

“How Does the Continental Divide Relate to Creationism?”

My 10-year-old son is studying the great continental divide in school—how does that relate to creationism? His teacher said it doesn't affect your view of creation, even though she is claiming it happened millions of years ago.

The fact that the great continental divide exists and how it got there are two very different issues. Honestly, for a 10-year old, he can probably learn all he needs to know about the divide without needing to debate how or when it arose. If the geological development is part of the lesson, your son can always regard the timeframe a separate issue, or simply resolve to understand how most geologists explain it without committing himself to accepting their entire explanation. I would recommend he learn what is required of him and simply resolve to keep his mind open to the timeframe issue. Creationist flood-model geologists would explain the rising of the Rockies (hence the continental divide) by the same mechanisms as evolutionary geologists, just over a much shorter time frame.

Hope this helps.

Respectfully,

Ray Bohlin
Probe Ministries

“How Do I Approach a Carl Sagan Fan?”

Dear Dr. Bohlin,

I'm a pastor that is meeting with a young man who is planning to marry a young lady that is a member of our church. This young man, who is in his twenties, said that he believed in God—much like Carl Sagan. He seems to have a postmodern view of truth, but my question is, how can I read up on the spiritual views of Sagan? Do you know any websites or critiques on Sagan? I read your article "[Contact: A Eulogy to Carl Sagan](#)"—what would be the best approach to this young man?

It sounds like you have a rather sticky situation on your hands. Believing in God “like Carl Sagan” means little more than a deistic belief in some kind of super intelligence that helped order our universe but has no personal involvement with it or you and me. Sagan had a profound dislike for any theistic belief, particularly Christianity. His novel *Contact* brings this out much more strongly than the movie adaptation.

My concern would be that the young man is saying some things to help smooth things out with his bride-to-be, but is potentially hostile to her beliefs. Sagan basically believed Jesus was a good man but not God (page 167-173 of the Pocket edition of the novel *Contact*. The character of Ellie Arroway is basically Sagan personified, so these seven pages will give some insight into his thinking. It's about twelve pages into Chapter 10 if you find a different edition). My fear is that he would eventually ridicule or otherwise try to undermine her faith with science and skepticism.

I would ask him if Sagan was a hero of his and do his ideas

about God and religion coincide with Sagan's. If yes, does he hold the same disdain for Christianity and clergy (yourself) as Sagan did? This will perhaps force him to come a little cleaner and bring a little more understanding to the situation. He should be concerned with devaluing the belief system of the person he says he loves. If your intuition is correct about his taking a rather post-modern view, he should be sensitive to this. After all, truth is impossible to know so if it's true for her great, what's it to him?

Would he ever come to church with her?

What about children, how should they be raised? As skeptics or in the church?

I agree with your suspicion I sensed from your message. These kids need some hard questions asked of them. What are her thoughts? Does she think she can convert him? This rarely works out, but if this is her intent, is she ready to follow the prescription in 1 Pet. 3:1-2? Most women find this difficult even with a saved husband who has wandered away.

There is a potentially fatal divergence of basic world views which will affect nearly all aspects of their future lives. Maybe they just need to wait a little longer and give each other some time to explore these differences before committing to marriage.

Well, I have said a lot for someone who has little knowledge of the individuals involved.

Hope this helps.

Let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Respectfully,

Ray Bohlin
Probe Ministries

“Vegetarianism is a More Biblical Diet!”

I, as a vegetarian and a Christian, thought it important to point out that being a vegetarian is the more “natural” form of diet considering the Garden of Eden. In Genesis 1:29 we see that God gives the the fruits and seeds, vegetables etc...”as meat,” causing one to consider then obviously He (God) made a distinction between the meat of animals and the meat for humans to eat. I personally try to eat as close to Gen 1:29 as possible...this is not saying that meat is wrong—Jesus ate meat—yet Hinduism is simply ripping off God’s original plan and adding a twist of spirituality to what God intended to be natural and common sense. I am also not making a blanket statement that meat is unclean...not calling unclean what was made (or possibly created to be?) clean...considering the mass production of cattle in the U.S. and horrible sanitation we have adopted as common practice in the meat industry largely as a whole...we owe it to ourselves to consider these points that:

1. God created man for a plant based diet
2. That changed when sin entered the picture
3. We are God’s temple, BODY, soul and spirit
4. Animals being killed and eaten was symbolic also of Jesus’ sacrifice and our remembrance of Him in communion (a bit of foreshadowing). Also possibly why when meat consumption is documented it is only in special occasions—e.g.: symbolic feasts, sacrifice of the priests, celebrations of significance—but not frivolously. One would soon run out of cattle if you were eating them all the time. You wouldn’t sin too much either if you had to sacrifice cattle all the time.

