

## Cultural Examples of Violating the Law of Non-Contradiction

### God's Not Dead

---

In the movie, "God's Not Dead" The college professor has a problem with God. Actually he hates Him because he holds God guilty of wrongdoing. To the degree that anyone who will not agree with him that there is not any god at all will fail the class. God cannot be guilty of wrongdoing AND be non-existent at the same time.

### Abortion and Women's Rights

---

A little while ago, a famous Christian artist was asked her views on abortion and "woman rights", but sadly the artist refused, saying, "I don't think it's my place to tell women what they can and can't do with their bodies." This was the wrong answer. If she was truly a Christian, as she stated, then she should have had something to say about it. The Bible clearly tells us to go out to all nations and all people spreading his word. This is very important because, for one, she disobeyed God's command, and she public portrayed the wrong picture of Christianity saying that it wasn't her place.

### Flood, Fossils, and Missing Links

---

On February 4<sup>th</sup>, 2014, creationist Ken Ham debated naturalist Bill Nye on the topic 'Is creation a viable model of origins in today's modern scientific era?'. While both sides had their strengths and weaknesses, Nye did raise a slightly questionable point near the end of his 30 minute presentation. That portion of his speech, in his words, are as follows:

'One of the extraordinary claims associated with Mr Ham's worldview, is that this giant boat, very large wooden ship, went aground safely on a mountain in the middle east-what we now call the Middle East. And so places like Australia are populated by animals who somehow managed to get from the Middle East all the way to Australia in the last 4,000 years. Now that to me is an extraordinary claim. We would expect then, somewhere, between the Middle East and Australia, we would expect to find evidence of kangaroos. We would expect to find some, uh, fossils, some bones, in the last 4,000 years, somebody would have been hopping along there and died along the way and we'd find them. And furthermore, there is a claim that there is, was a land bridge that allowed these animals to get from Asia all the way to the continent of Australia, and that land bridge has disappeared. It's disappeared in the last 4,000 years. No navigator, diver, no US navy submarine, no one's ever detected any evidence of this let alone any fossils of kangaroos. So the expectation, is not met. It doesn't seem to hold up ... *If you could find just one fossil, just one, you could change the whole world! You would be a hero to*

the scientific community! But many people have looked, and no has ever found one anywhere else on the world. And I just can't accept that...'

While that may sound convincing, he later states in the second debate (and likely many other places as well) that while evolution is dependent on transitional links, there have been none found. That doesn't bother him however, because he has faith that in the future they will be found, and hopes that everyone else will believe the same. But this presents us with a large contradiction, as he said you have no grounds to believe the creation model because no one's found any select fossils to prove it yet, and apparently he doesn't have any faith that will happen. How can he hold both of these views that contradict each other (a fallacy some may call Sibling Rivalry)? Maybe he doesn't realize this big problem in his thinking.

Still, there might be some who think that he is right after all, claiming that evolution doesn't need to meet the same criteria as creation. They might reason that since they view evolution as a scientific fact, it doesn't need those fossils to be found for it to be considered right. While creation on the other hand, since it is just 'a religious view', would need more proof to be used as evidence when arguing for that worldview. But since evolution is not much more than man's idea- widely accepted or not-without that extra needed evidence, they don't have much more than blind faith.

Meanwhile, Creationists claim their beliefs to be based on the word of the one and only God, the one who made everything and rules all things. Knowing all things, God is the standard that we are to live by, and we are subject to his rules. With this type of worldview, creationists say they don't need those kangaroo fossils as evidence to support their views because *all* creation testifies to a creator, unlike the ideas on the other side of the equation.

Ultimately, it is up to each person what they decide to believe, whether their beliefs are true or not. None the less, this kind of contradiction in Nye's beliefs should not go unnoticed. Either way, one of those ideas has to go for they cannot logically coexist together. By pointing out the slight problems in someone else's thinking, even someone as educated and famous as Bill Nye the Science Guy, we all can learn to correct our own thinking and make sure we don't make the same mistake ourselves.

## First Amendment vs. City Ordinance

---

In 2013, the city of Phoenix, Arizona, made an ordinance prohibiting any discrimination against people based on "sexual orientation." This ordinance was made to give more freedom to the LGBT community. The Bible, however, clearly states that God created man and woman with gender differences and to try to be another gender is wrong. To force a Christian or like-minded person to do business with gay people, lesbians, etc., would take away their freedom to stand up for what they believe. While this was done to give the LGBT community more freedom and acceptance, it took away the freedom of those who do not accept that lifestyle by forcing them to do business with them. This also breaks a higher law, the First Amendment, which "guarantees freedoms concerning religion, expression, assembly, and the right to petition." The ordinance that was made goes against an Amendment; a law was made that goes against a law. It is important to point out this contradiction because, if not realized, our nation could

eventually become a country that is no longer based on the fundamentals that it was founded on, and laws wouldn't matter because they contradict themselves anyway.

“I'm drowning...”?

---

In the film *October Baby*, there is a scene where the protagonist is sitting on the dock and writing in her journal. The entry reads, “I am drowning”. While this is probably meant to be an emotional simile, this statement is impossible due to the pages still being dry, her remarkable penmanship as she writes, the fact that the journal continues to have successive entries, and because we see her... not drowning.

U. S. Courts Contradict their own Rulings

---

There are many examples of our U.S. Court having contradicting ideas, and even contradicting their own rulings. I will present two examples today of such happenings. First, we have in Denver, Colorado, a teacher was ordered to stop reading his Bible during recess and to remove religious literature from his classroom library. However, the presiding court ruled that a Bible may be shelved in the school library. This really doesn't make sense as having a Bible in a school library is just about as “dangerous” as having it in a classroom library. Another example occurred in Zion, Illinois; the city was ordered to remove the cross from its city seal. This cross dates back to the turn of the century, when Zion was founded as a religious community. However, the city of Austin, Texas, also has a cross on its city seal, and was never ordered to have it removed. It is obvious that both of these rulings are completely contradictory. Finally, we have the ruling in Crestwood, Illinois. An Italian -language mass was planned to be held in a public park during the city's Italian festival. A lower court ruled out the proceedings, however, which is in complete violation of the Supreme Court Equal Access ruling. This states that if other groups are permitted to use a public place, then religious groups also have a right to use that place's services. As, can be seen in these three examples, it appears that our courts (at least when dealing with church – state affairs), is incapable of following the basic law of non-contradiction.