

**General Topics :: tribes that never heard of jesus****tribes that never heard of jesus - posted by luckyd (), on: 2007/1/22 20:43**

i told me pastor about tribes and people that never got a chance to hear the gospel and he said something about how if one was really seeking to find god then he would send the people a missionary or something, and ive heard that before but then i was thinking, what about the tribes like before christopher columbus. no one who was christian ever reached t hem. maybe someone has heard of some guy from a tribe seeing a vision of jesus because he seeked god or something but its been bothering me because i was thinking how ya its easy for me to accept jesus...well you know not easy but i m ean easier since i actually live in a place where jesus is preached, but what about the people who never got it preached t o them. my pastor said the gospel is now preached everywhere but i know it wasnt in the past because christians hadnt t raveled the whole world at one point.

**Re: tribes that never heard of jesus, on: 2007/1/22 21:08**

luckyd

not sure that your pastor is correct about the Good News being preached everywhere. the answer that God has given m e to your question about tribes of people throughout history that do not have access to the Gospel is that we are all unde rgoing multiple, progressive lifetimes in various circumstances of birth and becoming experienced in all that God's creati on has to offer us.

what many call evil is not an intelligent, malevolent being, but rather not-God, not-love, nothingness. and in the end we will be delivered to eternity with this God-love-being or nothingness.

the alternative is to believe that an all-powerful God created the universe and us with the foreknowledge that an angel w ould rebel and become the devil and lead many of his created humans, which He obstensibly loves, into eternal damnatio n and torture. No loving God would do such a thing, but that is what the Church is essentially saying, God created peop le (the unsaved) in order for them to go to hell with the devil?!

Don't worry about the unsaved tribes of the past or those of the present. God loves us all with the eternal blessings of lif e, as we approach the heart of our Savior. Down through the ages we are each allowed the choice to join Him or join the nothingness of the void.

Bubbaguy

**Re: tribes that wished they'd never heard of jesus - posted by c52 (), on: 2007/1/22 22:11**

Christopher was a Christian, the Spaniards that financed his voyage were Christians. Sadly, all they did was enslave an d decimate the "New Worlders" Check it out..." A People's History of the United States". The author Howard Zinn says th at Chris " called them Indians, because he mis-calculated the size of the earth". funny huh?

**Re: tribes that never heard of jesus, on: 2007/1/24 19:26**

jesse,

by now i hope (expect) that someone from this Sermon Index site has corresponded with you regarding your query. it is an important one.

i'm quite certain that those in correspondence with you may not have appreciated my comments and advised against the m.

you should understand that i value the Bible greatly and am a Christian (Quaker) yet, i interpret the Bible in a considerab ly different manner. where many hold that the events of the Old Testament were factual, i hold that some of these are fi gurative and representational. thus, Adam represents mankind, and was not an individual. another example would be th e Great Flood which covered the earth during Noah's time and killed all but his kin representing a devastating event winn owing mankind down to the very few people that genetic scientists now claim that all humans are descended from.

**General Topics :: tribes that never heard of Jesus**

i believe many of the stories of the Bible were authored and recorded as representational accounts much in the way that parables were told by Jesus. in fact, i think He is pointing to this in His testimonies recorded in the New Testament.

by restricting Biblical accounts to being literally true, much of the meaning and intentions of the authors is lost.

biblical literalism is a crutch for those with weak faith.

bubbaguy

i hope you discuss this issue further with your pastor and others.

**Re: - posted by Stan53 (), on: 2007/1/24 20:28**

Quote:  
-----i'm quite certain that those in correspondence with you may not have appreciated my comments and advised against them.  
-----

I am not a moderator, but I would advise as you have suggested. This being because, unfortunately the Bible doesn't support your view. What I am amazed at is that no one has stopped your false teaching. There are two questions to be asked. Is your teaching supported by the Bible, and does it glorify Christ. Yours fails both, therefore it is false teaching. The whole purpose of God's Word is to bring fallen man to repentance and salvation. As by one man, sin entered into the world, and so by one man sin is removed. Read Romans 5 for this subject please. It will make it far clearer. Your view of things doesn't take into account a Holy God who is utterly separate from sin. Your view says, it doesn't matter because if you don't come to a saving knowledge of Christ then it doesn't matter, you will cease to be. That view says, Fine do as you please. It doesn't say that literally but it certainly does theoretically. Your view of the Old Testament is not supported by the authors of the new. Let us not have false teaching please.

**Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/1/24 20:31**

Dear Bubbaguy,

Aren't we supposed to take the Bible literally? If we don't then we end up with a huge mess on our hands of trying to decide what to take literally and what is only a parable.

Bubbaguy wrote:  
"biblical literalism is a crutch for those with weak faith."

I strongly disagree with that. "Biblical literalism" has helped me in a great many areas because to many people were trying to give me counsel that wasn't from the Bible.

Jordan

**Re:, on: 2007/1/24 21:09**

bubbaguy said

Quote:  
-----we are all undergoing multiple, progressive lifetimes in various circumstances of birth and becoming experienced in all that God's creation has to offer us  
-----

Where does Jesus speak about reincarnation and karma?

**General Topics :: tribes that never heard of Jesus**

Quote:  
-----what many call evil is not an intelligent, malevolent being, but rather not-God, not-love, nothingness. and in the end we will be delivered to eternity with this God-love-being or nothingness.  
-----

So "nothing" tempted Jesus in the desert?

Quote:  
-----Down through the ages we are each allowed the choice to join Him or join the nothingness of the void.  
-----

So the "nothing" rich man burning in a lake of "nothingness" begging Abraham to send Lazarus to "nothingville" to drop some water on a "nothing's" tongue?

Quote:  
-----you should understand that i value the Bible greatly and am a Christian (Quaker) yet, i interpret the Bible in a considerably different manner  
-----

Sigh.

Quote:  
-----where many hold that the events of the Old Testament were factual, i hold that some of these are figurative and representational. thus, Adam represents mankind, and was not an individual. another example would be the Great Flood which covered the earth during Noah's time and killed all but his kin representing a devastating event winnowing mankind down to the very few people that genetic scientists now claim that all humans are descended from.  
-----

So, the Bible is part fact, part myth... and we must compromise its message and reinterpret it to "fit in" in with what intellectuals, scientists, and New Agers of every stripe believe.

Quote:  
-----by restricting Biblical accounts to being literally true, much of the meaning and intentions of the authors is lost.  
-----

No. The "meanings and intentions" are lost to "you", not us. The intellect cannot comprehend the Bible's truths without the aid of the Holy Spirit and a circumsized heart. I've tried and it nearly drove me mad.

Quote:  
-----biblical literalism is a crutch for those with weak faith.  
-----

Wrong again. Trying to mould God, Jesus, His prophets, and His Word to fit the world, science, and your personal "interpretations" is a crutch. Feel free to drive yourself mad by trying to use a flawed system (logic) designed by a flawed creature (man) to make sense of a flawed universe... but don't be asinine enough to think you can contemplate God, or His Word, into a box.

YOU fit into HIS plan. HE won't fit into yours.

You sure you're a Quaker? You've amalgamated science, religion, and New Age philosophy... I could swear you were a Theosophist or Freemason.

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/1/24 21:23**

Bubba wrote:

Quote:

-----by restricting Biblical accounts to being literally true, much of the meaning and intentions of the authors is lost.  
-----

Bubba, have you considered that when you believe this you will place yourself in the position where you will have to decide what is applicable, what is true, what is to be acted upon which in turn will make you a god? You will be the one who decides what is right, what is wrong! The first commandment is "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Do you not realize the seriousness of your view of the Scriptures? I am sorry, but I do not think you would make a good god! Do you ?

Quote:

-----i believe many of the stories of the Bible were authored and recorded as representational accounts much in the way that parables were told by Jesus.  
-----

Upon what authority do you make this assumption? Every parable Jesus spoke is identified as such. So how can you assume this is true of the other stories?

Sir, why do you want to believe this?

ginnyrose

**Re: tribes that never heard of jesus - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/1/24 21:37**

luckyd,

You have asked a question most people at some time wrestle with. Did you ever consider Romans 1: 19-25: Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them.  
20: For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:  
21: Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.  
22: Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools,  
23: And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things.  
24: Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves:  
25: Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen.

Brother, there are stories of people whom the LORD revealed himself to who had no previous knowledge of Him at all. There is Sammy Morris, who lived in the early 1900s; Bilquis Sheikh, a Muslim woman - this account is recorded in the book "I Dared to Call Him Father". I have heard this is happening today in the Muslim world where the gospel is hidden from the people. In these cases God will often use dreams and visions to communicate.

In thinking about this issue, did you ever consider we may err into believing that if they would know they would all accept the LORD? But that is not true either - people today are resistant to the Gospel and according to Romans 1 I am of the mind God knows who will accept him and will reveal himself to them.

This is my understanding...hope it will help ..

Blessings,  
ginnyrose

**Re: Been here - posted by crsschk (), on: 2007/1/24 22:36**

Quote:  
-----the answer that God has given me to your question about tribes of people throughout history that do not have access to the Gospel is that we are all undergoing multiple, progressive lifetimes in various circumstances of birth and becoming experienced in all that God's creation has to offer us.  
-----

Quote:  
-----"biblical literalism is a crutch for those with weak faith."  
-----

Piecing these two together it could also be said;

"Biblical faith is the alternative for the answer that God has given me."

'Bubba' has been with us here for some time and in light of the recent posts here for some humbling and charity amongst ourselves it is difficult to say much more towards all this.