5. We are never commanded to eat meat.
6. The meat back then and the meat now are almost two completely different things (as far as healthy content and environment are concerned).

Anyhow, I thank you for your time and on a final note...nothing in this world is the Devil's original idea...it is simply a twist of God's original idea...this goes for religions as well as health practices. The religions of the world have truth to them but those truths belong to Christianity and have been twisted and blown way out of proportion. May God bless you richly. Grace and Peace.

I agree with much of what you wrote but I would not go so far as to say that vegetarianism is more natural from a Biblical perspective. Clearly that was God's initial intent, but the Fall changed many things as you indicated. Sin was not natural to our being before the Fall but is quite natural after. So it is quite possible that most of our bodies are going to struggle on a purely vegetarian diet as a result of changes wrought by the Fall. In fact, the care and knowledge needed to follow a strictly vegetarian diet and remain healthy, may indicate that in our fallen state, a diet that includes meat may be more natural. Just a thought.

Also we are clearly told that we can eat meat in Genesis 9:3, "Every moving thing that is alive shall be food for you; I give all to you, as I gave the green plant." It is the same language and tense as in Genesis 1:29. Neither statement is strictly a command but God's intent is made quite clear.

Respectfully,

Ray Bohlin
Probe Ministries

“Is It OK for Christians to Drink in Moderation? Didn’t Jesus Drink?”

Is all alcohol “bad,” so to speak? I thought at a point in my studies that if someone imbibed alcohol at any point that it was a sin, but recently I’ve begun to read scripture that might be interpreted differently.

I know that any form of drunkenness is a sin. However, there are allusions to a possible use of alcohol as a healing agent in “a little wine for thy stomach’s sake, and thine often infirmities” (1 Tim. 5:23). The question I have, is that the gospel of Matthew speaks about John, and how he ate sparingly and drank nothing (indicating alcohol, unless by divine favor he could exist without fluid whatsoever). Then it says that the Son of Man, which I have been told is how Jesus referred to himself, ate and drank, even going so far as to say that people called him a “winebibber” (Matt. 11:12-20). Does this mean that Jesus drank wine, meaning that it is not a sin to drink wine? For we know that Jesus did not commit sin while here on earth, therefore if he did drink wine, it is not a sin to do so, unless you cross the boundaries of gluttony or alcoholism. Or is Jesus repeating one of those slanderous terms to refer to the way that people intended to demean his name?

Then we come to another verse that states that we as Christians should not do anything that could be perceived as wrong, that we may not lead another to do the same (1 Cor. 10). Would buying and drinking alcohol fall under this category of sin? Drinking beer or wine may appear sinful to those who believe it to be so, therefore would it not be a sin for me as a Christian to go purchasing a bottle of wine or brandy, even if for cooking or celebrating a special occasion?

Your reasoning appears quite sound from my perspective. I believe that Jesus did drink wine based on the accusation you mentioned and the fact that he turned water into “good” wine at Cana. Even if this wine was of a lesser alcohol content than our current choices, the fact remains he wouldn’t have made wine that he didn’t expect people to drink with his approval.

Your concern about choices we make that concern a weaker brother or sister are valid. This is also a personal choice. However, many Christians I know who do drink alcohol, only do so in the privacy of their home or at a restaurant where they do not expect to see someone who might be offended. This may seem risky but it also has a lot to do with the church you fellowship at. If the vast majority of your fellowship believe any drinking of alcohol is sin, this would seem a large risk not worth taking. Other churches are more tolerant and there may be little risk at all. This does explain why many pastors choose not to drink alcohol and many seminaries and Bible colleges require students, faculty and staff to sign statements promising not to drink while associated with the institution. Many of their constituents would not understand.

