

Scriptures and Doctrine :: public prayer?

public prayer?, on: 2007/10/21 22:46

(Matthew 6:5-18 NKJV) "And when you pray, you shall not be like the hypocrites. For they love to pray standing in the synagogues and on the corners of the streets, that they may be seen by men. Assuredly, I say to you, they have their reward. {6} "But you, when you pray, go into your room, and when you have shut your door, pray to your Father who is in the secret place; and your Father who sees in secret will reward you openly. {7} "And when you pray, do not use vain repetitions as the heathen do. For they think that they will be heard for their many words. {8} "Therefore do not be like them. For your Father knows the things you have need of before you ask Him."

Does your Church condone and allow public prayer by clergy and laity? This shameful activity is quite clearly condemned by Jesus in this passage from Matthew, so how is it that fundamentalist Churches that hold the Bible as the literal word of God allow this?

Bub

Re: public prayer? - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/10/22 1:04

Nice to hear from you Bubbaguy.

Perhaps we should specify what we mean by 'public prayer'. If we mean speaking prayers for ceremonial pomp and circumstance or as a political statement then this type of prayer could be vanity.

However, we can hardly understand Jesus' disdain for showy prayer to mean that we cannot pray in front of one another, or even in large groups. Acts 1---And when they were come in, they went up into an upper room, where abode both Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, Philip, and Thomas, Bartholomew, and Matthew, James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James.

These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren.

So, prayer can obviously be a group activity. It's not for show, but it can be 'public,'...albiet a rather intimate public. ;-)

MC

Re: public prayer? - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/10/22 13:49

Quote:

-----how is it that fundamentalist Churches that hold the Bible as the literal word of God allow this?

It probably because they regard the whole bible as a complete revelation rather than picking and choosing the bits we believe in as you do. You accuse evangelicals of idolatry but you have made an idol your inner witness. You serve it rather than the God revealed in the scriptures.

Re: - posted by vsuarez, on: 2007/10/22 14:55

Perhaps we should consider Jesus' prayer just before He raised Lazarus from the dead. This was indeed prayer and it was also public. I think it's like what someone else said here, it's not the act of prayer but the intent, what's motivating you to do it. The emphasis is that the Pharisees' were doing to be seen.

I think one can say the same for healing and miracles. Is it okay to heal in the public? Yes. But, what if your motive to heal is tainted by a desire to amass self-importance?

Scriptures and Doctrine :: public prayer?

I think discretion and sensitivity to the Holy Spirit is the key to balancing this issue. Once He is in full control (filled with the Spirit) then we need not be concerned about these things. For He (the Spirit) will always manifest the will of God and magnify Jesus, thus causing others who may witness a prayer or manifestation to give glory to God. This is the same for works. Christ exhorts us to do good works, which bring glory to His Father. But, there are works which are done for the purpose of self-glorifying and others that are for God-glorifying.

The essence is the attitude of the heart. That's my understanding.

Re:, on: 2007/10/22 18:33

Ron, It is not a matter of the Inner Light as it has been revealed to me, but rather the Inner Light as it has been revealed to the entire Religious Society of Friends (Quakers). We do not have public prayer because of the instruction that I quoted. But we do ask members and attenders to attend to our personal concerns in their private prayers. Thus, if I have a concern about the health of a relative or friend, for example, I would rise and ask that those in attendance "hold in the Light" my relative or friend in their personal prayers and explain this concern for them. In this manner we encourage the personal prayers of members and attenders while adhering to the instructions of Jesus regarding prayer.

Bub

Re: - posted by BrianPaul (), on: 2007/10/22 19:57

Quote:
-----For He (the Spirit) will always manifest the will of God and magnify Jesus, thus causing others who may witness a prayer or manifestation to give glory to God. This is the same for works. Christ exhorts us to do good works, which bring glory to His Father. But, there are works which are done for the purpose of self-glorifying and others that are for God-glorifying.

amen.

Re: public prayer? - posted by Miccah (), on: 2007/10/23 1:33

Quote:

bubbaguy wrote:{7} "And when you pray, do not use vain repetitions as the heathen do. For they think that they will be heard for their many words. {8} "Therefore do not be like them. For your Father knows the things you have need of before you ask Him."

Does your Church condone and allow public prayer by clergy and laity? This shameful activity is quite clearly condemned by Jesus....

Bub

Revelation 4:8

The four living creatures, each having six wings, were full of eyes around and within. **And they do not rest day or night, saying:**

“ Holy, holy, holy,
Lord God Almighty,
Who was and is and is to come!”