I do not know what it is that you seek to convince anyone here nor has it apparently been any use to mine all that is available here to move you to other considerations. No change of mind or heart just 'your interpretations'... We have covered this ground with a great deal of patience I believe in many past threads.

What is it you seek?

**Re: tribes that never heard of jesus - posted by Meriwether, on: 2007/1/24 23:47**

The scripture reference in Romans from ginnyrose says it all, conclusively.

I'd like to add that I don't think people go to hell because they haven't heard the gospel. It is my understanding that people go to hell because they are sinners. (Listen to Paris Reidhead's "Ten Shekels and a Shirt.")

For this reason, we should be in anguish over the lost. We should be committed and deliberate about witnessing and sharing our faith.

C.M.

**Re:, on: 2007/1/25 4:27**

This is part of the reason for my thread "Concerning God's Grace". The message of salvation is more than preaching the message as we have wrongly been taught to do. It is to be about preaching the message of the Good News of Jesus Christ who ushered in a new way to live called the Kingdom of God, through Him as the head of this new Government. Many in the world wait to hear this message. They wait with prepared hearts because they have recognized Grace as presented them to their understanding and live according to it, however imperfect their endeavors. It is a heart issue and God foreknows who they are who have a heart for Him.

Jesus Said, "Go and make disciples". He never said to go and get people saved. It should be obvious that what I am saying is that they already are and the message given should be about the kingdom of God and its Leadership. We make the mistake of making the message to be about heaven and hell when to many, from God's perspective, it isn't. God wants sons and birthed into His kingdom, not just "saved" people with only fire insurance policies in their hand standing before Him in that day.

5 pointers would do well to embrace this for better understanding of their 5 points.

Orm

**General Topics :: tribes that never heard of Jesus**

**Re:, on: 2007/1/25 9:36**

From evangelist Ray Comfort...

"Will people who have never heard the gospel all go to hell because they haven't heard about Jesus Christ?"

No one will go to hell because they haven't heard of Jesus Christ. The heathen will go to hell for murder, rape, adultery, lust, theft, lying, etc. Sin is not failing to hear the gospel. Rather, "sin is the transgression of the Law" (1 John 3:4). If we really care about the lost, we will become missionaries and take the good news of God's forgiveness in Christ to them.

The first few chapters of Romans clears this up as stated earlier.

bubbaguy - Do you consider yourself to be a good person?

-Jim

**Re: - posted by MSeaman (), on: 2007/1/25 9:43**

Quote:

-----bubbaguy - Do you consider yourself to be a good person?  
-----

Even though I know you are serious, I had to laugh because this is the main 'Way of the Master' question...if I was a gambler, I'd bet the answer to that question is 'yes.'

:-P

I agree with what everyone else has posted here with the exception of bubbaguy, because he is wrong.

**Re:, on: 2007/1/25 17:07**

To all that responded, I thank you for your consideration.

Several of you have mentioned the Holy Spirit. This is of essential concern to Quakers as the promise of Christ is that, where two or more are gathered in His name, He will be with us. Unprogrammed Quakers "wait upon the Lord" in silent, meditative worship and all are expected to minister to the group when moved to do so by the Holy Spirit. There is no clergy involved in these worship services, none is needed. (George Fox, one of the founders of the Religious Society of Friends (called Quakers) was a minister, self-taught, and many of religious education participate in the Society. We historically defer to elders in matters of controversy and contention, yet at times "stubborn" members have changed the beliefs of the whole. John Wollman, through a long travelling ministry, convinced the entire Society of Friends to abandon slavery, and it was soon after that the U.S. did so.

My perspective and point of view has been informed over the years through participation in Meeting for Worship as well as investigation of the world and through personal prayer and meditation. I have concluded that God would not create an archeological record that clearly displays sequential geological ages and an evolutionary fossil pattern of life as some kind of hoax upon man or a test to see if we will believe the Word or the geological evidence.

The record and other evidence shows humans emerging from the *Australopithecus afarensis* line of hominoids about 2 million years ago.

We also know that every culture of humans has had creation stories that are mythological, figurative, and have representational meanings bound up in them. These stories tell important truths about human nature and our relationship with the creation and Creator. Why should the stories of the Hebrews be any different or special?

I am convinced of the saving Grace of Christ's sacrifice because the Holy Spirit is present in worship and at other times, as promised by Christ. and the truths spoken by Jesus -- love your enemies!?! -- go beyond judgement and give us a gli

mpse of the perfection that is God the Father.

I will never believe that God would create the devil, which is what the conventional Christian church teaches us. the devil is a personification of evil which is something against Goodness, and Not the opposite, parallel of it. the spiritual universe is unipolar, and not bipolar (heaven and hell as equal opposites.) those convinced the existence of evil and who identify with the devil as real will expect eternal life in hell with the devil, but they will indeed weep and nash their teeth when they realize that at judgement, time comes to an end and they will simply be removed from it altogether, and it will be as if they never existed in the first place.

am i a good guy? i try, but like all i fail, here and there. i am trying to be sincere and open in approaching the spiritual world as well as the world of science. i try to live so that others benefit from what God has given me. i have worked on a drought relief, food distribution program in Africa, worked with Native Americans to get justice in the US and volunteered in many nonprofit, community projects.

in the end, no one is a "good guy", as we all come up short and need Grace. my problem with so much of what goes on at SI is that everything is rigid fundamentalism. it's a control game played by many in the clergy. i say, open your minds and spirits to the creation and the ever present Spirit and you will find your way. if you let a Christian pastor tell you that the theory of evolution is an evil idea produced to confuse those who love the Word of God, then religion is being used to dumb down and stifle the mind.

bubbaguy

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/1/25 18:49**

So, Bubba, do you have an point of reference that is unchanging? One that exists apart from human reasoning, logic?

ginnyrose

**Re:, on: 2007/1/25 18:53**

Quote:

ginnyrose wrote:

So, Bubba, do you have an point of reference that is unchanging? One that exists apart from human reasoning, logic?

ginnyrose

Great question, one I'd like to read and answer to because all I have read is human reasoning, much of what I don't find sincere. But that is just my human understanding....or perhaps something outside myself called, insight?

Orm

**Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/1/25 19:05**

Bubba wrote:"The record and other evidence shows humans emerging from the australeopithicus afarensis line of hominiods about 2 million years ago."

Please refresh my memory on the evidence. Much evidence has been shown to support the Bible literally.

In Christ, Jordan

**Re:, on: 2007/1/25 20:29**

Jordan, here's a website with current info.

<http://www.archaeologyinfo.com/evolution.htm>

Ginnyrose, regarding an absolute to stand by, that is the love demonstrated by Jesus. to love those who hate you sounds kinda crazy, but it is a standard that I hope to be able to at least approach in life. knowing that i fail.

bubbaguy

**Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/1/25 20:43**

Quote:

-----that is the love demonstrated by Jesus.  
-----

How do you know what "the love demonstrated by Jesus" is?

**Re:, on: 2007/1/25 20:59**

PreachParsly,

The daily newspaper routinely contains significant errors due to miscommunications, bias, egos, personnel issues, etc. but I trust them to tell me who runs the government and reliably provide much information. i get the same from the Bible . there's lots of information being presented in lots of ways and if i use the brain and reasoning that God gave me i can sort out most of it and the rest i leave to the Leadings of the Spirit. so, yes, i rely upon the Bible to tell me that Jesus existed, preached a message of forgiveness of sins, and died upon the cross at the hands of the Romans. but i'm not about to just throw all human reasoning away and uncritically accept stories in the Bible that are obviously not factual or literal, nor intended to be by their authors.

bub

**Re: - posted by beenblake (), on: 2007/1/25 21:03**

Dear Bubbaguy,

Quote:

-----the alternative is to believe that an all-powerful God created the universe and us with the foreknowledge that an angel would rebel and become the devil and lead many of his created humans, which He ostensibly loves, into eternal damnation and torture. No loving God would do such a thing, but that is what the Church is essentially saying, God created people (the unsaved) in order for them to go to hell with the devil?!

The problem with the above statement is where you say, "God created the unsaved." God did not create anyone unsaved. The choice to defy God's Word was our own. You cannot remove accountability.

God created us for love. In order to love, we must be able to make a willing choice. We must be able to believe in God by our own will. This is our choice, and God honors that choice.

People are led by the Devil, but the choice is ours. God will not force anyone to accept Jesus as Lord. God will not force anyone to reject the Devil as Leader, either.

God did not create anyone for Hell. A person is sent to Hell based upon his or her choice. God honors their choice.

Quote:



-----all undergoing multiple, progressive lifetimes  
-----

The problem with this theory is that we do not take knowledge from one lifetime to another. Who has previous knowledge of another life? Do you?

God knows the heart of all people, and He judges by the heart. If a person is truly seeking the truth, God Himself, then He will send someone bearing the gospel.

If the person in one life did not seek the Lord with his or her heart, why would a second life be needed? Do you not think the Lord could redeem a person in the lifetime He has given them to live?

Whether God allows a person to live 18 seconds or 110 years, He knows what is in their heart. He also knows how long it will take to make their heart fertile for planting the gospel seed. Don't you think the Lord would give everyone just enough time to accomplish His purpose?

Just some things to consider.

In love,  
Your brother in Christ,  
Blake

**Re:, on: 2007/1/25 21:17**

Quote:  
-----

beenblake wrote:  
Dear Bubbaguy,

Quote:  
-----

-----the alternative is to believe that an all-powerful God created the universe and us with the foreknowledge that an angel would rebel and become the devil and lead many of his created humans, which He ostensibly loves, into eternal damnation and torture. No loving God would do such a thing, but that is what the Church is essentially saying, God created people (the unsaved) in order for them to go to hell with the devil?!

