



WORLDVIEW MADE PRACTICAL
Volume 21 Number 13
April 1, 2026

Discussion on “Why Most Scientists Reject Creation”

By Freddy Davis

I generally produce a worldview video every month and post it to YouTube and Rumble. The main archive site for the videos is the MarketFaith Ministries website (www.marketfaith.org). However, it is from YouTube that I will often get a lot of feedback. In truth, most of the time I don't get much response from them at all. But sometimes one catches on fire – mostly from self-identified Atheists. Recently, one particular one caught fire. This video was called “Why Most Scientists Reject Creation.” You can view it at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N_e_s_K_b_r_i_71E&l-c=Ugzwy8FE0t1PiaeGMCx4AaABAg.ATw791og6d-dAU6XDjkMXV_

There were actually several different strings of conversations that emerged. Most didn't really amount to much, but there were three that I thought were worth sharing here. These are worth reading if you are interested in how to effectively interact with nay-sayers in a way that also allows you to share your faith.

[Note: There are a lot of grammar mistakes and misspellings in these dialogs. I have left them just as they were written.]

Conversation #1

petergolia386

What a load of crap! There is no evidence that we poofed into existence, or a golem spell was responsible.

Freddy Davis

Nobody said anything about being poofed into existence. I'm not sure you even understand what you are arguing against. If you want to give a positive argument for a different point of view, then out with it. Simply trying to shout down a different point of view is not a rational argument.

petergolia386

@Freddy Davis - There is no scientific evidence for creation. Just because a book said man was made from a golem spell and life from breath was put into him does not mean its true. The earth is 4.5 billion years old, proven. Many creatures existed way before man evolved into todays man. Instead of disproving evolution, try proven creation or just God.

Freddy Davis

@petergolia386 - There is also no scientific evidence for naturalistic evolution. Just because it is written in science books that life can emerge from non-life and naturally evolve into increasingly complex life forms does not mean it is true. To be called science, it has to be demonstrated using the scientific method – which it never has been. You are basing all of your conclusions on the reasoning of naturalistic philosophy, not on science. Prove, using the scientific method, that naturalistic philosophy is true, then you win the argument. Until you do that, you are doing nothing but telling me your religious beliefs.

As far as proving God, what kind of proof do you require? There is all kinds of evidence of that, though if you are insisting that I prove it using your naturalistic philosophy, that is impossible. Evidence for God lies in a different place. Like I said, prove naturalistic philosophy and you win the argument. Until you do, your unsupported beliefs are nothing but that.

[Note: At this point, @petergolia386 dropped out of the discussion.]

Conversation #2

@Theoverthinker81

Creation in what god, there's thousands of them. If your talking about the Christian god yahweh who started off

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.*

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>.

Jewish then changed his mind because of his son who had infinitely less wisdom? The all knowing god knew this would happen anyway. Same as he knew the flood wouldn't work but still killed innocent animals, pregnant women and people like the Neanderthals that were not mentioned in the bible. yahweh who killed his dad El and most of his family, the all powerful, all knowing ever lasting god who created space, time a universe but was overly worried about a patch of dessert on one tiny little planet.

Freddy Davis

I'm sorry, but that is one of the strangest explanations I have ever heard. It certainly does not represent the Christian faith. I think you need to go back and do some study. Where did you get your theological education?

@Theoverthinker81

@Freddy Davis - mixture of the church of England (Dad), Catholic (Mom), and the Greek scholar Francesca Stavrakopoulou (Me).

Freddy Davis

@Theoverthinker81 - In other words, you just basically made it up. Not a very scholarly evaluation.

@Theoverthinker81

@Freddy Davis - no, Francesca Stavrakopoulou is a bible scholar and has extensive knowledge of the bible and it's history. As the old testament is the Jewish 'Tanakh', it's fair to study Tanakh history then new testament history. So many things have changed since the bibles conception, hence god having a family. But no I didn't make it up, I was referencing the Jewish parts of the bible.