Using alcohol in food preparation is a different issue. If there is to be cooking involved, the alcohol from the beer, brandy or wine is boiled off by the time it gets to the dinner table (alcohol boils at a lower temperature than water). It’s the flavor you’re after. Various kinds of alcohol, depending on the recipe, add just the right flavor and no alcohol is consumed.

I see nothing in Scripture which forbids the drinking of any alcohol. There are plenty of warnings for over-indulging. Sometimes the decision of whether to drink at all needs to be based on the ability to resist the temptation to drink too much. Some people never really learn to just enjoy a glass of wine or a beer without adding two or three more. Such an individual is better off not drinking at all. (If your hand

causes you to sin, cut it off, Matt. 5:30.) And I do know of Christians who drink a little wine with certain meals because it actually does aid their digestion! This is not a myth. Some people have trouble digesting beef (a real uncomfortable feeling results) without some red wine. But the decision regarding a weaker brother or sister is one of individual conscience and the particular fellowship in which you reside.

I hope this helps.

Respectfully,

Ray Bohlin
Probe Ministries

“How Do We Discern God’s Will?”

Ray and Sue,

I was hoping I could take a few minutes to ask a question and draw upon your experience and wisdom. It concerns knowing the will of God and faith and confidence. We have a decision to make in our family, and there are good reasons to believe we should go through with it, for the benefit of many of us. There are many factors involved: financial, relational, comfort, influence of the children, etc. And, though I may be convinced it is the right thing, there is still an uneasiness. Now, I know many of the principles of finding God’s will:

- *What is righteous*
- *Peace after prayer / Clear feeling of direction*
- *Open and closed doors*

- *Blessing to others*
- *Wisdom of scripture*
- *Wise counsel (uh, that would be you guys!)*

My question is whether my uneasiness is a lack of faith. In studying science (and especially probability and statistics), we define confidence as a measure of certainty, and it is always somewhere on the continuum between 0 and 1, exclusive of the endpoints. So, I feel that I cannot say anything with 100% confidence, though I may approach that on the most serious issues in life. And when I want to determine the will of God in the gray areas, my confidence is much less than on things of which I'm doctrinally certain.

If it is a lack of faith, does this have spiritual implications I'm unaware of? I mean you can say I'm sure God exists, and I'm certain Jesus was raised from the dead. To some extent, though, my confidence is based upon my perception of these realities. Any my perception can always have a (remote) possibility of being false, right? The easiest person in the world to fool is myself (Richard Feinman). Even if I know God wants me to walk that tightrope, I may still have an uneasiness as I do it, right? Is this a lack of faith? What am I missing here? What are your experiences regarding this?

Thanks for your time. I'll be very appreciative of any insight you can throw my way.

Dear _____,

Good to hear from you. Glad to know God is leading you into places of uncertainty!

Let me explain. It sounds like you have availed yourself of godly wisdom and sound counsel. Your hesitancy is not so much a lack of faith as it is a normal human reaction to change. It's called fear! Stepping out of our comfort zone! When a soldier is asked after performing a heroic deed in battle if

he was scared, he invariably says YES! Courage is not the lack of fear but the ability to do what is right in the midst of fear. Jesus Himself experienced the agony of Gethsemane. It wasn't a lack of faith He wrestled with, but the very real fear of separation from the Father. Once He was convinced that the path ahead was the will of the Father, He went ahead despite the fear.

Each time I was elected chairman of the elders at our church (two consecutive years), I experienced times of wrestling with God whether He really wanted me to do that. I was scared of not being able to measure up. I felt unqualified. But once I was convinced that this was His path, I was still scared and insecure but determined to follow His path for me regardless of the consequences.

I have found that this is precisely where God wants us so we can depend on Him and not ourselves. If we are fully confident in our own abilities and decision-making, then our confidence is in our own flesh and not in Christ. Sometimes we need to be put in a rather squeamish or uncertain position, so we can recognize that it got done by His grace, and God gets the glory and not us.

If God is leading you in an uncertain or slightly scary position or decision, that means He is giving you an opportunity to grow. Will you trust Him or yourself? He won't shout or make it so plain as to be a no-brainer. He wants to see if you are listening to that still small voice despite the contrary noise of your flesh. I have never regretted stepping out when it didn't always make complete sense. The fear or uneasiness often doesn't dissipate until well after the decision is made and the results begin to show.