The problem with the above statement is where you say, "God created the unsaved." God did not create anyone unsaved. The choice to defy God's Word was our own. You cannot remove accountability.

God created us for love. In order to love, we must be able to make a willing choice. We must be able to believe in God by our own will. This is our choice, and God honors that choice.

People are led by the Devil, but the choice is ours. God will not force anyone to accept Jesus as Lord. God will not force anyone to reject the Devil as Leader, either.

God did not create anyone for Hell. A person is sent to Hell based upon his or her choice. God honors their choice.

Quote:  
-----

-----all undergoing multiple, progressive lifetimes  
-----

The problem with this theory is that we do not take knowledge from one lifetime to another. Who has previous knowledge of another life? Do you?

God knows the heart of all people, and He judges by the heart. If a person is truly seeking the truth, God Himself, then He will send someone bearing the gospel.

If the person in one life did not seek the Lord with his or her heart, why would a second life be needed? Do you not think the Lord could redeem a person in the lifetime He has given them to live?

Whether God allows a person to live 18 seconds or 110 years, He knows what is in their heart. He also knows how long it will take to make their heart fertile for planting the gospel seed. Don't you think the Lord would give everyone just enough time to accomplish His purpose?

Just some things to consider.

In love,  
Your brother in Christ,  
Blake  
-----

A-hem, Blake, my friend, me thinks you have some rethinking to do over in another thread, don't you believe so?

Orm

**Re:, on: 2007/1/25 21:19**

Blake,

Why would an allknowing, allpowerful God create a person knowing that they will reject Him in the future and go to hell?  
does a perfect God create inferior beings that have such bad judgement?

bub

**Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/1/25 21:25**

Quote:  
-----but i'm not about to just throw all human reasoning away and uncritically accept stories in the Bible that are obviously not factual or literal, nor intended to be by their authors.  
-----

How do you know if something is factual or not? What is your standard?

**Re: - posted by beenblake (), on: 2007/1/25 21:35**

Dear bubbaguy,

Quote:  
-----if you let a Christian pastor tell you that the theory of evolution is an evil idea produced to confuse those who love the Word of God, then religion is being used to dumb down and stifle the mind.  
-----

Paul said we should test all things. I do believe this is true even for matters of science. The foundation of science is based upon testing, though its results are objective and empirically based versus spiritually based.

As for the matter of evolution, have you studied this theory in depth? Do you find that it agrees with what you believe about God?

The theory of evolution bears some truth based upon observable evidence, but it has also been quickly introduced into many areas of science including anthropology where the evidence is blurry, if non-existent.

Micro-evolution has been proven. We can easily see evolution at work on a cellular level where the genes from man and woman are passed to form a new born baby. However, macro-evolution has no firm basis and is often contradictory to the relationship of man and God. Primarily this is seen in the explanation of morality and the development of self and love. Evolution basically says that humanity has evolved from animals. This means that our "free will" or ability to love did not come from God. Rather, this trait or quality that exists in humanity came about from a process of genetic mutation.

Where evolution and theology conflict is in the purpose of humankind. Evolution does not embrace love as the purpose that humanity was created. It does not embrace our call for holiness, righteousness, or authority. Rather, according to evolution, humanity is merely an animal that has evolved into a new species. We have no purpose. We are merely a freak

accident that happened by chance.

Is this what you believe? Do you think God intentionally created us to love one another, or do you think humanity evolved by an accidental genetic mutation?

Now, I have heard some say, "Evolution is the process by which God created all life." However, this also contradicts.

Firstly, if God had used this process of evolution to develop all the species on earth, then there would be more variations between the species. You would not see clear cut distinctions between say cats and dogs, as there would be more variations between species. Instead, we see variations within a species without any crossing to another.

Secondly, there has been yet a successful cross between species. We cannot mate a dog and cat to produce a new species. A donkey and horse may produce a mule when mated, however, mules cannot reproduce.

Thirdly, death entered the world through sin. Before sin, there was no death. Therefore, if Adam had evolved from humans, those creatures were still alive at the time Adam sinned. In fact, all the variations of evolution would have existed at the time of Adam. You would have seen living evidence between a single cell to Adam Himself.

However, evolution has no explanation as to why anything ages and dies. Many surmise that aging is caused by a gene. However, if this were true, would not this gene have faded out of the gene pool first?

Fourthly, God created each to their own kind. When God created, He established different kinds. He established unique species. We applied this to everything on earth. A stone is different from dirt is different from clouds is different from grass. God established things with properties and characteristics. We have discovered unique elements that give way atomic ally to all things.

Lastly, evolution proposes ([http://evolution.berkeley.edu/evolibrary/article/0\\_0\\_0/evo\\_16](http://evolution.berkeley.edu/evolibrary/article/0_0_0/evo_16)) four mechanisms of change. The only one of the four that can produce a previously unknown species or trait that has never existed is by genetic mutation. This mutation results because of an "error." If evolution is true, then all life has come about because of an "error". Do you believe this? Is humanity just one big mistake?

Some things to make you think,

In love,  
Blake

**Re:, on: 2007/1/25 21:36**

of course, that depends upon the issue at hand, standards vary. for instance, 29 times 3 can be verified to be exactly 87. but that's not what you are getting at, is it?

what's your real question?

**Re:, on: 2007/1/25 21:48**

Blake quote:

"Where evolution and theology conflict is in the purpose of humankind. Evolution does not embrace love as the purpose that humanity was created. It does not embrace our call for holiness, righteousness, or authority. Rather, according to evolution, humanity is merely an animal that has evolved into a new species. We have no purpose. We are merely a freak accident that happened by chance."

I agree with this, as far as it goes. Science doesn't hold humankind as a special, Holy beings. and there is "that of God" in each person which is not something evolution can explain. in this way i see these two as being complimentary, rather than in conflict. Christianity explains for me the lost soul of man and science the physical container. God bless you all,

Bubbaguy

Re: - posted by beenblake (), on: 2007/1/25 21:57

Dear Bubba,

Quote:

-----Why would an allknowing, allpowerful God create a person knowing that they will reject Him in the future and go to hell?  
-----

This is the same question a rebellious teenager asks his parents when his life is filled with pain. Why would any parent have children fully knowing that they will suffer on this earth?

There are several reasons for this. Firstly, the "evil" ones are allowed to live to fulfill God's purpose. They help bring God's people into repentance. Secondly, God's will for everyone is that we love God and live with Him forever. A person is sent to Hell for defying God's will. A person is sent to Hell for their choice. God made His choice. He chose to give that person life. The person then made a choice to oppose God. The person suffers in Hell for eternity because God's Will is eternal. He does not change. God's eternal desires is that we live forever with Him in love. However, a person suffers in Hell for eternity because they have rejected Him.

If God changed His perfect will for that person to have life, then God's will would not be perfect would it? Do you think God should change His Will just because a person rejects Him?

You cannot ask God to do this. God is love. His will is His love. In love, God desired to give a person life. If God were ever to change His Will, then He would be acting contrary to His nature. God loves us so much that He has allowed us this choice.

God is love. Hell is a testimony to the love of God. God loves us so much, He is willing to let us have what we want.

Quote:

-----does a perfect God create inferior beings that have such bad judgement?  
-----

Again, you just do not understand. Our choice is not simply a matter of "bad judgment." Our choice is not a mental activity. Our choice is a spiritual one that happens in our heart. Love is an eternal choice. Whoever says, "I will love you for a few days, but that's all." We always say, "I will love you forever." It is foolish, because we die, but we still say it.

We all have bad judgment. Who is not ignorant. Who can see all things?

Those who go to Hell are not "inferior." They do not go to Hell because they are lesser. Hell is a place of immense honor. God honors a person so much, He sends them to Hell. He could easily just annihilate them and remove their choice. Instead, He says, "If you don't want to love me, then I honor your choice. You may be with the one you love." The only problem is that the one they love lives in Hell.

Hope this helps,

In love,  
Blake

Re: - posted by beenblake (), on: 2007/1/25 22:00

Quote:

-----A-hem, Blake, my friend, me thinks you have some rethinking to do over in another thread, don't you believe so?  
-----

Nothing I have said conflicts. If it does, then please show me. Feel free to put me on public display. If you prove my word s to be contradictory, I will admit my fault. I have made mistakes before, just ask Krispy.

In love,  
Blake

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/1/25 22:14

Buba wrote:

Quote:

-----but i'm not about to just throw all human reasoning away and uncritically accept stories in the Bible that are obviously not factual or l  
iteral, nor intended to be by their authors.  
-----

How do you know the Bible stories are not factual or literal?

ginnyrose

Re:, on: 2007/1/25 22:51

GinnyRose,

of course it depends upon the story. but let's pick Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel for starters. There just has to be more people to begin the human race with than this! there is no mention of others being created or where they might have co me from.

the story is clearly told to convey a message about mankind and his relationship to a creator God. that's the important pa rt, not the rib stuff.

bub

Could you be wrong? - posted by crsschk (), on: 2007/1/26 0:22

Quote:

-----  
I will never believe that God would create the devil,  
-----

Yet He created you ...and me.

Quote:

-----which is what the conventional Christian church teaches us.  
-----

Created angel and fallen devil.