Freddy Davis

@Theoverthinker81 - Seriously? Francesca Stavrakopoulou's view of the Bible is based on the historical-critical method grounded in methodological naturalism – which treats the Bible as a human product shaped by historical, political, and religious development, rather than as divine revelation. She considers the Bible to be an evolving religious tradition and bases her interpretations on social science principles rather than le-

gitimate hermeneutics. She sees it as ideological literature written to promote particular political or religious agendas. She is one in a long line of people who begin their interpretation using naturalistic assumptions. In other words, she tries to interpret a theistic document using naturalistic assumptions. That is not serious (or legitimate) scholarship. She is not an honest broker, but is an ideologue who is trying to promote an anti-God agenda.

@Theoverthinker81

@Freddy Davis - I see your points, that's why I said I didn't exclusively take her word. She has a point as well in that men have and still do change the bible to suit their needs. I've also studied with the JW and their new world translation has lots of little differences which make a big change. I was told differently by different churches, I'm in search of the facts but unfortunately I don't think that's possible. We ultimately all have to accept our own translation of the bible when it gets to the finer points.

Freddy Davis

@Theoverthinker81 - That is not true. People do not change the Bible. What is true is that some people mistranslate the Bible to suit their own purposes. That is exactly what the New World Translation has done. They don't start with the biblical text, but with their own false theology, then translate in ways designed to support their theology. That is totally illegitimate. We don't just have to "accept our own translation." There is an entire field of study called textual criticism that studies the physical manuscripts that exist from the earliest times to determine the most accurate original wording and track changes or errors that occurred during centuries of copying. There are thousands of them. And based on this study, we can be confident in the accuracy of the original text. Translations are another thing all together. There are very good ones and very bad ones. The NWT is a really really bad one.

@Theoverthinker81

@Freddy Davis - we disagree on things but you have been very respectful, polite and informative.

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. 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

Phone: 850-383-9756

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**, © 2026. All rights reserved.

Freddy Davis

@Theoverthinker81 - Thank you for the kind compliment. God is an objectively real person who has revealed Himself to humanity in a way that allows us to know Him in an objectively real personal relationship – by God's grace through faith in Jesus Christ. It is my prayer that your seeking Him will not cease, and that you will come to know Him. Your eternity ultimately depends on your decision concerning Christ.

[Note: At this point, @Theoverthinker81 dropped out of the discussion.]

Conversation #3

@gabeking1005

@Freddy Davis lets go argument by argument if you like - first claim that scientists (97-99% according to Pew) deny special creation because, 'its all they've ever been taught in there studies' - this is wrong on multiple fronts, firstly religious claims are not scientific ones, in fact a significant portion of religious claims are untestable. Secondly, a significant number of scientists are indeed Christians (and other faiths), it is not mutually exclusive to be religious and a scientist (eg. Francis Collins). Thirdly, 'special creation' is an untestable claim with no explanatory value - put simply this is not taught in science. Fourth, your understanding of the scientific method appears to be flawed of you think evolution is a homogeneous mechanism that is explicitly unquestioned in science.

In short, I'm 16 seconds in and your video has major flaws that could easily be addressed if you bothered to explore the other side.

Freddy Davis

@gabeking1005 - Okay, argument by argument.

1. I don't understand why you object to the first one. I was simply reporting the Pew survey. If you have evidence that this is incorrect, then I would be interested in seeing it. Your arguments on this do not even relate to what I wrote.

2. I never said there aren't Christian scientists, and I don't disagree with you at all that science and the Christian faith are mutually exclusive. In fact, Christians wholeheartedly support the use of the scientific method for learning things about the natural universe. You seem to have totally misunderstood what I said on that front.