They never rest.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: public prayer?

Miccah

Re:, on: 2007/10/23 10:37

Compton,

Yes, I see what you mean about prayer in a closed group of believers. Yet, the vast majority of prayer in Church service today fits the description of "heaping up words." It sounds good, but is its own reward. In the long run, it alienates attendees from the actual worship of God.

The same goes for the swearing of oaths. The vast majority of "Christians" will swear an oath in court when asked to do so. But Jesus has told us "let your yes be yes" and not to swear oaths.

I get very confused about Christians who claim that the Bible is God's literal word, dismiss the mountains of evidence for evolution, and yet swear oaths and readily attend Church services filled with public prayer that is a pile of lofty b.s. The words of Jesus are clearly meant to be taken literally, and the story of Creation is also clearly meant to be metaphorical and a parable. The clergy of these Churches make no effort to correct these mistaken ideas and, in fact, encourage them. They build their congregational houses on sand, so to speak, and in the end of times these congregations will be the first to flee the Word of God because their theological foundations will readily crumble beneath them.

Bub

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2007/10/23 11:02

Quote:
-----bubbaguy wrote:
Compton,

I get very confused about Christians who claim that the Bible is God's literal word, dismiss the mountains of evidence for evolution, and yet swear oaths and readily attend Church services filled with public prayer that is a pile of lofty b.s.

Evolution. Do you believe in the Big Bang theories as well?

Quote:
-----The words of Jesus are clearly meant to be taken literally, and the story of Creation is also clearly meant to be metaphorical and a parable.

Who is teaching you this? Is it a scientist or your church?

Quote:
-----The clergy of these Churches make no effort to correct these mistaken ideas and, in fact, encourage them.

Quote:
-----They build their congregational houses on sand, so to speak, and in the end of times these congregations will be the first to flee the Word of God because their theological foundations will readily crumble beneath them.

Well, if you believe in evolution, something will just pop up in the future anyways, so why worry about it? If you believe in the Big Bang theories (multiple big bangs is the fad theory among the scientist), how can you truly believe in "the end times" These theories are based on an ever expanding, then contracting universe, over multiple different times. So will the "end of days" come with a bang, or the revolution of the next Big Bang?

God = creation in 6 days
man = scientist belief in evolution

I choose God.

Miccah

Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/23 12:16

bubbaguy wrote:

Quote:

-----dismiss the mountains of evidence for evolution

Are you aware, of how opposite evolution, and the Bible are?

Let me just show you a tiny list of the contradictions between the Genesis account, and the evolution account.

Cross reference the numbers from the "Genesis" section with the numbers from the "Evolution" section.

Genesis

1. Earth before sun
2. Sea before dry land
3. Sea before atmosphere
4. Light on earth before sun
5. Earth before stars
6. Earth before other planets
7. Land plants before sea creatures
8. Starfish before earthworms
9. Trees before land animals
10. Man before death
11. Man before thorns and thistles
12. Man before TB pathogens and cancer
13. Birds before reptiles
14. Whales before land animals
15. Fruit trees before other plants*

16.Mammals (cattle) before “creeping things”*

17.Bats before land animals

18.Birds before dinosaurs

19.Flowering plants before insects

20.Plants before sun

21.Dolphins before dinosaurs

22.Pterosaurs before land reptiles

23.Flying insects before land insects

Evolution

1.Sun before earth

2.Dry land before sea

3.Atmosphere before sea

4.Sun before light on earth

5.Stars before earth

6.Earth at same time as planets

7.Sea creatures before land plants

8.Earthworms before starfish

9.Land animals before trees

10.Death before man

11.Thorns and thistles before man

12.TB pathogens & cancer before man (dinosaurs had TB and cancer)

13.Reptiles before birds

14.Land mammals before whales

15.Simple plants before fruit trees

16.Insects before mammals

17.Land mammals before bats

18.Dinosaurs before birds

19.Insects before flowering plants

20.Sun before plants

21. Dinosaurs before dolphins

22. Land reptiles before pterosaurs

23. Land insects before flying insects

bubbaguy, you can see the contradictions, and you can research them to see that what I have written is true.

You are deceived, and will continue to be so until you acknowledge God as God, and repent from your wickedness. You are full of false doctrine and lies, repent, and cease to pervert the word of God, or God himself will judge you. I command you in the name of Jesus Christ to repent, and believe the truth.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss () , on: 2007/10/23 13:03

Hi bubbaguy...

