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A person’s heart could still be beating though the person had stopped breathing. He had not actually died, and hence, “mouth-to-mouth” resuscitation enabled a person to start breathing again. At that point of medical understanding, it was thought that when the heart stopped beating (determined by placing one’s ear to the chest of the person), the individual had died. However, with additional advancements and understanding, it was determined that it was possible to restart the heart, through cardiovascular resuscitation, compressions of the chest cavity, injection of powerful drugs directly into the heart, massaging the heart directly, and eventually defibrillation, in which an electrical shock is delivered to the heart with a defibrillator. The current definition of “dead” is associated more with the cessation of brain activity. A typical definition of “flatline” is “to die or be so near death that the display of one’s vital signs on medical monitoring equipment shows a flat line rather than peaks and troughs” (Fuxel, n.d.). “Flatlining” can refer either to heart or brain activity or both, depending on who is using the term.
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We openly grant that the accusation represented by the title of this article is true, at least for many individuals today. But not for all.

"BLIND FAITH"—MANY HAVE IT

What is "blind faith"? What is meant by the accusation? The idea behind "blind faith" is that a person chooses to believe in something or someone (namely, God) without any supporting evidence. The portrait painted in our minds is that of a person who puts on a blindfold and steps up to a ledge. He has no idea how far down the drop is—whether or not he will plummet to his death, break his legs, or simply fall down. He has no idea if there is water, a trampoline, or rocks at the bottom. He simply decides to believe that he will not die if he jumps off—that he will be safe. He has no evidence, only pure, baseless "faith." So, he takes a "leap of faith." Question: who in their right mind does such a thing? Whoever has such a faith truly is naive, an extremely emotionally, rather than rationally, charged individual, and possibly is in need of counseling, or has an agenda for having such a belief system.

Sadly many people have such a "faith." Many people call themselves Christians, and claim to believe in the Bible, but clearly have not read it. They have a "blind faith" which, according to the Law of Rationality (Ruby, 1960, pp. 130-131), is irrational. Their belief in God is not based on the evidence, but is a blind leap into the dark without it. Philosophers call this phenomenon "fideism" (Popkin, 1967, 3:201-202). However, the biblical portrait of faith (Greek, pistis—translated equally as faith, belief, trust, or having confidence in) is not what some in Christendom have defined it to be nor what Hollywood has portrayed it to be. It is not "believing when common sense tells you not too," as the 1947 movie, Miracle on 34th Street suggested (Scatton). It is not a "leap of faith" like Dr. Jones' actions in Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade (Spielberg, 1989). The Bible does not advocate a "Fool, don't think" mentality, like that encouraged by Qui-Gon Jinn in Star Wars (Lucas, 1999). Biblical faith is based on evidence (Hebrews 11:1). It is trust—comparable to the trust one has in a parent or friend—that is based on proof. We trust someone when he has proven himself to be trustworthy. When one listens to or reads revelation from God's Word (i.e., what Bible believers call "special revelation") and the information therein proves to be true, one develops faith in God (Romans 10:17). When one examines the evidence from the created order (i.e., what Bible believers call "general revelation"), and it points to the existence of a supernatural Being as Creator—rather than blind, random, accidental change over time—we learn to trust God based on that evidence.

In short: The biblical model of faith requires evidence. According to the biblical model, the truth of God can be known—not felt or accepted without proof—and it will set men free (John 8:32). Sincere truth seekers examine what they have been told and investigate its veracity by pondering the evidence, as did the "fair-minded" Bereans of Acts 17:11, before becoming Christians. In fact, God (through Paul in 1 Thessalonians 5:21) tells the creationist that he is expected to prove or test something before believing it—only accepting what has been proven right or good. Do such passages give the impression that the Bible advocates a blind, evidence-less faith?

Sadly, evidence-based faith is not the faith of many within Christendom. But "don't throw the baby out with the bathwater." Many of us base our view squarely on the evidence—such as the evidence presented below.

[NOTE: See Miller, 2003a for more on the topic of "blind faith" and the Bible. Also, Miller, 2003b.]

(continued on p. 81)
Islam is the second largest religion in the world—and swiftly closing the gap with Christianity. The largest Muslim nation in the world is not even in the Middle East. Islam is making extensive encroachments into American life. Over 1,200 mosques dot the American landscape from California to New York—over half of which have been founded in the last three to four decades, with more being built every day. Politicians now freely include Muslims in their allusions to the social fabric of the nation. Headway is even being made to include the teaching of Islam in the public schools.

This DVD answers questions like...
•    Who was Muhammad?
•    What is the religion of Islam?
•    What are Islam's central doctrines?
•    Who are the Sunnis and Shi'ites?
•    Why do Muslim terrorists hate Americans?
•    Does the Quran possess the attributes of inspiration?
•    Are Christianity and Islam compatible?
•    Does the Quran encourage violence?
•    What did America's Founders say about Islam?
•    What should Christians do?

For more information call (800) 234-8558 or visit www.apologeticspress.org

Buy 20 or more DVDs for $2.00 ea
Creation versus Evolution

In order for a belief to not be “blind” or irrational, it needs supporting evidence. While the creationist does not claim to hold direct, observable evidence of God, since we cannot taste, touch, see, hear, or smell Him, the indirect evidence—a legitimate source of scientific evidence—is overwhelming. What supporting evidence do creationists put forth? A thorough treatment of this subject is outside the scope of this article, but hundreds of articles and books deal eloquently and credibly with the subject. [NOTE: See www.apologeticspress.org for a library of said material.]