3. Of course special creation is an untestable claim. My point is, so is naturalistic philosophy. In spite of that, most scientists (according to the Pew study) use naturalistic philosophy as their worldview foundation when studying science. In most schools, naturalistic philosophy is also not taught overtly, but the courses are taught "as if" naturalistic philosophy is true (and special creation is not). Both points of view are faith (religious) assumptions. This says nothing about the truth of either one. Truth concerning this topic has to rely on evidence that science is unable to even address.

4. I do recognize that there are scientists that question evolutionary theory, but they are a very small minority. If you read the articles that deal with the topic in most science journals, you will find evolutionary theory almost universally assumed. In fact, most will not even accept an article that assumes anything different.

I'm still not sure what case you are trying to make. If you have any direct empirical evidence to contradict what I have said, then out with it.

@gabeking1005

@Freddy Davis - perhaps you are not equipped to have this discussion as you either cannot or chose not to engage with the substance of what you have said and implied. In short as we both agree, Science cannot test or explain supernatural claims... nor does it claim to. Scientists are not 'taught' this concept it is a nature of the tool they use. Science therefore can only undermine the claims posed by religions eg. Donkeys can talk (they can't), or a global flood occurred (it didn't), or a deity created everything the way it is (didn't happen).

If you are trying to teach apologetics to others through books and a course you need to understand at least the basics if you're 16 seconds in and already making inaccurate claims, I have concerns.

Freddy Davis

@gabeking1005 - Do you understand that you are trying to dispute what I am saying using the beliefs of naturalistic philosophy? You are trying to assert the falsity of my beliefs using worldview beliefs that do not correspond with mine. If naturalistic philosophy is true, then what you are saying is also true. But if Biblical Theism is true, then miracles are certainly in the picture. Your comments about my understanding of apologetics are only valid if you can prove, using empirical science, that naturalistic philosophy is true. So, rather than continuing to disparage me, give me your proof. Until you do, nothing you are saying has anything to support it.

As far as science, it is a methodology and not a belief. It is only valid as a tool for use in studying the natural universe. Christians believe that concept as much as any atheistic scientist. That is not at issue. It is the worldview assumptions that define what a person considers real vs. fantasy that is being disputed between us. If you want me to take you seriously, then you are going to have to support your assumptions – which to this point you have not even addressed. I have not made ANY inaccurate claims, and I am beginning to have concerns that you don't understand the very arguments you are making.

@gabeking1005

@Freddy Davis - scientists reject special creation because it is what most of them have been taught in their studies – that is not true... I have expressed why that is not true.

If you are suggesting that my assumptions (and yes they are assumptions) that I live in a real world, that has identifiable patterns is wrong... I'm all ears... please correct me. I cannot overcome hard solipsism, but I'm guessing neither can you.

@gabeking1005

@Freddy Davis - Atheism is the absence of belief in any gods or deities, ranging from a passive lack of belief (implicit) to an explicit rejection or denial of their existence (explicit). Rooted in the Greek atheos ("without god"), it is not a religion or a single belief system, but a position on a specific question. It is distinct from agnosticism, which questions whether knowledge of a god's existence is possible.

@gabeking1005

I really wish that people would engage with the arguments made by the 'other side' before posting poor apologetics online. These arguments are poor, either due to misunderstanding or the creation of a strawman.... Do better, instead of trying to flog some wares (books & courses), try actually engaging with the arguments that scientists and atheists actually make.

@Freddy Davis

It would be helpful to know who you are directing your comment to.

@gabeking1005

@Freddy Davis - you Freddy... hence the comment on YOUR video. Ultimately your argument could be explained by the following combinations: Incredulity with a dose of special pleading, throw in a strawman or two and a healthy dose of poisoning the well.

Freddy Davis

@gabeking1005 - Your insult is not an argument. It is nothing more than an attempt to put down another person without having to make an argument. Really bad form.