You are right to say that we are never entirely certain of anything. But that is not a lack of faith, just being human.

As a whole, I am firmly convinced that the church suffers

today because too many are unwilling to face their fear or indecision and truly rely upon God and not themselves. I think you already know what is the course He wants you to follow. My advice is to make the decision knowing that at every step you are relying on Him and not yourself.

Respectfully,

Ray Bohlin

Dear _____,

So good to hear from you, and thank you for honoring us with this question!! I loved what Ray wrote and mega-dittoes to him on everything he said. I just have one thing to add. . .

I think that when we have a decision to make, it's either between two good things OR between the right thing and the wrong thing (or possibly wise and unwise). If it's a choice between good things, we can choose either one and the Lord will be glorified and He will accomplish His purposes either way. In that case, it's been my experience that we don't necessarily get a super clear "YES, DO THIS AND DON'T DO THAT" kind of response from the Holy Spirit. Which can be a little unsettling because we want clear direction and instead what we get is the Lord saying, like a waiter opening the menu before you, "Choose whatever you want and you'll enjoy whatever you choose."

Then there's the other kind of choice, which is between right and wrong or wise and unwise. I like to think of those as "red light/green light" kinds of choices. Either the Lord gives us a red light ("Stop! Don't do it!" or a check in our spirit) or a green light, which is either a sense of being given permission or a lack of any constraint otherwise (and sometimes it's a clear "Go for it!").

So my question is, is your uneasiness due to a "red light," in which case making that choice would be disobedience, or simply

the reality that you're not completely sure?

Sounds to me like it's the second, which takes you back to what Ray said about the humanness of experiencing fear as we step outside of our comfort zone.

Hope this helps!

Warmly,
Sue

“Can Deacons Be Divorced?”

Please let me know what your thoughts are on the qualifications for deacons when the Bible speaks in 1 Timothy 3:12 about a husband of one wife. I know of a man that is serving as a Deacon that has been divorced 2 times and now he is married to his third wife. This has really bothered me. I have talked to a couple of people and they cannot give me answer, one of these being a minister. They say that if they go to Christ and ask for forgiveness that it is OK but I do not know what the scriptures say about being a Deacon. Thanks for your help.

I have served as an elder and as a chairman of the elders at our church and have spent a good deal of time studying the qualifications for elders and deacons. The general consensus of evangelical scholars on the phrase “husband of one wife” in both 1 Timothy 3 and Titus 1 is that it means the husband of one living woman. That is, it allows for a man to serve as an elder or deacon if his wife has passed away and he has remarried. This would seem to allow for a man to serve in these church leadership positions if he has been divorced and remarried. This is where it gets tricky. Jesus seemed to allow

for divorce in the case of adultery (Matthew 5:31-32) and Paul added an allowance for divorce if left by an unbelieving spouse (1 Corinthians 7:15). If a man seeking the office of elder or deacon had an unbelieving wife who left and divorced him, I would consider him eligible for office as long as he meets the other qualifications. However, if a believing wife and husband have sought divorce and the husband has remarried and is now seeking the office of elder or deacon, this would require a much deeper investigation into the circumstances. If the grounds for divorce were not biblical, then the subsequent marriages are suspect. I would not be inclined to allow such an individual to stand in church leadership because this would reflect poorly on their character and they may indeed be married in the eyes of God to two women. Paul instructs a married woman who leaves her husband to remain unmarried unless it is to be reconciled to her husband (1 Corinthians 7:10-11).

The question today remains when you have a remarried couple who have sought forgiveness for their sin, what then? They may be forgiven and brought fully into the fellowship of the church but that does not necessarily mean the husband is qualified for an official position of leadership in the church. Elders and deacons are held to a higher standard. If I were divorced while a believer, I would no longer consider myself eligible for official leadership in the church. I can still serve and have a ministry but not as an official elder or deacon. I believe each situation must be evaluated individually and in depth. A man who has been divorced must expect to be questioned thoroughly about the nature of the divorce and whether any sin involved has been fully repented of, if he desires to serve as an elder or deacon. Also please understand that different evangelical churches have come to different conclusions on this question.

I am not a theologian nor a pastor, but this is my opinion as I read the Scriptures and have had to deal with this question

as an elder.