I do understand your concern with preachers (and even believers) who mouth off prayers in the public (and even in private). When I first came to the Lord, I used to attend a prayer meeting with our local congregation. There was one particular believer who felt the need to "take control" of the prayer meeting and pretty much speak for everyone. He would even walk around giving "words" to those in attendance, which were supposedly the result of God speaking through him. I used to literally HIDE from this guy beneath the pews, because I hated to hear his phony-bologna "prophecies."

One day, after a particularly embarrassing lying "word" from this brother, I pretty much stopped the show. I stopped the guy midsentence and told him, "Why are you speaking for God when you are clearly wrong?" This man turned red with what seemed to be both embarrassment and frustration. I told him, "Look, I know you seem to be a sincere guy, but you are clearly putting words in the mouth of God that are not his!" This really upset him. I told him that I wanted to continue attending the prayer meetings, but I didn't want to be hunted down by a would-be prophet who can't even get the smaller details correct. Of course, this didn't go over too well with the brother. He warned others about not "heeding the words of the prophets." I just shrugged my shoulders and told him that a true prophet wouldn't worry about someone "proving" his words.

So, yes, there is an issue with the wrong manner of conducting public prayers. But as you are aware, there are many instances in the Bible where public prayers were given. Both the Old and New Testament are filled with examples of believers praying in public. There is a difference, however, from the motives between the Pharisees and prayer offered in humility.

Quote:
----- I get very confused about Christians who claim that the Bible is God's literal word, dismiss the mountains of evidence for evolution, and yet swear oaths and readily attend Church services filled with public prayer that is a pile of lofty b.s. The words of Jesus are clearly meant to be taken literally, and the story of Creation is also clearly meant to be metaphorical and a parable.

Actually, I don't think that it is quite so CLEAR as you claim.

One of my undergraduate degrees is in Electrical Engineering. As a requirement for EE, I took several classes in the more advanced sciences, including Inorganic Chemistry, Bio Chemistry, and Advanced Physics. Believe it or not, several of my professors were believers (including one who was also a licensed Baptist minister). There is never a "clear consensus" with science.

Recently, former Vice President Al Gore received a Nobel Peace Prize for his work with the cause of global warming. His film, *An Inconvenient Truth*, also won this year's Academy Award for BEST DOCUMENTARY. Al Gore has consistently claimed that his "facts" were above reproach. In various publications, Gore claims that it is the "clear consensus" of the scientific community that global warming not only exists – but that it is undoubtedly the result of mankind. Gore also claims that the clear consensus is that many people will die if something is not done to stop this warming trend. His claims are extremely calamitous, and certainly worth looking into.

There is a sure consensus amongst scientists that global warming is measurably taking place. However, there are many scientists – even some that Gore quotes – who do NOT believe that global warming is largely due to the contributions of mankind. Even fewer believe that it will result in worldwide catastrophe. Many scientists are quick to point out st

udies about “global warming” at the turn of the 19th-20th Century. In the 1950s and 1960s, there were scientists who predicted “global COOLING” as a result of studies that predicted that the world was growing colder. In the 1990s, the measurements once again indicated global warming. In Texas, we experienced one of the coolest and wettest summers in nearly 100 years even though my parents experienced a very hot and dry summer in the north.

Even now, there are quite a few scientists who believe that global warming is a result of the transit of the Earth as it revolves around the sun. Solar activity is the primary source of heat upon this planet. If our planet veers just a bit during its rotation around the sun (pulled away by the gravity of outer planets), then it will certainly affect our climate (and make it cooler). If the outer planets are far enough ahead (or behind as we revolve around our solar orbit), they can react with the gravity of the sun and actually tug the planet a little closer to the sun, thereby HEATING the planet just a bit. Scientists have been noting such changes on the planet Mars. In some years, its ice caps (possibly water or “dry ice”) are much larger than other years. This past year, the ice caps on Mars were almost non-existent. However, they have already grown larger than they were the previous year.

Quite a bit of environmental laws were passed during the early 1990s. Very strong restrictions were placed upon the installation of refrigerants. Why? Scientists and Congressmen pointed to the hole in the “ozone layer” over Antarctica. At the time, scientists felt that there was a clear correlation between this “hole” in the ozone and the recent warming trend. Emissions laws were increased and were extended to things like hair spray and Lysol. Interestingly, within a couple of years, there was an almost immediate noticeable shrinkage of the hole in the ozone! Scientists and lawmakers declared this legislation a success. However, later that year, the hole suddenly grew larger. Then, it shrank. Then it grew larger. Then, it shrank again. After all was said and done, scientists decided that they weren’t entirely certain WHY the ozone was behaving in such a peculiar manner. One physicist stated that the observation of the ozone with satellites is only a couple of decades old. He reasoned that this may have ALWAYS been the trend!