Quote:

-----the devil is a personification of evil which is something against Goodness, and Not the opposite, parallel of it. the spiritual universe i s unipolar, and not bipolar (heaven and hell as equal opposites.) those convinced the existence of evil and who identify with the devil as real will expec t eternal life in hell with the devil, but they will indeed weep and nash their teeth when they realize that at judgement, time comes to an end and they wi ll simply be removed from it altogether, and it will be as if they never existed in the first place.  
-----

Or annihilation, how wonderful! Then there is absolutely no point nor concern whatsoever ... just pphht or Heaven.

You are not convinced of *the existence of evil*? The guy who robbed you, last year was it? misguided? Hungry? Drug addict ... Bored? Why bother doing all these humanitarian projects you mention?

Isa 5:20 Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!

For all the nefarious notions you have attempted to bring forth here ... you have grown worse.

Quote:

-----I am convinced of the saving Grace of Christ's sacrifice because ...  
-----

Because what? Saved *from* .... what? Christ's sacrifice for ... what? A non-existent evil?

Sin  
SIN, n.

1. The voluntary departure of a moral agent from a known rule of rectitude or duty, prescribed by God; any voluntary transgression of the divine law, or violation of a divine command; a wicked act; iniquity. Sin is either a positive act in which a known divine law is violated, or it is the voluntary neglect to obey a positive divine command, or a rule of duty clearly implied in such command. Sin comprehends not action only, but neglect of known duty, all evil thoughts purposes, words and desires, whatever is contrary to God's commands or law. 1 John 3. Mat 15. James 4. Sinner neither enjoy the pleasures of nor the peace of piety. Among divines, sin is original or actual. Actual sin, above defined, is the act of a moral agent in violating a known rule of duty. Original sin, as generally understood, is native depravity of heart to the divine will, that corruption of nature or deterioration of the moral character of man, which is supposed to be the effect of Adam's apostasy; and which manifests itself in moral agents by positive act of disobedience to the divine will, or by the voluntary neglect to comply with the express commands of God, which require that we should love God with all the heart and soul and strength and mind, and our neighbor as ourselves. This native depravity or alienation of affections from God and his law, is supposed to be what the apostle calls the carnal mind or mindedness, which is enmity against God, and is therefore denominated sin or sinfulness. Unpardonable sin, or blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, is supposed to be a malicious and obstinate rejection of Christ and the gospel plan of salvation, or a contemptuous resistance made to the influences and convictions of the Holy Spirit. Mat 12.

2. A sin-offering; an offering made to atone for sin. He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin. 2 Cor 5.

3. A man enormously wicked.

4. Sin differs from crime, not in nature, but in application. That which is a crime against society, is sin against God.

SIN, v.i.

1. To depart voluntarily from the path of duty prescribed by God man; to violate the divine law in any particular, by actual transgression or by the neglect or non-observance of its injunctions; to violate any known rule of duty. All have sinned and come short of the glory of God. Rom 3. Against thee, thee only, have I sinned. Psa 51.

2. To offend against right, against men or society; to trespass. I am a man more sinned against than sinning. And who but wishes to invert the laws of order, sins against the eternal cause.

SIN, for since, obsolete or vulgar.

Sin  
H2403

&#1495;&#1496;&#1468;&#1488;&#1514; &#1495;&#1496;&#1468;&#1488;&#1492;  
chat&#803;t&#803;a&#770;'a&#770;h chat&#803;t&#803;a&#770;'th  
khat-taw-aw', khat-tawth'

From H2398; an offence (sometimes habitual sinfulness), and its penalty, occasion, sacrifice, or expiation; also (concret

ely) an offender: - punishment (of sin), purifying (-fication for sin), sin (-ner, offering).

Evil

H7451

&#1512;&#1506;&#1492; &#1512;&#1506;

ra&#8219; ra&#770;&#8219;a&#770;h

rah, raw-aw'

From H7489; bad or (as noun) evil (naturally or morally). This includes the second (feminine) form; as adjective or noun: - adversity, affliction, bad, calamity, + displeasure (-ure), distress, evil (, man, thing), + exceedingly, X great, grief (-vous), harm, heavy, hurt (-ful), ill (favoured), + mark, mischief, (-vous), misery, naught (-ty), noisome, + not please, sad (-ly), so re, sorrow, trouble, vex, wicked (-ly, -ness, one), worse (-st) wretchedness, wrong.

Devil

G1228

&#948;&#953;&#945;&#769;&#946;&#959;&#955;&#959;&#962;

diabolos

dee-ab'-ol-os

From G1225; a traducer; specifically Satan (compare ): - false accuser, devil, slanderer.

Satan

H7854

&#1513;&#1474;&#1496;&#1503;

s&#769;a&#770;t&#803;a&#770;n

saw-tawn'

From H7853; an opponent; especially (with the article prefixed) Satan, the arch enemy of good: - adversary, Satan, with stand.

Quote:

-----my problem with so much of what goes on at SI is that everything is rigid fundamentalism. it's a control game played by many in the clergy

Which is what I am sure you will find all the above to be, "rigid" fundamentalism. You prefer to mock the very thing you profess to hold to which is often a complex weave of contradictions making a nice out for yourself and an easy application as to so much that *goes on here*. It is all quite absurd. You have as much pride as the devil you believe to be some caricature, some abstract notion or allegory.

You probably are the kindest and most charitable devil that has come through here but no less one regardless. And of course that will just roll right off of you otherwise I would hardly make the utterance. I also realize you will again ignore the more pressing questions posed to you and only tackle and defend your notions and interpretations anyway. Nothing has changed your mind or seemingly given you pause for consideration, you are above it all and we, the 'fundamentalists' are so far below your open minded appreciation for ... any spirit that tickles your funny bone. Rather frightening it is to hear you suggest opening the mind up against 'the control game' as you see it, when you cannot even recognize what this loss of control is allowing you to not even consider.

It is rather perplexing in a way to hear you again 'Bubba' (That is not a slight to any reading this, just a lot of past history here). After all the long threads on evolution (which I personally could care less about in light of so much heart disease of a very serious spiritual and natural sort) and almost a defending of yourself not due to your notions but because of a hope that maybe some of this might cause you to reconsider ... What is it honestly that you think you are going to be able to contribute or challenge a great audience of sincerely God loving Brethren that have come here to share and search their hearts, find the real truth of so much ... pretense out in the world and the world of "Christendom"? Is this really about "control"? Here? Seriously? The great attempt to practically ignore so many denominational pursuits and find the gems or seeds that cut across all these lines of history. Tremendous challenges up against even some long held 'doctrines' ... "Control"? I think there is a great dismantling of pretense and falsity in all its forms, the vast majority here are far more concerned with manipulation and 'control' than you know or may admit to.

That 'we' as a whole have practically turned back-wards to search and find old paths is not some trip down memory lane

or a sentimental romanticism. These are hungry saints. This is life and death, this is no game. How absurd.

Stranger still, hardly am I even remotely angry however this sounds, it's too long as usual... I just don't know that any pleading and questioning and learning or humbling or reconsidering is possible. You wish to tear to shreds that which is held in high esteem, the scriptures and here I was just foolish to think that Ron's (Philologos) challenges to you were often too ... strenuous and thus the 'moderator hat' intervention, holding out hope. To my opinion? Hardly, am half way to the beginning it seems most often, but that you can so easily disallow and ignore whole large sections of what is written to suit your preconceived notions and assumptions is ... incredible.

I know this is a large waste of time sadly. Perhaps it's for others benefit. Perhaps you might read through this terrible rigid fundamental controlling bit just to see how far from it you really are ... it's difficult not to be cynical, I just do not know what else there is;

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic\\_id10733&forum34&post\\_id&refreshGo](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id10733&forum34&post_id&refreshGo)) Jonathan Edwards - Undiscerned Spiritual Pride

**Re: - posted by beenblake (), on: 2007/1/26 8:25**

Hey Bubbaguy,

I just wanted to say that everything I said was in love, and I hope it was received in love as well.

May Christ be yours,

Blake

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/1/26 9:33**

Bubba,

Do you not see that you are falling for the same line that Eve did when the Serpent asked her "Yea, hath God said...?" This caused her to rationalize: (Gen. 3:6) It was good for food, pleasant to the eyes, and a tree desired to make one wise

In using a "pick and choose" approach to the Scripture are you not doing what Eve did in seeing the BOOK as one which contains ideas which will make you wise? Sir, I fear for you....

Your posts remind me of a quote by Ravi Zacharias: Is it possible that somewhere in the deepest recesses of the human heart we are not really battling intellectual ideas as much as fighting for the right of our sexual proclivities and our passionate indulgences?

~Ravi Zacharias, Lessons from the Battle of Ideas, 11-21. Does this apply here?

Sir, I fear for you....

ginnyrose

PS: BTW, I am not clergy, just a 59 YO wife, mother and grandmother to 8 children. I do not believe someone just because he says he is clergy. The Bible is my point of reference and the Holy Spirit confirms it in my Spirit. When the Bible uses words like "is", "was", "shall be", "must" I take it to mean that exactly. Need no other human logic to understand that - even a child knows that much!

**Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/1/26 11:14**

Bubba wrote: "of course it depends upon the story. but let's pick Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel for starters. There just has to be more people to begin the human race with than this! there is no mention of others being created or where they might have come from."

[http://www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/tools/cains\\_wife.asp](http://www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/tools/cains_wife.asp)



**Re: - posted by Chariot, on: 2007/1/26 11:19**

bubbaguy

i've been following your post carefully and still i have a hard time trying figure out how you draw some of your conclusions.

When i read stuff like "there just has to be" and "there is no mention of" and then conclude with a statement like "the story is clearly told" i have to say that is just poor reasoning. So was "the rib stuff" nothing more than extra filler or an overlooked redundancy? If not then what does it convey? Do you believe in the virgin birth?