In short, the creationist argues, among other things, that:

1. The available evidence contradicts the atheistic model (cf. Miller, 2012b; Miller, 2013c), which logically leaves theism—the Creation model.
2. The fundamental evidence that contradicts the naturalistic model, supports the contentsions of the creation model, which never contradicts the scientific evidence.
3. The existence and teachings of the laws of science demand a non-material, uncaused Cause for the Universe.
4. There are numerous natural evidences in the Universe that exhibit characteristics of intent, purpose, and complexity, which indicate a Mind behind them. Such attributes testify to the presence of intelligent design, which implies a Designer.
5. Objective morality exists, which implies a higher Law that transcends mankind, which in turn demands a supernatural Author.
6. A Book exists that contains certain characteristics that can only be explainable if it is what it says it is—the Word of the Creator.

These proofs, and many others, provide evidence that demands an explanation and cannot be satisfied by naturalistic theories. Only supernatural Creation provides an answer in keeping with the evidence. The Creation model can hardly be deemed unscientific. Its legitimate followers cannot be brushed aside as “blind” believers. Such sweeping accusations are unfair and betray a prejudiced, stereotypical mindset, to say nothing of the fact that such accusations fall victim to the ad hominem logical fallacy (“Fallacies,” 2012).

Actually, Evolutionists Do

In truth, Creation is the reasonable choice—the one not beholden to evidence-less leaps of faith. It is not contingent on the baseless, mythical claim that aliens exist and initiated life on Earth (cf. Miller, 2013a); that abiogenesis—like magic from a fictional novel—is somehow possible (cf. Miller, 2012b); that non-humans give birth to humans, as they do in the tabletops (cf. Flew and Warren, 1977, pp. 25, 45, 65); or the fanciful idea that Universes spontaneously pop into existence (cf. Miller, 2013c). Indeed, atheistic evolution is simply well-packaged superstition. Creation is the option in keeping with reason and the evidence. While some who call themselves “Christians,” do, indeed, have an unscriptural, blind faith, in truth, the same can be said of the evolutionary community—and more so. Why? (1) Because unlike evolution, the evidence does not contradict Creation but supports it; even though some have accepted Creation without that evidence; (2) because not all creationists hold to a blind faith. Some examine the evidence and draw the reasonable conclusion that a Creator exists. However, all naturalists must have a blind, evidence-less faith, since atheistic evolution is based on certain baseless, unprovable assumptions, including abiogenesis, naturalism, spontaneous generation or the eternalism of matter, etc. (cf. Miller, 2013b and Kerkut, 1980 for other key, baseless evolutionary assumptions). Belief in those assumptions is purely blind. They (1) are not supported by the evidence, which classifies evolution as irrational; (2) actually contradict the evidence; and (3) even show the naturalist to be engaged in self-contradiction, which he blindly ignoring when confronted with the evidence of his contradictions (cf. Miller, 2012a). It seems clear that it is the evolutionist—not the creationist—who holds to a blind faith.

Consider the following timeless quotes from various prominent evolutionists concerning the character of the naturalist’s faith:

Robert Jastrow, evolutionary astronomer and founder and former director of the Goddard Institute for Space Studies at NASA: “At present, science has no satisfactory answer to the question of the origin of life on the earth. Perhaps the appearance of life on the earth is a miracle. Scientists [i.e., naturalists—JM] are reluctant to accept that view, but their choices are limited; either life was created on the earth by the will of a being outside the grasp of scientific understanding, or it...
evolved on our planet spontaneously, though chemical reactions occurring in nonliving matter lying on the surface of the planet. The first theory places the question of the origin of life beyond the reach of scientific inquiry. It is a statement of faith in the power of a Supreme Being not subject to the laws of science. The second theory is also an act of faith. The act of faith consists in accepting the scientific view of the origin of life as correct, without having concrete evidence to support that belief” (1977, pp. 62-63, emp. added).

John Sullivan, once a popular evolutionary science writer, was able to accept the hypothesis that life has developed from inorganic matter is, at present, still an article of faith” (1933, p. 95, emp. added).

Richard Lewontin, evolutionary geneticist of Harvard University: “Our willingness to accept scientific claims against common sense is the key to an understanding of the real struggle between science and the supernatural. We take the side of science somehow compelling us to the laws of science. The second person, still an article of faith” (1960, p. 150, emp. added).
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NEW DVD on Islam

Several years ago, Apologetics Press released a book titled *The Quran Unveiled* that assesses the Quran's claim to inspiration. Shortly thereafter, we released a DVD of the live seminar that presents some of the information from the book. The packaging consisted of three discs and was rather expensive. That seminar has now been completely updated, expanded, and reshot. In line with other A.P. video products, the new Islam DVD is packaged and priced inexpensively in order to get the material out to as wide an audience as possible.

The DVD consists of eight 30-minute sessions suitable for classroom viewing. The central purpose of the series is to ascertain whether the Quran possesses the attributes of inspiration. Hence, a detailed analysis of the text of the Quran is provided. Additionally, the presentation offers—

- an introduction to Islam and Muhammad, its founder;
- a look at Islam’s five major doctrines (“pillars”);
- incidents of Muhammad’s personal behavior;
- a comparison of the primary doctrinal conflicts between Islam and Christianity;
- a look at what the Founders of America said about Islam;
- recommendations for the future.

Sadly, the time has come for Christians and all Americans to contemplate the impact of Islamic encroachments on the fabric of society. Christians must inform themselves to enable them to consider strategies for evangelizing Muslims.

Dave Miller