The idea of your definition of "an absence of belief in God" is a meaningless statement. No one cares what you "don't" believe. There is no such thing as a "passive" lack of belief. You don't believe one thing because you "do" believe something else. What you have not stated is what you do believe. Until you do, your assertions about belief have no meaning is meaningless. Since you have not overtly stated that, I have had to make an educated guess and reply based on that. Based on what you have said, my guess is that you believe in naturalistic philosophy (which is atheistic) -- which is a religious belief.

@gabeking1005

@Freddy Davis - it is not MY definition, it is literally the first definition that came up on search... the fact that many people are calling you out on your bad fair definition should be telling. Instead of telling others what they believe,

perhaps start asking... for example I 'believe' a host of things and would regard myself as a secular humanist in moral outlook but in terms of my god belief and knowledge I am an Agnostic atheist.

Freddy Davis

@gabeking1005 - Like I said, that definition is totally meaningless when it comes to discussing what people "do" believe.

Agnostic Atheist? That is a distinction without a difference. Whether you affirmatively assert there is no God or simply live life "as if" there is no God, you have totally kicked God out of the picture of your life. In that case, your authority source is your own opinion. So why should that be considered valid?

As for Secular Humanism, it is also a belief based on naturalistic philosophy, which is a religious belief. It has no objective basis at all. All of the beliefs associated with Secular Humanism are made up out of thin air.

And, BTW, I am not telling other people what they believe. I am taking what they tell me and talking about the implications of what they say. And how do you know that what I am saying is in "bad faith," You don't know me, and that seems to be making a judgment about me based on bad faith itself. Something is not bad faith simply because you don't like it. So far, you have not really made a positive case about anything. All you have done is complain about what I have said without giving any evidence that your point of view has any validity at all.

@gabeking1005

@Freddy Davis - so 'Gish galloping' already ... an agnostic atheist tells you my belief and knowledge of a deity - i can express it as confidence if you'd prefer. Why is this valid, because we cannot get around solipsism and I know myself. If you're wanting to go down the moral objectivity route, I'd think again as you may not have actually engaged deeply on this topic... I am happy to address your comments but a scattergun approach will be annoying for both of us. Perhaps you should demonstrate YOUR moral objectivity before you question the morality of others.

Freddy Davis

@gabeking1005 - I have not questioned your morality. All I have said is that you have no objective bases for making moral statements. The objective foundation for Christian morality is what an objectively real God has revealed in the Bible. What you have told me by saying you are an agnostic atheist is that you don't believe in God. And your Secular Humanist beliefs are simply list a set of religious beliefs that have no objective foundation. If you have confidence in that, then your confidence has nothing to support it but your own personal opinion. The fact that you don't believe in God does not demonstrate that what you believe is true, nor that what I believe is not true.

As for demonstrating the objective basis for my moral beliefs, what kind of evidence would you accept?

@gabeking1005

@Freddy Davis - well to demonstrate you have 'objective morality' that is based on something you have to demonstrate what that is... what is your best argument? I would argue that even IF your God existed, that still is not providing 'objective morals' but rather dictats

Freddy Davis

@gabeking1005 - If He doesn't exist, then nothing I am saying has any meaning at all. But He does and can be known in a personal relationship. My argument is that human beings are persons made in the image of God – which is spiritual (transcends natural reality). That is, there is an objectively real aspect of the human person that has the capacity to interact with God who lies outside of the natural universe. Just because it is not tied to the natural universe does not mean it is not objectively real. Since He is objectively real and can connect and communicate with human beings, sharing objective moral beliefs is absolutely possible.

So now you need to justify your belief in naturalistic philosophy. How do you know that reflects reality?

@gabeking1005

@Freddy Davis cool story... demonstrate it...

Freddy Davis

@gabeking1005 - What kind of demonstration do you need?

But also, you need to justify your belief in naturalistic philosophy. How do you know that reflects reality? Don't try to slither out of this.

@gabeking1005

@Freddy Davis I've already suggested that we BOTH accept naturalism.... unless you have overcome hard solipsism.

