, your continued assertions about the viability of naturalistic evolution will continue to be false. The fossil record only demonstrates what you have said if Naturalism is true. There are other ways to interpret the fossil record using other philosophical presuppositions.

So yes, if you are going to assert the beliefs you have stated, you do have to show empirically how life started and how consciousness came into existence. Show me some science or you have nothing.

## **Test Test**

No you f\_\_ moron, we don't need to prove that the natural world is all that exists. If you think there is more to the natural world, then YOU HAVE TO DEMONSTRATE YOU STUPID PIECE OF SH\_\_. It's called the burden of proof you fat f\_\_.

If someone says science isn't correct because magical pixies explain the world, then THEY ARE REQUIRED TO SHOW ME EVIDENCE OF MAGICAL PIXIES, it's not my f\_\_ job to somehow prove magical pixies don't exist.

How f\_\_ stupid are you fat boy?

## **Freddy Davis**

So, you still don't understand the point of the video, yet I'm the moron ... yeah, right.

Actually, if you are going to argue that science is able to account for all of existence, you do have to demonstrate that the natural world is all that exists. If there is a part of reality that exists outside of the natural universe, then it is not subject to natural laws. Every bit of your argumentation is based on a philosophical assumption that everything can somehow be accounted for by scientific discovery. That is a positive assertion that must be demonstrated using your own naturalistic beliefs or your argumentation has no basis in reality.

I have never said that science is not correct. I absolutely believe in the scientific method. You seem to have some misunderstanding about what I believe, and especially about the nature of science. Science can only deal with topics that relate to the natural universe. You are insisting that science account for things that are not demonstrable using science. You are asserting a naturalistic worldview, yet you are doing it based on beliefs that do not correspond with what you are asserting. Either show me the science to prove what you are saying is true, or quit telling me I am wrong. You simply can't have it both ways.

I am truly sorry that you have such a hatred for God. He does exist as an objectively real person who has revealed himself and can be known in a personal relationship. He can also help you overcome the powerful anger that you seem to harbor in your heart. Hope you are able to get past some of that.

### **Test Test**

@Freddy Davis No you don't you f\_\_ moron, you can't prove a negative. Let's try this you fat lying asshole bitch. I say I have a magical invisible dragon in my basement that can't be seen, felt, radiates no heat and doesn't interact with our reality unless it wants to.

Prove to me that my dragon doesn't exist using empirical evidence. OH WAIT YOU CAN'T because I made the challenge impossible to do so.

How f\_\_ stupid are you really?

### **Freddy Davis**

@Test Test I have not asked you to prove a negative. I have asked you to prove a positive - one that is necessary for you to prove, using empirical science, if you want your point of view to be taken seriously. Your example simply does not illustrate what I said.

---

### **Test Test**

2) [Point 2 is related to my comment that the emergence of life from non-life is a matter of faith, not science.] No we don't. Even if magic space aliens started life billions of years ago as proto-cells that would not invalidate evolution in the slightest. Evolution is the study of life changing over time, not abiogenesis. We can't go back in time you stupid f\_\_ head, so we very well may never have a perfect understanding of how life first began... doesn't mean sh\_\_ for evolution, or the theory of gravity or biology in general you stupid f\_\_ retard.

### **Freddy Davis**

I do hope that one day you can learn to talk without using vulgarities. It is really quite the put-off for most people.

Evolution in a general sense, does involve the study of how life forms change over time, but you seem to be proposing a situation where changes are not only able to occur within kinds, but that less complex life forms are able to evolve, based on natural laws, to more complex life forms. The former is quite within the purview of science, but when you propose the latter, you have moved out of science and into philosophy and speculation. If you are going to insist on asserting that, then I insist on you showing me the science. Until you do, your point is meaningless.

As for your point about abiogenesis, again, you are making an assumption that the video was about evolution. It is not. It is about the nature of science in general. By your arguments, you are asserting an understanding of reality based on a naturalistic worldview. If you are going to do that, then you MUST prove your points based on empirical data. If you don't, then all you are doing is proposing an alternative religious point of view. My point about abiogenesis in the video is that a naturalistic worldview requires that, based on the natural laws of the universe, there be a way for life to emerge out of non-life. If you are going to argue based on naturalistic worldview presuppositions, then you are going to have to prove that is even possible - which means that you have to prove abiogenesis. I'll wait.

