

# THEY BELIEVE IN MIRACLES TOO!

---

Atheists, humanists and naturalist often ridicule Christians for believing in the super-natural events of creation and redemption, recorded in the Holy Scriptures. They tell us that, in contrast, their version of how the universe came to be and how man appeared on the planet earth is both rational and credible. But upon closer examination, these so called explanations are contrary to natural laws, discovered by scientific experimentation and observation. To believe them is to believe in miracles!

Miracles are presented in scripture as super (above) natural events. They represent the setting aside of the natural course through which certain things are accomplished, and the superimposition of a higher order. For example; the law governing reproduction requires that male and female come together in sexual intimacy. In this way, the female egg is fertilized by the male sperm. Though modern technology has rendered the sex act unnecessary by being able to bring these cells together outside the human body in a test tube, God's natural law for the uniting of male and female cells is nevertheless upheld.

That law, however, was suspended when Mary became pregnant with Jesus. No male sperm was present. Christians believe it was a miracle wrought by God to bring the body of His son into the world. God, who established the law, can temporarily suspend it. Believing in miracles therefore is consistent with the Christian position. Atheists and humanists however, have no God who works miracles. Their world view confines them to naturalistic causes for the effect of the marvelous cosmos and man's presence here. Yet they offer hypotheses so ridiculously incredible, and postulate positions so pathetically void of reason that it requires more faith to believe them than to believe the biblical account of the miracle of creation. Consider these examples.

Those who espouse a materialistic world view, offer the "Big Bang Theory" as an explanation of how the universe came to be. This however, does not address the question of what banged? Those who advocate this theory, assume a preexistence of matter, since a thing must exist before it can explode. Hence, this

is not really a theory of origins. The inadequacy of the “Big Bang” as a theory of origins is sometimes admitted even by atheistic scientists themselves. Rita Rhodes Ward quotes H. J. Rush, a noted materialist, as follows. “The scientist does not expect something to come from nothing. He has a dogged conviction that, if an explosion occurred, something must have been there to explode” (In *The Beginning*, pg. 17). We say amen to that! Let them tell us, if they may, without bringing God and the supernatural into the equation, how the elements that banged came into existence. Can they? I am not holding my breath! If the matter that exploded came from nothing I declare that such is a miracle! And if they believe that is what happened, then they believe in miracles too. Is it not curious how one can believe in supernatural events, while denying the existence of a supernatural being who caused them?

Christians believe that God is not only creator, but that he is also the designer of the order and complexity we observe in the world, and that these testify to His power and genius. An architect will always be superior to his drawings. Materialists, however, credit blind mechanistic processes as the architect of living things. Dr. Joe White and Dr. Nicholas Comninellis in their book *Darwin’s Demise* quote from molecular biologist Michael Denton, on the complexity of a single cell. He writes. “On the surface of the cell we would see millions of openings, like the portholes of a vast spaceship, opening and closing to allow a continual stream of materials to flow in and out. If we were to enter one of these openings we would find ourselves in a world of supreme technology and bewildering complexity” (*Darwin’s Demise* pg. 28). This is just at the cellular level. Think of the enormous reciprocity and inter working of billions of such cells that make up a human being. White and Comninellis, the previous authors, cite Dr. Duane T. Gish on the complexity of the human brain. He says, “The human brain with its twelve billion brain cells and 120 trillion connections is the most complex arrangement of matter in the universe” (*Darwin’s Demise* pg. 30). The principle of cause and effect proposes that every effect must have an adequate cause. School children, for example, throwing rocks at each other in New York City, could not result in the Empire State building, nor would be accept that a tornado assembled a Boeing 747 with a first-class seating section, from scattered plane parts in a hangar. The aerodynamic design and specified complexity of a 747 demands an intelligent and

deliberate cause, and it is neither rational nor credible to believe otherwise. But the complexities of a 747 pale in comparison to the marvel of the human brain, and for materialists, who scorn the idea of miracles and insist on rational and natural causes, to credit random chance as its architect is laughable!

Evolutionists fare no better in their belief of the spontaneous generation of a single celled amoeba, which eventually developed into man after passing through many intermediate forms, over hundreds of millions of years ago. Is this a credible hypothesis? Is such an explanation consistent with scientific laws established through experimentation and observation? Can atheistic scientists really tell us with any degree of certainty what happened a hundred million years ago? It would be a miracle if they could! But remember they don't believe in miracles. Spontaneous Generation, the bedrock of the evolutionary theory was believed to be true in ancient times. Before the advent of the microscope that allowed organisms to be viewed at a microbial level, thinkers in the field of origins believed that maggots came from decaying flesh and that frogs instantly appeared from mud. But it is inexcusable that this idea is still being paraded under the guise of science in the modern era. Commenting on the falsity of Spontaneous Generation, Phillip Eichman had this to say. "Many scientists, including Redi, Spallanzani, Pasteur, and others worked for years to disprove this erroneous theory. It was not until the work of Pasteur in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century A.D. that the theory was finally laid to rest" (Understanding Evolution pg. 46). Pasteur's experiments brought to light the law of biogenesis, that all life results from previously established life.

Why do atheistic scientists reject their own scientific laws and principles and offer the very "miracles" they repudiate as theories of how things began? The answer may be found in Paul's words to the Roman Christians, on what happens when man rejects God. **"For though they knew God, they did not glorify Him as God, or show gratitude. Instead, their thinking became nonsense, and their senseless minds were darkened. Claiming to be wise, they became fools....."** (Romans 1: 21, 22 HCSB)

*Written by: Thaddeus Bruno*