Respectfully,

Ray Bohlin
Probe Ministries

“Aren’t the Bonds in Peptides More Easily Formed?”

Dr. Bohlin: I have been in contact with a good friend and we have been having a wonderful discussion regarding a series of topics centering around intelligent design. As typical of our conversations we tend to head down tangential trails that avert our focus momentarily. This week’s parley has to do with chemical bonding as associated with protein synthesis. Specifically, your position that the probability of amino acids forming proteins on their own is astronomical. My friend sent you an email recently asking why covalence is not a possibility when considering formation of amino acids and eventually proteins. In your response you referred to two primary problems: chemical and informational. In regards to the chemical you briefly stated that using the early earth scenario (where earth scientists envision a watery world) the energy required to release the water molecule during the peptide bonding process is high especially in an aqueous solution. Further, you state that this barrier can be overcome by the cell through the use of ribosome in a protein fold devoid of water but that the early earth had no RNA to overcome this barrier. Here is my long drawn out question to you.

First, I contend that the weak hydrogen bond (not covalent)

associated with the loss of the two hydrogen and one oxygen atom during the formation of an amino acid with the peptide bond is easily broken through a heat catalyst such that existed during the high radioactive decay of the early earth as it cooled from its molten stage (and still does today but to a much lesser degree). This loss of a water molecule would heighten the affinity of the amino acid to the peptide bond thus strengthening their mutual attraction. The early earth model also indicates that pH (percent hydrogen) levels were probably very different which would also act as a catalyst to break the hydrogen bond as the hydrogen and oxygen atoms try to degas from solution and neutralize the solution. The earth's closed system perpetuated this process indefinitely by trapping the heated gases laden with other hydrous compounds such as sulfuric acid. The formation of the amount of water on earth certainly could not be accomplished by the release of water molecules through the formation of proteins alone. This begs the question of which came first the chicken or the egg? If it were the amino acids, then we would have a sea of amino acids greater than the volume of the oceans. If the amino acids were formed outside of an aqueous solution then where did the water molecules come from that were eventually released? Both hydrogen and oxygen had to be abundantly present and together they form many, many more molecules other than just amino acids and water. The information concern you were referring to suggests that 10 to 65^{th} power is unobtainable. However, when there exists many times more that number of amino acids the odds quickly reduce and become more favorable. 10 to the 65^{th} sounds astronomical but 10 to the 6500^{th} is even more astronomical thus diminishing the former. Further, amino acids can be synthesized in the laboratory which suggests that the building blocks are present on earth. In time, with the correct agents in place (such as powerful radioactive isotopes {neutrinos perhaps?}) the left-handed stereoisotopes of amino acids may also be laboratorily synthesized.

Finally, I would like to know your thoughts on why you believe that proteins were designed. Is it purely philosophical or have you developed a hypothesis that has been tested by others that lends further credence to your postulation? Thank you for your time in advance.

Thank you for your consideration of my earlier response and I am glad to answer your questions and objections.

First, the bonds that are broken to form a peptide bond formation with the subsequent release of water are not hydrogen bonds, they are covalent. That is why peptide bond formation is endothermic or uphill in relation to energy. Simply providing heat is not going to overcome this problem. Sydney Fox attempted thermal synthesis of proteins in early earth conditions, the results of which he termed proteinoids. Beginning with amino acids (in solution or dry) he heated the material at 200 degrees C for 6-7 hours. The water produced by bond formation (and any original water from the aqueous solution) is evaporated. The elimination of water makes a small yield of polypeptides possible. The increased temperature plus the elimination of water makes the reaction irreversible. However, this process has been rejected for four reasons. First, in living proteins only alpha peptide bonds are formed. In Fox's reactions, beta, gamma and epsilon peptide bonds are also found in abundance. Second, these thermal proteinoids are composed of both L and D amino acids. Only L amino acids are found in living proteins. Third, these are randomly sequenced proteins with no resemblance to proteins with catalytic activity. "Fourth, the geological conditions indicated are too unreasonable to be taken seriously. As Folsome has commented, 'The central question [concerning Fox's proteinoids] is where did all those pure, dry, concentrated, and optically active amino acids come from in the first place.'" (*Mystery of Life's Origin*, 1984, Thaxton, Bradley, and Olsen, p. 155-156)