As for your evidence.... I have no idea what you claim or know, that would be arrogant and presumptuous to do... therefore, provide your best argument for your claims. So far you have made lots of claims, that have no supporting (or more specifically testable) evidence, I would therefore suggest start there.

Freddy Davis

@gabeking1005 - Seriously? Why would I accept Atheism? There is no evidence whatsoever to support that it reflects actual reality. You have not even attempted a serious explanation. It appears to me that you are the one who needs to overcome solipsism.

You are asking me to demonstrate my beliefs, yet you are not willing to accept the explanation I have already given. You have rejected it out of hand. So, it is not unreasonable for me to ask what kind of demonstration would satisfy you. You don't need to know what I claim to know in order to answer what you would accept. There is all kinds of evidence that I could give you that is testable, but you don't seem willing to test it. God is an objectively real person who can be known in a personal relationship. If you will open your life to him by faith in Jesus Christ, you can know Him, too. Certainly you are not suggesting that I base my theistic proofs on your naturalistic presuppositions. Since that is impossible, you will have to do your test yourself in the realm of Christian Theism. So, are you willing? Are you ready to put your faith in Christ?

@gabeking1005

@Freddy Davis - does God interact with our physical world? If yes, provide a testable claim that has been demonstrated - that is evidence.

Freddy Davis

@gabeking1005 - I just did and you have ignored it. You have also dodged giving empirical evidence for the validity of your naturalistic philosophy, and until you do that, even your questioning of my beliefs is meaningless. Man up and quit trolling.

@gabeking1005

@Freddy Davis - well we are talking past each other then... as I missed your evidence and I explained my position on 'naturalistic philosophy' – I assume that we live in the real world, where natural laws are consistent (generally). I acknowledge that this is an assumption, but as yet no one can overcome solipsism. If you reject this argument, I'd love to hear why.

Freddy Davis

@gabeking1005 - Well, you are not talking past me because I know exactly where you are coming from. It is not just that you assume that we live in the real world, where natural laws are consistent, but that you assume the natural world is all that exists. I obviously am talking past you, though, because you don't seem to grasp the concept that there could be a transcendent reality that includes God. If what you believe is true, then certainly requesting some kind of empirical proof would be appropriate. But since the transcendent reality I am asserting is not subject to the laws of nature, it is not appropriate. A different kind of evidence is required. I shared that with you above, but since you didn't seem to get it, I will say it again by copying it here.

["God is an objectively real person who can be known in a personal relationship. If you will open your life to him by faith in Jesus Christ, you can know Him, too."]

While this is objective proof, you can only access it by reaching beyond empiricism to meet the objectively real God based on a personal introduction as your spirit opens up to His Spirit. It is objective in that it is real (that is, God actually exists). Your unwillingness to explore that possibility says nothing about whether or not it actually is real. Your rejection of it is rejection out of hand, not because evidence does not exist.

As it relates to naturalistic philosophy, it requires that everything be capable of proof based on some kind of empirical evidence. The only problem is, there is no way to get at the truth of naturalistic philosophy based on empiricism. It is a position of faith – blind faith. So, you are essentially requiring me to give you empirical proof of the existence of God based on your belief in naturalistic philosophy while not holding yourself to the same standard regarding your faith. So, I reject your argument because it cannot even meet its own standard. To hold the beliefs you hold, you have to believe it purely by faith (which is unacceptable under Naturalism).

@gabeking1005

@Freddy Davis - now you are being arrogant and presumptuous - I do not accept that, 'the natural world is all that exists', I just need demonstration and evidence to accept a proposition that says otherwise.

You have said 'I am unwilling to explore the possibilities of god' which is again said with such arrogance that I am genuinely shocked, as you know nothing about my background, journey, life history or though process.

So to put it bluntly (hence asking questions - you should try that), you accept that we have a shared reality? If we both accept that reality is real the its irrelevant whether this can be empirically demonstrated or not (the hard solipsism issue). We both accept and share this, hence we can move forward from there.... so if yes, you accept reality exists (etc), then we can move on to things we disagree with and you can provide your evidence.