Its hard to tell from your post, but do you believe Cain and Abel were real people or mythical figures? If mythical, was Jesus then referring to the mythical blood of a mythical Abel in Matthew 23:35 when he says, "That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias...". If that be the case, would'nt we have to conclude that Zacharias is also a mythical figure?

Stretching back to the first page you wrote:

Quote:

-----by restricting Biblical accounts to being literally true, much of the meaning and intentions of the authors is lost.

biblical literalism is a crutch for those with weak faith.  
-----

I believe you have it backwards, when i was weak in faith i was looking for any reason to substitute my own thoughts for Biblical writ. Restricting the Biblical accounts means avoiding harmful or errant interpretations of what we 'think' the authors might have meant or intended. It allows you to come up with empty concepts like the redundant nothingness of the void, nothing more than a euphemism for HELL. Not trying to sound harsh, but that looks to me like someone grabbing for a crutch.

**Re: Could you be wrong?, on: 2007/1/26 11:55**

quote:

"You are not convinced of the existence of evil? The guy who robbed you, last year was it? misguided? Hungry? Drug addict ... Bored? Why bother doing all these humanitarian projects you mention?"

Isa 5:20 Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!"

Mike, i haven't yet finished reading your post but wanted to respond to this right away. yes there is a whole litany of the confoundingly stupid and unproductive activities of mankind. and there is a mindset held by some that is against Good for merely antagonistic reasons. i don't see these as "evil" in the sense that some malevolent spiritual force is guiding or directing them. they are nothing more than callousness, stupidity, and blindness. they are not the opposite of love, which is directed by a creative Spiritual force inherent in the universe that we identify as God the Father.

i am not calling good evil, nor evil good. i am saying that the conception and personification of the devil as the source of evil is just and only that. adam and eve ate of the apple because they didn't heed the warning of the consequences that would follow, this is not productive and is stupid behavior, but i don't see it as the equivalent opposite of the force of love

Bubbaguy

PS. question: Did Adam have a belly button?

:-P :-P

**Re: Could you be wrong?, on: 2007/1/26 12:29**

Mike and fellow SI participants:

you make a good point in asking me what i'm trying to do. here it is; this ministry proports to propagate and support the teachings of the Christian Church and the sermons and ministry of evangelical Christianity. as a Christian i don't like to see what i consider shaky foundations being put underneath the Gospel of Jesus. when the devil (to use your conception) comes along and gives the fundamentalist Church a good wacking, it will come apart at the seams because its foundation excludes everything that God's creation around us is telling us. when you have convinced your followers that science and evolution are of the devil and that hard sciences don't matter in the face of THE WORD, then you are endangering people spiritually. i chose this online ministry at random one day long ago because it seemed like there were some thoughtful people corresponding about serious issues in an open and Christian manner. I am grateful for the chance to participate and voice my perhaps too frequent or persistent contrarian positions, but i mean no ill will nor abuse of you, sir. a friend recently reminded me when i was lamenting a seemingly intractable situation that the only activity to address it was prayer. good advice.

Bubbaguy

**Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/1/26 12:56**

Bubbaguy,

I know your being swamped with posts, but I am curious to know what your authority is in truth? How do you know of something is true or not?

By what standard do you compare a "story" to see if it is true or not?

**Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/1/26 13:06**

Hi Bubbaguy,

Quote:

-----when you have convinced your followers that science and evolution are of the devil and that hard sciences don't matter  
-----

This is an untrue statement that does not face up to the real problems with evolution...which is as much philosophy as it is science. It also should be acknowledged that opposition to evolution exists in the proper 'scientific community' and is not an exclusively Christian position.

There are no 'followers' here...not in the sense you imply with customary hubris. "Of the devil" is irrelevant...the simple fact of the matter is that evolution presents irrational and impossible problems to the honest intellect. To call it "hard science" is plainly a misnomer. It's inability to answer many persistent chasm sized questions...such as explaining the first cell, or the survivability of half-formed organs and appendages, demonstrates that Evolutionary Theory is a belief system can't be defended through measurement or observation alone, but must be organized and discussed along prior philosophic (and even political) commitments.

MC

**Re: - posted by taco, on: 2007/1/26 14:03**

Quote:  
----- It also should be acknowledged that opposition to evolution exists in the proper 'scientific community' and is not an exclusively Christian position.  
-----

Have you any sources to back this up?

(not a challenge, a genuine question)

**Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/1/26 14:30**

Hi Taco,

Here are just a few books that take Evolutionary Theory to task, researched and written by secular "Ivy" league professors and scientists. These authors are not advocating Short Earth Creationism per se. Nevertheless they have concluded, in light of developments in fields as scientifically rigorous as Biochemistry and Mathematics, that Evolution must be rejected as a credible theory for explaining our origins.

([http://www.amazon.com/Darwins-Black-Box-Biochemical-Challenge/dp/0684834936/refpd\\_sim\\_b\\_1/002-5415958-1454438](http://www.amazon.com/Darwins-Black-Box-Biochemical-Challenge/dp/0684834936/refpd_sim_b_1/002-5415958-1454438)) Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution

([http://www.amazon.com/Evolution-Theory-Crisis-Michael-Denton/dp/091756152X/refpd\\_sim\\_b\\_5/002-5415958-1454438](http://www.amazon.com/Evolution-Theory-Crisis-Michael-Denton/dp/091756152X/refpd_sim_b_5/002-5415958-1454438)) Evolution: A Theory in Crisis

([http://www.amazon.com/Darwin-Trial-Phillip-E-Johnson/dp/0830813241/refpd\\_sim\\_b\\_1/002-5415958-1454438](http://www.amazon.com/Darwin-Trial-Phillip-E-Johnson/dp/0830813241/refpd_sim_b_1/002-5415958-1454438)) Darwin on Trial

([http://www.amazon.com/Uncommon-Dissent-Intellectuals-Darwinism-Unconvincing/dp/1932236317/refpd\\_sxp\\_grid\\_pt\\_2\\_2/002-5415958-1454438](http://www.amazon.com/Uncommon-Dissent-Intellectuals-Darwinism-Unconvincing/dp/1932236317/refpd_sxp_grid_pt_2_2/002-5415958-1454438)) Uncommon Dissent: Intellectuals Who Find Darwinism Unconvincing

([http://www.amazon.com/Design-Inference-Eliminating-Probabilities-Probability/dp/0521678676/refpd\\_sxp\\_grid\\_i\\_0\\_2/002-5415958-1454438](http://www.amazon.com/Design-Inference-Eliminating-Probabilities-Probability/dp/0521678676/refpd_sxp_grid_i_0_2/002-5415958-1454438)) The Design Inference: Eliminating Chance through Small Probabilities. (Cambridge Studies in Probability Induction and Decision Theory)

([http://www.amazon.com/Reason-Balance-Against-Naturalism-Education/dp/0830819290/refpd\\_sim\\_b\\_2/002-5415958-1454438](http://www.amazon.com/Reason-Balance-Against-Naturalism-Education/dp/0830819290/refpd_sim_b_2/002-5415958-1454438)) Reason in the Balance: The Case Against Naturalism in Science, Law & Education

MC

**Re: - posted by taco, on: 2007/1/26 14:53**

I am not sure that most of these IDers would be accepted by the scientific community at large. This of course doesn't throw their arguments out. Most of them do believe in, what most evangelicals would see as, evolution. They possibly reject that life itself started by a random process or that evolution was not directed in some way. But I think you will find that they will all agree that humans had non human ancestors somewhere along the line. I get the impression that this is the bit that evangelicals have a problem with.

I doubt very much that there is a credible biologist that believes that human beings just appeared on the earth without any ancestry behind them. I would be amazed if there were such.

Doesn't bother me personally. I am here one way or the other :-)

**Re: - posted by taco, on: 2007/1/26 14:57**

oh, and thanks for the links some of those books look very interesting.

I have final exams coming up shortly and when they are finished I think I will take time to read some of them. I am fascinated by all things scientific.

**Whacky ... - posted by crsschk (), on: 2007/1/26 15:50**

Quote:  
-----here it is; this ministry proports to propagate and support the teachings of the Christian Church and the sermons and ministry of evangelical Christianity. as a Christian i don't like to see what i consider shaky foundations being put underneath the Gospel of Jesus. when the devil (to use your conceptioning) comes along and gives the fundamentalist Church a good whacking, it will come apart at the seams because its foundation excludes everything that God's creation around us is telling us. when you have convinced your followers that science and evolution are of the devil and that hard sciences don't matter in the face of THE WORD, then you are endangering people spiritually.  
-----

I don't know quite what to make of that... As it pertains *here* the sheer lack of discussion over evolution other than when you bring it up makes this quite a quandary. YOU are the one with this mandate.

Quote:  
-----when you have convinced your followers that science and evolution are of the devil and that hard sciences don't matter in the face of THE WORD, then you are endangering people spiritually.  
-----

Again am unsure who "you" refers to, generally, personally or 'this site' wise. But it seems irrelevant and strangely odd to hear you say *in the face of THE WORD*, this very thing that you have such issue with and dis-allowance of ... unless it pertains to YOUR issue of evolution then it's open to all sorts of interpretation ...

The church has been given more than a good whacking in it's long history and has even become beyond 'wacky' in many instances, and yet ...

Strange that the core fundamentals still stand to this day. Somebody else's seams will come unraveled, but The foundation that was laid is unshakable.

**Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/1/26 16:07**

Hi taco,

Quote:  
-----I am not sure that most of these IDers would be accepted by the scientific community at large.  
-----

ID, a broad umbrella for ideas that allow for God's influence in life, is the only possible alternative to Evolution, which does not allow for God's influence. (If it did, it would be classified as "Intelligent Design and reject itself!) Note how we are conditioned to accept the tautology that anything that is not evolution is not accepted...So when scientists interprets data in a way that is not organized along evolutionary guidelines it is assumed the data needs to be reorganized.

This leads one to believe that public institutions are committed to Evolution for philosophic and political reasons. Objective science is often only the pretext in today's political correctness. However keep in mind that one form of recognition in our most prestigious universities is employment and tenure, and in that regard ID scientists and authors are undeniably respected and 'legit.'

Now science as mere pretext was alive even in Darwin's day. Thomas Huxley, the contemporary of Darwin whose fierce defense of Evolution earned him the nickname "Darwin's Bulldog" was initially opposed to evolution. One of the reasons he jumped on board the new theory was that it gave him an opportunity to oppose his rival Richard Owen. My deduction here is admittedly subjective, but the historic record does show Huxley's opposition, his hatred for Owen's and his 180 degree turn-about that catapulted him to fame in the Victorian scientific world.

Evolution is simply the theory that God did not create life. Evolution then attempts to explain how those organisms most likely to survive are the ones that reproduce the most on their own. This tautology is prejudiced and predisposed to reject any non-naturalistic argument for creation.

Also, it must be considered that if Evolution had been invented 200 years earlier it would not have been accepted because it needed the philosophic and political developments happening in 18th century Europe in order to find enthusiastic endorsement and overcome initial opposition. Further proof of this is the fact that it wasn't until the mid 20th century that scientists finally achieved a 'method' that could accurately prove and measure the age of rocks. How did they know that they hadn't found a reliable method until then...well earlier efforts were providing time frames too short to support Evolution so they had to be rejected.

Compare this to other scientific advancements where regardless of religious or secular obstruction they prevailed. (Astronomy, biology, etc.) In fact Christianity and science were quite compatible until it became fashionable to separate truth and reason from 'religious faith'. Once this false dichotomy was entrenched, Christians were more or less ostracized from the public discourse on science.

Neo-orthodoxy tried to put a band-aid across this dichotomy. Yet, in the end this school of Christian thought (Barth, Bonhoeffer, Niebuhr) ultimately proved even more problematic to the church because they tried to solve a false problem. There is no conflict or divide between reason and faith.

Blessings

MC

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/1/26 21:17**

I cannot contribute anything scientific to this discussion except for a testimony.

Our oldest son graduated from Mississippi University for Women in 1991 (I think) with a major in Microbiology. He told me if you learn the basic rules as taught in Biology, you can easily detect the fallacy of evolution. He graduated from a state institution of higher learning a creationist. BTW, he did have a professor who was an evolutionist.

ginnyrose

**Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/1/26 22:11**

Quote:

-----He told me if you learn the basic rules as taught in Biology, you can easily detect the fallacy of evolution  
-----

I believe that Ginnyrose.

I'm certainly no scientist myself! LOL However, much of the material that is available to the public is understandable in a basic way on a layman's level.

Also it should be remembered that Evolution attempts to express itself through many scientific disciplines. This means that while a mathematician may be an expert in math, this same expert becomes a layman when attempting to express the molecular biology aspects of evolution. In other words, every so-called "expert" talking down to the layman, is in fact just a layman themselves in at least some of the fields of study required to 'authenticate' evolution. The title 'scientist' is used as some type of diplomatic immunity against having to answer the reasonable questions of the intelligent layman.

Most "scientific experts" persuade the public not because they are more intelligent than the rest of us, but that they are more articulate. Well I'm not buying it. To me they are all laymen on some points of the discussion... :-)

Blessings,

MC

**Re: - posted by saved\_matt (), on: 2007/1/28 9:18**

Taco:

Quote:  
-----I doubt very much that there is a credible biologist that believes that human beings just appeared on the earth without any ancestor  
y behind them. I would be amazed if there were such.  
-----

Here's a small list for you:

**John K.G. Kramer:** Dr. Kramer is a research scientist with Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada. He holds a B.S. (Hons) from the University of Manitoba, an M.S. in biochemistry from the University of Manitoba, a Ph.D. in biochemistry from the University of Minnesota and completed three years of post-doctoral studies as a Hormel fellow at the Hormel Institute and as an NRC fellow at the University of Ottawa. Dr. Kramer has identified, characterized and synthesized the structure of numerous food, bacterial, and biological components and has published 128 refereed papers and numerous abstracts and book chapters. He was one of the core scientists who evaluated the toxicological, nutritional and biochemical properties of canola oil and demonstrated its safety. He presently serves as associate editor of the scientific journal LIPIDS.

**Paul Giem:** Dr. Giem is assistant professor of emergency medicine at Loma Linda University. He holds a B.A. in chemistry from Union College, Nebraska, an M.A. in religion from Loma Linda University and an M.D. from Loma Linda University. Dr. Giem has published research articles in the areas of religion and medicine. His current research includes work on carbon-14 dating methods. He is author of the book Scientific Theology, which deals with a number of science-Bible areas, including dating methodology and biblical chronology.

**Henry Zuill:** Dr. Zuill is professor of biology at Union College in Lincoln, Nebraska, USA. He holds a B.A. in biology from Atlantic Union College, an M.A. in biology from Loma Linda University and a Ph.D. in biology from Loma Linda University. Dr. Zuill also serves as curator of the Joshua C. Turner Arboretum, which is an affiliate of the Nebraska Statewide Arboretum.

**Jonathan Sarfati:** Dr. Sarfati is a research scientist for Answers in Genesis in Australia. He holds a B.S. (Hons) in chemistry and a Ph.D. in physical chemistry from Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand. Dr. Sarfati is a former New Zealand Chess Champion and represented New Zealand at the World Junior Championships and in three chess olympiads.

**Ariel A. Roth:** Dr. Roth is a former director of the Geoscience Research Institute in Loma Linda, California. He holds a B.A. in biology from Pacific Union College and an M.S. in biology and a Ph.D. in biology from the University of Michigan. His research has been supported by U.S. government agencies. During his career he held numerous university positions, including professor of biology and chairman, Loma Linda University. During the latter appointment, Dr. Roth directed a university team for underwater research on coral, which was sponsored by the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. He has authored over 140 articles on origins issues and for 23 years edited the journal Origins.

**Timothy Standish:** Dr. Standish is associate professor of biology at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan. He holds a B.S. in zoology from Andrews University, an M.S. in biology from Andrews University, and a Ph.D. in biology and public policy from George Mason University (University of Virginia), Charlottesville, Virginia. He teaches genetics at Andrews University and is currently researching the genetics of cricket (*Achita domesticus*) behavior.

**Bob Hosken:** Dr. Hosken is senior lecturer in food technology at the University of Newcastle, Australia. He holds a B.S. in biochemistry from the University of Western Australia, an M.S. in biochemistry from Monash University, a Ph.D. in bio

chemistry from the University of Newcastle and an M.B.A. from the University of Newcastle. Dr. Hosken has published more than 50 research papers in the areas of protein structure and function, food technology, and food product development.

**James Allan:** Dr. Allan is a former senior lecturer in genetics at the University of Stellenbosch in South Africa. He holds a B.S. in agriculture from the University of Natal, an M.S. in agriculture from the University of Stellenbosch and a Ph.D. in genetics from the University of Edinburgh, Scotland. He currently serves as an international consultant in the field of dairy cattle breeding.

**George Tavor:** Dr. Tavor is Professor of Biochemistry, School of Medicine, Loma Linda University, in Loma Linda, California. He holds a B.S. in chemistry from Brown University, a Ph.D. in biochemistry from Columbia University, New York, and completed post-doctoral studies at Rockefeller University. Dr. Tavor has published over 40 technical papers and abstracts in the area of biochemistry and a similar number of articles on science-Bible topics.

**Dwain Ford:** Professor Ford is Emeritus Professor of Chemistry, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan. He holds a B.A. in chemistry from Andrews University and a Ph.D. in chemistry from Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts. Over an academic career spanning more than 30 years at Andrews University, Professor Ford served in various positions including chairman of the Department of Chemistry and dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. He was the recipient of five awards for excellence in teaching as well as three National Science Foundation fellowships.

**Angela Meyer:** Dr. Meyer is a former research scientist at Hort Research, Mount Albert Research Centre in New Zealand. She holds a B.S. in botany from the University of Auckland, an M.S. with first class honors in botany from the University of Auckland and a Ph.D. in horticultural science from the University of Sydney. Dr. Meyer (née Snowball) has published 11 refereed papers in the area of seasonal effects on fruit production and in 1994 was awarded the New Zealand Science and Technology bronze medal for excellence in kiwi fruit research and service to science.

**John Marcus:** Dr. Marcus is research officer at the Cooperative Research Centre for Tropical Plant Pathology, University of Queensland, Australia. He holds a B.A. in chemistry from Dordt College, an M.S. in biological chemistry and a Ph.D. in biological chemistry from the University of Michigan. Dr. Marcus's current research deals with novel antifungal proteins, their corresponding genes, and their application in genetic engineering of crop plants for disease resistance.

**Nancy Darrall:** Dr. Darrall is a speech therapist at the Bolton Community Health Care Trust in the United Kingdom. She holds a B.S. with first class honors in agricultural botany from the University of Wales, a Ph.D. in botany from the University of Wales, Aberystwyth, and an M.S. in speech and language pathology and therapy from the University of London. For 14 years Dr. Darrall worked in the area of environmental research at the National Power, Technology, and Environmental Centre, at Leatherhead, studying the environmental impact of electricity generation, and in particular the physiological effects of gaseous air pollutants on agricultural crops and trees.