Why am I saying this? Because science never clearly establishes anything but principle through observation. Such principles are observed, but changed they have a tendency of being reinterpreted over time. This is true of evolution. This is true of astrophysics. Most biologists certainly embrace the theory of “natural selection” as espoused by Darwinism. However, there is quite a bit of debate that goes on amongst even evolutionary scientists as to the extent of the process. Some evolutionary scientists argue that the evolutionary process is due to “cause and effect.” Something causes a change in the biological process which then creates the effect of changes in offspring. Scientists point to widespread increases in certain diseases or conditions (such as autism) as the possible result of chemical reactions – possibly including the fluoride in the toothpaste of our grandparents! This reaction causes changes in the epigenome as it alters the sperm that becomes the catalyst for life. This, however, is not evolution in the Darwinian sense.

Darwin argues for NATURAL SELECTION, or, a vast evolution of a species caused by a shift in the needs of the species itself. Primordial soup gave way to ocean life to amphibians to earth life to variation of species. The major roadblock for evolution is the lack of fossil record. If the culmination of the species of the entire world is the result of such evolution, then every single species should have links between them. These records do not exist. There are certainly a very few partial fossil records that have been found after years of search for “missing links” (such as the Leakey’s “Lucy”). However, even these are not conclusively considered interspecies finds. None of these records consist of entire finds. Rather, they consist of incomplete skeletons. There is a great deal of scrutiny that is displayed even before these findings are released, because there have been many “false positives” found. These false positives typically end up being another species of already discovered primate. Some scientists have even pointed at “Lucy” (the most famous and widely embraced fossil “evidence”) as being the damaged fossil record of a possible subspecies of primate, rather than a link between primate and hominid.

For years, scientists believed that Einstein’s theory of Special Relativity was firmly established and proven through years of space travel. Einstein hypothesized that the speed of light, and not time or distance, was the sole universal constant. However, they now realize that light is NOT the universal constant that Einstein suspected (it can speed up and slow down). Space is also filled with many gravity induced “bends” (caused by unseen “dark matter”) in the space-time continuum. The principles proposed by Einstein may certainly exist, but the theory itself is at least partially flawed. Even the theorized “constant” of the speed of light is itself based upon a measurement of distance divided by time.

The point that I am trying to raise is that there is NOT a clear consensus in the scientific community, let alone the Christian community. A great deal of our earthly science is based upon the premise of an ancient universe. We measure the distance of stars by how long we think it takes for light to travel from them. Now that we realize that light can speed up (like when it penetrates a pool of cesium particles), how does this change our understanding of far reaching distances? Biological and geological sciences are based upon the approximated age of the Earth. This age has changed often due to

o scientific advancement and discovery. It is largely based upon the estimated half-life of carbon atoms. But what if this estimation is wrong – or altered by other forces? And what is the starting point of this half-life – the formulation of the Earth or the creation of the atomic bond?

Within the Christian community, there are people who believe in a literal six-day creation. There are others who believe in “six-ages” (each “day” is an “age”) of creation. And then, there are others who believe that the Heavens were created first – and then the Earth. Genesis 1:1 states: *“In the beginning, God created the heavens AND the Earth.”* Some hypothesize that God created the universe first, and much later, the Earth. Some even believe that there was a period of “chaos” between Genesis 1:1 and Genesis 1:2 (“...*and the Earth was without form*”). They believe that at this was the period of time in which the war between angels took place.

Regardless of what we believe, there is no “clear consensus” in such matters. There is still much room for debate. I understand that there is quite a bit of rhetoric from believers that have little understanding of scientific principle. However, there are believers who are astutely aware of the issues invoked by modern science and still hold to a Biblical account for Creation. In fact, one of my University Physics professors – who specialized in Special Relativity – teaches a class about the limits of scientific theory.

Sadly, you are correct in mentioning the great amounts of preachers who are ignorant of science, yet still feel the authority to speak of issues in which they are not properly educated. They do give believers a bad reputation. I implore believers everywhere to not make a conclusion until they are aware of the facts. But one fact does remain: God did create the world. The world is not a great, cosmic accident. Man did NOT evolve from monkeys. Neither man nor monkey evolved from the living plasma supposedly created from primordial soup. Rather, God created man in His image and likeness.

I apologize for straying from the theme of this thread (public prayer). However, I thought that your comments were worth commenting on.