I am sorry you got the impression that I believed that the

formation of peptide bonds and the concomitant release of a water molecule produced the original water on the planet. That is not the nature of the chicken or egg dilemma. The chicken or egg dilemma refers to the fact that in living systems today, proteins are required for DNA and RNA to function with specificity. Histones are required to maintain DNA folding structure and more importantly, proteins are required for DNA and RNA replication. However, it is the DNA which contains the code for the construction of proteins. DNA needs proteins, proteins need DNA. Which came first in the early earth? DNA or protein, chicken or egg? The proposed RNA world, RNA molecules which can perform some limited enzyme (protein) functions is negated by the fact that there is no mechanism for the production of RNA in an abiotic early earth. Even if this is accomplished, the enzyme-like functions of some small RNA molecules are not sufficient to support life in any shape or form.

Just because $1/10$ to the 65th power is large compared to $1/10$ to the 6,500 power does not minimize $1/10$ to the 65th as a very small probability. It is estimated that there are 10 to the 80th power particles in the universe. The smallest amino acid, glycine is comprised on 13 atoms, each atom (either hydrogen, carbon, nitrogen or oxygen) is composed of multiple protons, electrons and neutrons and each of these is composed of multiple quarks. You can readily recognize that a sea of 10 to the 65th amino acids is a physical impossibility. Current estimates suggest that the concentration of amino acids in the early earth could never have exceeded, 10 to the -7 molar, which is the same as the present Atlantic Ocean (*Mystery of Life's Origin* cited earlier, p. 60). Sheer numbers are not going to help. Most researchers rely on some form of concentration mechanism to get enough amino acids together for protein formation. Even when this happens, many of the same problems that Fox's experiments run into are difficult to eliminate.

Finally, I believe that proteins are designed for both philosophical and scientific reasons. Proteins as stated earlier, contain information. The sequence of the 20 different amino acids in a protein consisting of 100 amino acids is crucial to its function. William Dembski (in the *Design Inference*, Cambridge University Press, 1999 and *Intelligent Design*, Intervarsity Press, 2000) rigorously defines this information as complex specified information or CSI. It is complex because the sequence of a protein is not a simple repetition as in a nylon polymer. And it is specified because it can tolerate only a small range of substitution at any one of the 100 positions, indeed at some positions, no substitution can be tolerated. Summing these up is where the 10 to the 65th power came from.

Most biologists readily admit today that chance alone is incapable of overcoming these odds. Therefore, they hold out for some undiscovered natural law that will allow information to arise out of the chaos of a mixture of amino acids. But law is also an unlikely candidate. Some have suggested that perhaps certain amino acids have an affinity for certain other amino acids. This could give some level of sequence specificity. This fails on two counts. First no such pattern is observable when nearest neighbors are analyzed in modern proteins. Second, this would defeat the entire process since the sequence would no longer be complex but simple. Simple because the sequence could now be predicted once the first amino acid is put in place. This would lead to a very limited number of possible combinations and not the millions of possibilities currently residing in living cells.

The only known source for CSI today is intelligence. Even the fundamentalist Darwinian Richard Dawkins, said in his book *The Blind Watchmaker*, "Biology is the study of complicated things that give the appearance of having been designed for a purpose." Perhaps they appear to be designed because they were designed. There is certainly nothing unscientific about

wanting to explore that possibility.

Respectfully,

Ray Bohlin
Probe Ministries

“Why Don’t You Cite Young Earth Creationists in Your Material?”

Ray:

I couldn’t help but notice that ICR/Dr. Henry Morris and Answers In Genesis/Ken Ham aren’t cited (or at least I did not see their viewpoints) in some of your material about creation/evolution. Are there points of disagreement? Do you take a stand beyond design that commits to either a young earth or old earth?

I do occasionally refer to writings from young earth creationists. The [article on human fossils](#), for instance, comes directly from young earth creationist Marvin Lubenow’s book *Bones of Contention*. I focus on intelligent design because it is an area that nearly all creationists, young and old earth agree on. At Probe we do not take an official position on the age of the earth question primarily because most of us here, including myself are undecided (see [Christian Views of Science and Earth History](#)) about this critical issue. I agree with Phillip Johnson that we need first to stand united against the current naturalistic filibuster in science by opposing the naturalistic approach to origins and then come back to the age of the earth question later.