Freddy Davis

@gabeking1005 - Did you even read what I just wrote? I have asked you before what kind of "demonstration and evidence" you require, and your reply ONLY allows for a naturalistic response. I give you an objective proof, but you, again, have dismissed it out of hand – in fact, not even acknowledging the fact that I gave you a proof you can actually try. I am not being arrogant. I am reflecting exactly what you yourself have said. Whether or not reality can be verified empirically is totally NOT irrelevant. In fact, it gets to the very core of our disagreement. If you don't understand that, you literally don't understand the difference between your naturalistic philosophy and my Biblical Theism.

I do accept that reality is real and that we have a shared reality. But your understanding of that reality only allows for one part of the reality that I accept. I fully accept that we live in a material world that operates by natural laws – but that is not all there is. I am more than accepting of the use of the scientific method to discover things related to the natural world – so I accept the reality you accept in that regard. But the fullness of reality transcends that. How, then, can you say that I don't believe reality exists? You are the one who is denying that a part of reality exists.

@gabeking1005

@Freddy Davis - where to start.... you accuse me of not reading your response, yet ironically you do the same.

If you accept we share the same reality, then any interactions with that reality that your God has, should be testable - please provide that evidence....

Freddy Davis

@gabeking1005 - Did you read the part of my response that said, *"I do accept that reality is real and that we have a shared reality. But your understanding of that reality only allows for one part of the reality that I accept. I fully accept that we live in a material world that operates by natural laws - but that is not all there is. I am more than accepting of the use of the scientific method to discover things related to the natural world - so I accept the reality you accept in that regard. But the fullness of reality transcends that."*

In other words, the shared reality that we have is only partial – not total. You seem to have not read that part.

The ability to know God is testable, yet so far you have refused the test. I can't do that for you.

You have also ignored my challenge to your understanding of reality. You only accept the existence of the material universe. Prove that the natural universe, operating by natural laws, is all that exists. Even though I have stepped up to your challenge, your challenge to me is totally meaningless until you demonstrate that your understanding is true using your own requirements. By continuing to ask me to do something I have already done twice, and refusing to justify your own challenge, you are acting like a troll, not someone to be taken seriously.

@gabeking1005

@Freddy Davis - again, I currently only accept the existence of the 'material universe' as you put it because thats all that can be demonstrated - if you have a way to demonstrate beyond this... I'm genuinely all ears.

I have said time and again that this is a necessary assumption (you have agreed). Reality exists and we can test it... what IS this test of your deity?

Freddy Davis

@gabeking1005 - No, that is not all that can be demonstrated. That is true only if God does not exist and has not revealed Himself. But He does and He has. The fact that you are not willing to personally check that out does not change

reality. Your limitation is that you are only willing to accept what can be empirically demonstrated – at least that is what you claim. But you can't empirically demonstrate your own beliefs. Demonstrate using empirical science that:

1. The natural universe came into existence by natural means.
2. Life emerged from non-life by natural means.
3. All the life forms that now exist came into being by naturalistic evolution (actually show me the science that is it possible)
4. Consciousness can emerge from non-consciousness.

You can't prove any of these because there is no science to back that up. You believe it by faith in naturalistic philosophy. It is your religious belief. You can't even live up to your own requirements to demonstrate the truth of your beliefs. When you can prove your faith to be true by naturalistic explanations, you will have a leg to stand on to dismiss my beliefs. But until you do, you have nothing.

[Note: At this point, @gabeking1005 dropped out of the discussion.]

Conclusion

The beliefs expressed by these commenters is VERY common. That is what is taught in most schools, and represents the worldview that dominates modern American society. Knowing how to deal with people who hold these beliefs is one of the first steps that is necessary for Christians to take in order to share Christ with them. It is truly worth the effort to get up to speed on this.

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. 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. 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). We are here to serve you.