### **Test Test**

@Freddy Davis Kinds is not a scientific term you fat f\_\_ piece of human sh\_\_. That's how I know you are a liar and a f\_\_ moron. Since you are too stupid or fat to get up and go to an actual university, let me explain it to you child.

"Evolution is a process that results in changes in the genetic material of a population over time." That's f\_\_ it. That is the scientific definition. From Nature baby, leading biology publication where peer review happens. Now shut the f\_\_ up about things you don't know about you lying sad fat asshole.

### **Freddy Davis**

@Test Test Your lack of knowledge is continuing to show through your profane utterances, as well as your continued inability to show me the science.

No, "kinds" is not a scientific term, but I was hoping that you would get my point. There is no precise term that is used to differentiate the magnitude of difference between macro and micro evolution, so we just have to do the best we can. (There is actually no precise definition for what constitutes a species, either.) I keep waiting for you to give me some actual science to demonstrate your point, but all you do is insult. It's not a shameful thing if you are not able to do it, but if you are going to attack me, it is incumbent on you to back up your attack. So far your argument is rather meaningless.

I understand the definition of evolution, but there is a difference between macro-evolution and micro-evolution. You don't seem willing to make that distinction, and if you insist there is no distinction, I insist that you prove, using empirical science, that macro-evolution is possible. Until you do your insults are rather shallow.

---

### **Test Test**

3) [Point 3 is related to my comment that the Theory of Evolution is not demonstrated by empirical science.] We've done that you f\_\_ moron. Have you ever gotten off your fat ass and actually tried to look at the research? Such as the evolution of horses, mammals or any specific species? If you had you'd see we have an amazingly detailed understanding of how life forms evolved into the forms we see today. Especially given that we have a multi billion year old planet and only rarely in that time does any specific animal turn into a fossil. You fat moron.

### **Freddy Davis**

It appears to me that you have a really difficult time being respectful to people you disagree with. Can't make an intelligent argument, so you try to insult and browbeat people into submission. A very sad way to live.

You keep making assertions about what is known about naturalistic evolution, but have not shown even one piece of actual research to prove it is even possible. It is not true simply because you believe it or because you say it is. Do you even know the difference between micro-evolution and macro-evolution?

### **Test Test**

@Freddy Davis Listen you fat asshole, have you ever bothered to research the evolution of any animal or plant? Followed back the changes over time? If you say no, then shut your fat f\_\_ lying mouth you sh\_\_ head because you are a liar and asshole. I am not here to teach you biology you lazy stupid f\_\_. how about you go to a university library and actual STUDY YOU FAT MORON

### **Freddy Davis**

@Test Test You do realize, don't you, that people who have to resort to profanity are demonstrating that they aren't able to carry on an intelligent conversation? I find it interesting that you accuse me of not bothering to research, yet you have not pointed me to any research at all that you know about. You are only making assertions. Show me the science if you want to have any credibility.

---

### **Test Test**

4) [Point 4 relates my comment that science is unable to account for the origin of conscious life.] Why the f\_\_ would evolution have to show anything about consciousness? You have zero f\_\_ clue what you are talking about you fat stupid piece of sh\_\_. This is completely irrelevant to evolution theory. It's a great question and we know a great deal about the brain, how we think, how damage to the brain affects our thinking, etc. How about you get off your fat f\_\_ ass and show the existence of the soul using science? oh wait, you won't and you will run away like the stupid fat bitch you are boy.

### **Freddy Davis**

My, my, my. Still haven't learned how to make an argument, so you continue to throw out vulgarities. It really doesn't help your case and only makes you look bad.



Perhaps you should re-watch the video. It wasn't even about evolutionary theory - it was about the nature of science. Science is not a philosophy, it is a methodology. You are trying to use a methodology to prove a philosophy - something that science cannot even deal with.

But okay, since you want to go there, show me the actual science that demonstrates that non-conscious matter was able to evolve into conscious life based on naturalistic evolution - or even that conscious animal life was able to evolve to a self-conscious animal. Knowing a lot about the brain says NOTHING about the origin of consciousness. Your comment is not even about the video.

### **Test Test**

@Freddy Davis "non-conscious matter was able to evolve into conscious life based on naturalistic evolution" why the f\_\_ do I have to do your research for you? As I said you fat moron, abiogenesis is separate from evolution. We don't need to know how life started to know it evolved. Is that simple enough for you fat piece of lying sh\_\_? Do you understand this?