**Arthur Jones:** Dr. Jones is a science and education consultant. He has a B.S. (Hons) from the University of Birmingham in biology; an M.Ed. from Bristol University and a Ph.D. in biology from the University of Birmingham. Dr. Jones has taught science and religion courses at London and Bristol Universities. He presently works for the Christian Schools Trust as their research consultant for curriculum development. He is a member of the Institute of Biology, London.

**George Howe:** Dr. Howe is professor, Division of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, the Masters College, Newhall, California. He holds a B.S. in botany from Wheaton College, an M.S. in botany and a Ph.D. in botany from Ohio State University, where he was a Charles F. Kettering fellow. He also completed post-doctoral studies in botany at Washington State University; in desert biology at Arizona State University; and in radiation biology at Cornell University. As well as publishing technical papers and books in the area of botany, he has published numerous papers in the area of creation versus mega-evolution, and philosophy of science. He served as president of the Creation Research Society from 1977 to 1983.

**D.B Gower:** Professor Gower is emeritus professor of steroid biochemistry at the University of London, United Kingdom. He holds a B.S. in chemistry from the University of London, a Ph.D. in biochemistry from the University of London and was awarded a D.Sc. from the University of London for his research into the biochemical mechanisms for the control of steroid hormone formation. Professor Gower is a fellow of the Royal Society of Chemistry, a fellow of the Institute of Biology and a chartered chemist.

**Walter Vieth:** Dr. Walter J. Veith is professor and chair of the Department of Zoology at the University of Western Cape,

South Africa. He holds a B.S. (hons) cum laude and an M.S. in zoology from the University of Stellenbosch, and a Ph.D. in zoology from the University of Cape Town. He is the author of *The Genesis Conflict: Putting the Pieces Together*.

**Robert Eckel:** Dr. Eckel is professor of medicine, and of physiology and biophysics, and program director, General Clinical Research Center, at the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center. He holds a B.S. cum laude in bacteriology, University of Cincinnati, and an M.D. from the University of Cincinnati College of Medicine. Dr. Eckel has published more than 80 research papers, 17 book chapters and received 20 research awards. He is a reviewer for 50 medical journals, a member of the American Society for Clinical Investigation and The Association of American Physicians, and chairman, Nutrition Committee, American Heart Association.

**Jack Cuozzo:** Dr. Cuozzo is a research orthodontist and head of the orthodontic section, Mountainside Hospital, Montclair, New Jersey. He majored in biology at Georgetown University, and has a D.D.S. from the University of Pennsylvania and an M.S. in oral biology from Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois. Dr. Cuozzo took the first cephalometric (orthodontic) radiographs of the Neanderthal fossils in France and subsequently in many other countries. He has published a number of articles related to origins from a biblical perspective, and a book, *Buried Alive*.<sup>1</sup> He was a member of the American Association of Orthodontists for more than 30 years.

**Geoff Downes:** Dr. Downes is Senior Research Scientist with the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO), Division of Forestry and Forest Products, in Australia. He holds a B.S. (hons) first class from Monash University, a Ph.D. in tree physiology from the University of Melbourne, and spent a year as a post-doctoral fellow at the University of Aberdeen, Scotland. At CSIRO, Dr. Downes researches climatic and environmental effects on wood formation.

**Wayne Friar:** Professor Friar is professor emeritus of biology at The King's College, Tuxedo, New York. He holds a B.A. in zoology from Houghton College, New York, a B.S. in zoology from Wheaton College, Illinois, an M.A. in embryology from the University of Massachusetts, and a Ph.D. in biochemical taxonomy from Rutgers, The State University, New Jersey. He is the author of a number of research papers on turtles and also on creation-evolution topics, including the book *A Case for Creation*.<sup>1</sup> He was a witness for the defense at the famous 1981 creation versus evolution trial in Little Rock, Arkansas. Professor Friar is a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and, for the years 1986 to 1993, served as president of the Creation Research Society.

**Sid Cole:** Dr. Cole is a research associate at the Sanitarium Health Food Company in Australia. He holds a B.S. and M.S. in chemistry from Melbourne University and a Ph.D. from Newcastle University for studies of ligand binding by metalloporphyrins. He is a former director of the Australasian Food Research Laboratories and a fellow of the Australian Institute of Food Science.

**Don Batten:** Dr. Batten is a research scientist for Answers in Genesis in Australia. He holds a B.Sc.Agr. with first-class honors from the University of Sydney and a Ph.D. in plant physiology from the University of Sydney. Dr. Batten worked for 18 years as a research scientist with the New South Wales Department of Agriculture, studying the floral biology, environmental adaptation, and breeding of sub-tropical tropical fruit tree species such as the lychee, custard apple, and mango.

You did ask about just biologists didn't you?

I left out all the mathematicians, physicists, geologists etc...:-P

All of the above have written articles that can be found in this book:

([http://www.amazon.com/Six-Days-Scientists-Believe-Creation/dp/0890513414/sr8-1/qid1169993407/refpd\\_bbs\\_sr\\_1/105-2251466-4645244?ie=UTF8&sbooks](http://www.amazon.com/Six-Days-Scientists-Believe-Creation/dp/0890513414/sr8-1/qid1169993407/refpd_bbs_sr_1/105-2251466-4645244?ie=UTF8&sbooks)) In Six Days

matt and mim



**Re: Original restated - posted by crsschk (), on: 2007/1/28 10:10**

*i told me pastor about tribes and people that never got a chance to hear the gospel and he said something about how if one was really seeking to find god then he would send the people a missionary or something, and ive heard that before but then i was thinking, what about the tribes like before christopher columbus. no one who was christian ever reached them. maybe someone has heard of some guy from a tribe seeing a vision of jesus because he seeked god or something but its been bothering me because i was thinking how ya its easy for me to accept jesus...well you know not easy but i mean easier since i actually live in a place where jesus is preached, but what about the people who never got it preached to them. my pastor said the gospel is now preached everywhere but i know it wasnt in the past because christians hadnt traveled the whole world at one point.*

There is some very good discussion here and this is not dissuade that at all. It did however occur to me that the original question here ended up being somewhat overshadowed.

Am sure this has been addressed here before, it would take some searching to find prior postings. I really do not have much to add finding so much of it speculation at best ...

Gen 18:25 That be far from thee to do after this manner, to slay the righteous with the wicked: and that the righteous should be as the wicked, that be far from thee: Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?

**Re: - posted by taco, on: 2007/1/28 14:25**

Quote:  
-----Heres a small list for you  
-----

You are suggesting that these are all non religious?

**Re: - posted by saved\_matt (), on: 2007/1/28 15:26**

Quote:  
-----You are suggesting that these are all non religious?  
-----

no, of course not as the part of your post i was referring to was the bit about how you doubted there were any 'credible' biologists who believe that human beings appeared without an ancestry, i supplied a list of present day ones.

I'm just wondering what your getting at asking about 'non-religious biologists who dont believe in human beings without an ancestry'

not a challenge just a genuine question

If your looking for non christian creationists i can tell you that Islam has it's own creationism ;-)

matt and mim

**Re: - posted by taco, on: 2007/1/28 15:37**

If you read back you will see that I was refering to Comptons suggestion that there were non christians who questioned evolution.

I looked up some of the people that you listed. Many of these believe the earth (and in fact whole universe) is no more th an ten thousand years old!

This is not science. I look up above me and I see the light from stars that has been traveling for millions of years.

Earth is around five billion years old. Many many types of dating all come up with this figure. Its not a conspiracy.

God is a patient God He is well able to take his time to get the job done.

**Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/1/28 15:48**

"God is a patient God He is well able to take his time to get the job done."

But God is also I God who likes to do the humanly impossible things. Why can't we all just take God's Word literally and believe that He would do something awesome like creating the world in six 24hr. days?

If we start rationalizing things like that in the Bible how are we supposed to believe what we read in the NT about Jesus' miracles?

Jordan

**Re: - posted by saved\_matt (), on: 2007/1/28 15:49**

Quote:

-----God is a patient God He is well able to take his time to get the job done.  
-----

Absolutely right God could have taken about 4.6 billion years to form man from 'the dust of the ground' i dont disagree wi th you at all on that, but the question is not what God could have done but what has He said He's done?

Exodus 20:11 For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.

You also say

Quote:

-----I looked up some of the people that you listed. Many of these believe the earth (and in fact whole universe) is no more than ten thou sand years old!

This is not science.  
-----

Interesting because:

Quote:

-----Earth is around five billion years old.  
-----

this is not Biblical

Matt and Mim

PS. For the starlight time travel issue see this: (<http://www.answersingenesis.org/tj/v17/i2/cosmology.asp>) A new cosmology: solution to the starlight travel time problem

**Re: - posted by taco, on: 2007/1/28 15:57**

Quote:  
-----If we start rationalizing things like that in the Bible how are we supposed to believe what we read in the NT about Jesus' miracles?  
-----

Its not a question of rationalising. The earth is well over 6000 years old. Its pointless to try to pretend its not. I think its not a good idea either to force a situation where for God to be God and the bible to be true we must believe in a young earth.

When our kids grow up and start finding out that the earth is not 6000 years old they will begin to feel they have a choice God or science. This is an unnecessary position to put people in IMO.

You are entitled to believe the earth is 6000 years old if you like but I think it is pretty shaky ground to be honest.

**Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/1/28 16:07**

Taco,

Quote:  
-----You are suggesting that these are all non religious?  
-----

I suppose it's part of the PC bigotry where atheism is euphemized as "objective", that we must be forced to even ask the question of their faith in God. Apparently only atheists are allowed to grind their theological axes at the university level.

Well take heart...

Michael Denton, the author of "Evolution: A Theory in Crisis", is not only a molecular biologist he is also an atheist. I suppose the latter qualification is the most important to the Evolutionist.

Here is an excerpt from his above mentioned book that explains how much irrational faith evolution really requires.

The human brain consists of about ten thousand million nerve cells. Each nerve cell puts out somewhere in the region of between ten thousand and one hundred thousand connecting fibers by which it makes contact with other nerve cells in the brain. Although the total number of connections in the human brain approaches 10 to the 15th power (or a thousand million million). Numbers to the order of 10 to the 15th power are of course completely beyond comprehension. Imagine an area about half the size of the USA (one million square miles) covered in a forest of trees containing ten thousand trees per square mile. If each tree contained one hundred thousand leaves, the total number of leaves in the forest would be 10 to the 15th power, equivalent to the total number of connections in the human brain!

Even if only one hundredth of the connections in the brain were specifically organized, this would represent a system containing a much greater number of connections than in the entire communications network on Earth."

Again Denton says...

"The capacity of DNA to store information vastly exceeds that of any other known system; it is so efficient that all the info

Information needed to specify an organism as complex as man weighs less than a few thousandth-millionths of a gram. The information needed to specify the design of all the species of organisms which have ever existed on the planet, a number according to G. G. Simpson of approximately one thousand million, could be held in a teaspoon and there could still be room for all the information in every book ever written."

In the face of such expanding 21st century scientific knowledge the most obvious question is "how in the world can a 19th century Victorian idea continue to be believed in by reasonable men today?"

The answer is philosophical commitment without regards for objectivity.

Now as far as the other authors I do not know much about their personal beliefs. I do know Phil Johnson realizes there is a God, yet I can't say in what way. The others I can't speak for.

I think the point is that the men I listed are speaking from a secular platform under rigorous peer review from the general scientific community and not from within a 'religious' organization.

I hope this helps!

MC

**Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/1/28 16:22**

Another question is, how can we believe that God saved us when we have to guess what is true in His word and what is not? How can we be sure there is a heaven? That can't be proven scientifically.

Also, why should we believe something that is totally man's reasoning and not Creator God's own words.

Just a thought, Jordan

**Re: - posted by taco, on: 2007/1/28 16:26**

Quote:  
-----I suppose it's part of the PC bigotry where atheism is euphemized as "objective", that we must be forced to even ask the question of their faith in God  
-----

I beg your pardon. As I understand it you raised the issue of scientists who are not Christians who don't believe in evolution.

I was genuinely surprised by this. The man you quoted is a clear case in point. Very interesting.

I don't believe that atheism makes one objective nor does theism. One either is or isn't objective.

I am a believer. And I am interested in Creation/Evolution. Although of course I ultimately believe in creation I just don't know exactly how God "did it".

I don't want to give the impression that I am challenging people just because they are believers. I was responding to Matt- who seemed to be responding to my request to you for information on non-Christian doubters of evolution. I looked up a few on his list and found them listed in AIG so didn't think they qualified.

It's not because I am anti-Christian. (I happen to be one).

I am guilty of going down another rabbit trail though. Getting into the whole young earth thing. A very interesting debate but too much of a side issue on this thread which has already spawned other side issues.

**Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/1/28 17:37**

Taco,

Apologies. You misunderstand me. It is I who should beg your pardon sir. I wasn't clear in my communication!

I was not at all inferring you were PC...only pointing out that the question of faith in God is always made an issue in these discussions because of the PC environment we live in. Statistically speaking Evolutionists are overwhelmingly atheist. (from Darwinism on Trial.)

Once I was having a discussion over these issues with a fellow. At one point I mentioned a certain author, and he immediately cut me off by saying "Oh that fellow is a Christian." I said "What does that have to do with his research?" He looked at me like the answer was obvious and I replied "Sir you are a bigot."

He knew I was right and said nothing.

This is what I meant when I said "PC bigotry." I wasn't referring to you Taco.

My apologies again.

MC

**Re: - posted by taco, on: 2007/1/28 17:48**

Thank you Compton, I took you up wrong, so apologies on my part.

**Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/1/28 19:40**

Thank you Taco,

Actually your response served as a useful caution to me that, in spite of my empathy towards Christians like yourself in hostile territory, I need to guard against an uncharitable face towards Evolutionists.

You know a few experiences seem to shape so much of our perspective.

Years ago I attended a dinosaur anatomy lecture that was being given by Dr. Robert Bakker. (It was being given outside of a university at a weekend museum conference.) At one point he asked the people in the session there if they were familiar with Ezekiel 37 of the Bible. (He was about to point out how a paleontologist brings dead bones back to life...) Well no sooner did he ask the question than it seemed the room of (normally quiet and reserved) professionals broke out in a raucous of mockery and disdain for the Bible. Some were making up clever verses of parody, others were moaning, others were laughing. I thought I was back in Jr. High School.

To his credit Dr. Bakker scolded the classroom for their unprofessionalism.

That was the first (but not the last) time I saw how the modern Evolutionary academic establishment attracts people whose resentment for the scriptures runs deeper than pure objectivity.

It seems hard to believe how far our Universities have fallen. Imagine a little more than 100 years ago, William Lyon Phillips, who was voted Yale's 'most inspiring professor' for 4 years straight said I believe a knowledge of the Bible without a college course is more important than a college course without a Bible."

And Princeton's first president, Jonathan Witherspoon, said this

Cursed be all learning that is contrary to the cross of Christ.

Cursed be all learning that is not coincident with the cross of Christ.

**General Topics :: tribes that never heard of jesus**

Cursed be all learning that is not subservient to the cross of Christ."

So it is true of our day...

This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be...ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. 2 Timothy 2:1-7"

(Thanks to Kenneth Brown for the quotes in Timely Insights into Timeless Truth.)

Blessings,

MC

**Re: - posted by saved\_matt (), on: 2007/1/29 2:22**

Quote:

-----I was not at all inferring you were PC  
-----

Ha!!

Only here could that be a compliment :-P

matt and mim

**Re: ok sorry ive been busy with school - posted by luckyd (), on: 2007/2/2 4:06**

ok well bubba you told me things that i know are not true and i feel sad for you. im the original post with my question. First i would like to tell you that there are more facts that the bible is true. For example dinosaurs. Did you know at one time everyone thought the world was flat and it was always taught long ago. There have been many claims such as that and eventually have been proven wrong...so about dinosaurs. we are always taught in school about how long ago dinosaurs lived and the different possibilities that happened for them to die out. Did you know there is more in the bible that proves evolution is false. For example a dinosaur print and human print were found together and dinosaur clay figures have been found made by people as well as cave drawings.the bible in job talks about a dinosaur and a dragon very clearly and in fact there has been new evidence such as on the animal planet that dragons did exist. They even found a skeleton looking dragon figure with i believe if i remember correctly a sword with skeletons of humans... and it definitely didnt look like a dinosaur and again many say its a dragon. dragons were also talked about everywhere long ago and have been in drawings of past times. this was on the animal planet and there is more evidence other places. there is no proof for evolution. you might say ya but there is not proof that evolution didnt happen...yes there is proof evolution didnt happen. it starts with jesus. jesus changed my friends lives. They were druggies and one was a stripper and they were so unhappy and in gangs and now they are not. jesus saved them. I know the truth about jesus and i know the power he has had in my life. I had a girlfriend get saved and she always made fun of me and debated with me. she was smart when it came to religion yet she found jesus when she thought so intelligent in the worlds view. now heres the thing. Do i believe the evidence with evolution when we dont know if its real or do i believe what the bible says when i know jesus is real and that since hes god he used men to write the bible. and u might say they were just men and how could they write it perfect. Because maybe they arent perfect but god IS. and god can use anyone to do anything perfect in his name if he chooses to choose someone obedient. I will believe the bible because the one who i believe in who is perfect wrote it and he talks in job about a dinosaur and dragon and he says everything was made on the 6th day. like i said more evidence shows that dinosaurs lived with humans as well as dragons and so then evolution is wrong because everything was created on the 6th day. people were not apes either when they lived with dinosaurs because they could draw the dinosaurs. Now you can believe other things than when god says something about creation and believe god and know that it is literal or you can believe in evolution and say the bible is not literal. people say ok well where is the proof that evolution didnt happen. but like i said it is found with jesus. people cant see the proof that god is real because they wont change their hearts to jesus and so they can never see the proof but thats 100% proof of creation but remember this, the bible has been 100% right so far with prophecies and scientist have been proven wrong many times. they say that some animals are extinct yet they

**General Topics :: tribes that never heard of jesus**

end up being wrong because those animals end up being found alive. and you may believe evolution because of what scientist say, but remember this, your believing scientist with thier beliefs when our own human kind, gods own creation, i m talking about humans, they left proof by making for us drawings of dinosaurs and clay models of dinosaurs to show th ey lived with dinosaurs. so i wrote all this to show you that its going to be sad as the bible keeps proving you wrong as m ove evidence is uncovered and u one day have to face god. I mean just not long ago dragons were made belief yet the b ible has always talked about dragons and now just recently dragons were said to maybe be real afer all. And your so stu bborn that one day i pray you find the truth and understand who god really is and that the bible is his literal word.