Respectfully,

Ray Bohlin
Probe Ministries

“You Misguided Piece of **!”**

What the h*ll are you, you misguided piece of sh**!!! What did your so called ‘God’ snap his fingers and wham! earth is ‘created’ hehe you are an idiot. Where is your God anyway? Floating up in the atmosphere somewhere? Religion is something misguided humans look for when their life is in the dumps (eg. crops fail, someone dies etc etc), they want to believe in something..... which does not exist. Homo sapiens increased brain size has allowed it to think of things like this. That is all Christianity is, you can believe in it but don’t expect other people to believe a falicy.[sic]

Thanks for taking the time to visit at least one of my articles; whether you actually read anything I can’t tell from your message. Unfortunately your comments follow a rather common pattern of showing a lot of bluster with no substance. If you think I have made an error of fact or judgment, I would be glad to discuss something specific with you. I am sorry you have such a low opinion of people of faith (who, by the way, in reference to your comment about other people not believing it, are in the vast majority). It sounds to me like you are more mad at God than convinced of His nonexistence.

Respectfully,

Ray Bohlin, Ph.D.

“What is Inductive Reasoning?”

I took an aptitude test, in fact two of them, in which I tested very low in inductive reasoning. Apparently, this is a reasoning in which lawyers, doctors, and scientists, among other people, tend to have very strong aptitudes. What do you know about this reasoning process? What does it look like? If God has not made one strong in it, how should one compensate for it? (In one of the two tests I took, the administrator told me I needed to seek out people who were gifted in this area before I made major decisions.) I figured you may a lot more about this and use it quite often considering your scientific background.

Inductive reasoning uses facts and observations to reason to a general conclusion.

Induction: The reasoning process in which generalizations, laws, or principles are formed from the observation of particular cases; reasoning that moves from the part to the whole, from the particular to the general. Most human reasoning is inductive or empirical in character since it consists of generalizations based on our sense experience.

Ray Bohlin is a person
Ray Bohlin has feelings
Joe Blow is a person
Joe Blow has feelings
Sue Bohlin is a person
Sue Bohlin has feelings

Therefore, probably all persons have feelings.

The conclusion is not certain but likely. The premises provide some support for the conclusion

The conclusion is not itself a fact but a generalization or trend. For instance, Darwin observed that the shapes of the carapaces (shells) of the tortoises on the Galapagos were specific to each island. From this he reasoned (inductively) that perhaps they were all related and the specific differences were due to initial variations present in the first tortoises that occupied each island. His conclusion was just an idea, an analysis of a possible trend or connection. From this he would need to derive experiments designed to gather more specific data from which he would hopefully reason deductively to a specific conclusion. If this is true, and if this is true, and if this is true, then this must be true.

Deduction: The reasoning process in which conclusions are drawn from accepted premises. The premises are more general than the conclusion, so deduction is often defined as reasoning from the whole down to the part or from the general to the particular.

All humans are mortal.		Very general
Aristotle is human.		More specific but still general
Therefore, Aristotle is mortal.		Aristotle will die! Quite specific

If the first two are true, the conclusion must be true. The conclusion is certain.

Deductive reasoning reasons to an obvious conclusion that follows logically from the premises. Inductive reasoning takes the observations (facts) and reasons to a possible or general conclusion that is more tentative. Lawyers, doctors, and scientists need this kind of reasoning to solve problems, to

take the available facts and determine which direction to take their investigation next. They then need to collect additional facts to confirm their earlier conclusion or even deductively arrive at a definite, firm conclusion.

Some people have a hard time seeing connections between seemingly isolated facts that others see a clear trend from. The tests you took apparently put you in that category.

In my work I see a lot of evidence for intelligent design in the universe and life but the evidence is not so clear as to be able to draw a certain conclusion. I believe I am right, but not 100% certain. I continue to look for additional evidence to make my conclusion more reliable.

This was perhaps more than you bargained for, but I hope it helps. You may need to take some time and read it several times and come back to it again after a few days to let it percolate a little. I had to do some checking to make sure I got it right so let me know if I can help further.

Respectfully,

Ray Bohlin
Probe Ministries