### **Freddy Davis**

@Test Test Your shortcomings are evident for everyone to see on two fronts - your inability to speak civilly, and your refusal to actually make an intelligent argument.

You are correct that abiogenesis is not the same as evolution. But I never claimed it was. For some reason you made a leap into an arena that my video didn't even address. The video was about science, not evolution.

But, since you seem bound and determined to go down this path, I will indulge you. Naturalistic evolution is based on philosophical naturalism. It is a philosophical category, not a scientific one. While abiogenesis is not the same as naturalistic evolution, if you are going to argue that naturalistic evolution is true, then you necessarily must believe in abiogenesis. Based on a naturalistic worldview, you can't separate the two.

So, once again, if you are going to insist that naturalistic evolution is true, then I insist that you prove Naturalism is true using naturalistic presuppositions. Until you do, you are the one showing ignorance, not me.

Also, I am not asking you to do any research for me. I know the research. You are the one who is making statements that go beyond any actual empirical research that has ever been done. Show me the science and you win the argument. But until you do, you have said nothing.

---

### **Test Test**

@Freddy Davis The explanation [for explaining evolution] is a change in allele frequency in a population, random mutations and selective forces in the environment. THIS IS FIRST GRADE BIOLOGY YOU STUPID SH\_\_ EATER. For f\_\_ sake, if you don't have the knowledge of biology a 7 year old has maybe you should shut the f\_\_ up and go to school you fat moron.

### **Freddy Davis**

@Test Test You still don't seem to be able to carry on a civil conversation, but I will continue to ignore your childish behavior for the sake of trying to further your education.

I am very well aware of the nature of the argument that some, though not all, evolutionary biologists put forth concerning mutations. The only problem is, there is no actual science that has ever demonstrated it to be true. There have been numerous experiments done to try to generate an evolutionary change that would lead to the evolution of a new kind, but every attempt ever made has led to nothing. I even had a conversation one time with a scientist who was experimenting with amoeba. He was attempting to generate a macro-evolutionary change and had hit a wall. He was asking input from other scientists as to how he might take the next step. No one had any idea.

You are promoting a theory that has no actual science to back it up. You can continue protesting if you like, but until you can actually demonstrate, using an empirical study, that macro-evolutionary change is possible, it is you who are the one who is demonstrating ignorance, not me.

## Conclusion

At this point, both individuals quit engaging me. Generally, this is what happens when people begin to realize that they are not able to account for the weaknesses that exist within their own point of view. The reason they are not able to do that is that Naturalism is not true – it does not represent the actual structure of reality.

Whether or not you ever engage an Atheist on this topic, it is important that you understand that what they are proposing is not true, and can't be backed up. Almost without exception they will try to attack your beliefs based on the assumption that their beliefs are true, and will try to force you to justify your faith based on their worldview beliefs. The counter to that is to show them that their worldview beliefs do not, themselves, stand up to scrutiny. In fact, they can't even justify their own beliefs based on their own beliefs.

It is my hope and prayer that this dialog has provided for you a new level of confidence in your own faith, and that you will be able to use your knowledge and confidence as a means of sharing your faith in Christ with those who do not know him.

© 2019 Freddy Davis

### Would You Consider Supporting Us?

Would you consider financial support for **MarketFaith Ministries**? I feel confident that what we are doing is consistent with your beliefs about spreading the gospel and equipping the saints for ministry. Would you let us be one element of your hands and feet in this process? **MarketFaith Ministries** is a 501 (c) (3) not for profit corporation, so your contributions are tax deductible. If you would consider this we would be very grateful. Also, if you would like to know more about the ministry, it would be my pleasure to share with you personally what we are working on and how you can plug in. I can be reached at 850-383-9756 or by e-mail at [Freddy@marketfaith.org](mailto:Freddy@marketfaith.org). As for any donations, they may be sent directly to **MarketFaith Ministries** at 321 Anton Dr., Tallahassee, FL 32312, or you can contribute through our secure website at [www.marketfaith.org](http://www.marketfaith.org). Simply click on the "Donate" button at the bottom of the homepage. We are deeply grateful for your support of this ministry.

And, as always, if you have any thoughts, opinions or suggestions about how **MarketFaith Ministries** can help you, please feel free, at any time, to call (850-383-9756) or e-mail ([info@marketfaith.org](mailto:info@marketfaith.org)). We are here to serve you.