:~)

Re:, on: 2007/10/23 14:51

ccchhrrriiss:

you clearly have a good deal of education about science. and yes, theories and the evidence and interpretations of these that underpin them are changing. nevertheless, dna evidence shows clearly that we are not related to "monkeys", but are related closely to chimpanzees. the study of dna is the major change that you do not mention in how we view our relationship to other animals in God's kingdom.

for me science has proven that the big bang was the means God employed in creating the world (and subsequently the earth). evolution is the means by which animals developed and, eventually, we humans. take a trip to the grand canyon and you will see numerous layers of sedimentary rock that built up over the ages and also the river that cut through these layers of rock over many more ages. the earth is indeed very old; old enough for evolution to bring forth the life that God commanded to arise.

the bizarre ideas put forth to explain things like dinosaur skeletons (baby dino on the Ark!?!?) show the desperation that literal Creationists go to in order to make their interpretation of Genesis hold together.

I think Jesus told us that we should view the stories "from the foundation of the earth" as parables. (my previous post citing this was taken down??) He spoke in parable to tell us how God has communicated through the Word.

Yet, it could well be that there was a great flood and an Ark built by Noah. it could have occurred in the known world and involved saving breeding livestock, as well as Noah and his family. (a meteorite hitting the Mediterranean Sea would cause such a phenomena.)

but none of this really matters to me. Jesus, His teachings, His life, and His sacrifice and resurrection do matter. the promised presence of the Holy Spirit where two or more are gathered in His name does matter. our salvation by Grace does matter. and Truth does matter.

The real danger of biblical literalism is that it claims that God spoke and acted in our world within the confines of the world.

ds of the Bible, as interpreted by strict constructionalism. God is put into a straightjacket by doing so. and when this straightjacket is removed, what will underpin the beliefs of those who rely upon this manner of viewing the Bible? this is shaky ground upon which to pin a belief system. if Genesis is confounded in this view, all of the Bible becomes suspect. (because "all of it is true, or God is a liar") (someone actually said this to me once.)

the most important thing about Christianity is that we have been commanded to love our enemies, to love God with all our hearts and all our minds, and to love our neighbors as ourselves. the rest of it really doesn't matter much, because if you don't follow these teachings, you will be lost forever.

Bub

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss () , on: 2007/10/23 16:18

Hi Bub...

Quote:
----- nevertheless, dna evidence shows clearly that we are not related to "monkeys", but are related closely to chimpanzees. the study of dna is the major change that you do not mention in how we view our relationship to other animals in God's kingdom.

I apologize for using the word "monkey." I meant to use the word as a descriptive term (like "man" meaning "mankind" and "monkey" meaning "primate") rather than from a purely Latin-scientific etymology. Actually, the DNA differences between man and chimp are (<http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn2833.html>) greater than first thought. In the 1970s, it was believed that humans and DNA shared 99% of their genetic makeup. After more study, it has long been believed that chimps and humans shared more than 98.5% of our genetic material. More recent studies suggest that the similarity is actually less than 95%. This is the result of a leading DNA expert at Cal Tech, Roy Britten, who actually measured the first number (98.5%) and became suspicious of it two decades later. His estimate now has it lower than 95%. (<http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?chanIDsa003&articleID9D0DAC2B-E7F2-99DF-3AA795436FEF8039>) Subsequent studies show there to be about a 94% similarity. When all is taken into account, this is at least a three to four fold increase than what was previously thought. Recent fossil discoveries also indicate that homosapiens lived before the oldest known chimp fossils. As a result, some evolutionary biologists are now considering the notion that chimps and humans may not have even evolved from the same common ancestor, or that the separation took place at a much earlier stage. Of course, most Christians firmly believe that there was no evolutionary link at all. They are simply the result of similarity of design (like the similarity of design between a dolphin and a whale). But similarity doesn't equate to linkage. A 6% difference is quite drastic - particularly when you realize that differences in race equate to less than an almost immeasurable 0.00000000000001% difference.

Regardless of the similarities and differences in DNA, the fact remains that humans also share incredible DNA similarities with common earthworms. These similarities in DNA structure don't necessarily translate to common ancestry. It just means that the DNA is similar in structure. All living things are comprised of similar elements. We are all largely carbon-based creatures. Some designs are more similar than others - but again, that doesn't equate to similar ancestry. However, the theory of evolution and natural selection is based upon one (or possibly, a few) primary living organisms evolving through natural selection into the millions of species present today. It is my belief that the "science" of evolution is simply the science of observing similarities between living things (including their DNA/genome makeup) and theorizing various possible ancestral links between them. It does not explain the continued existence of "lesser evolved" life forms (like plankton) or the inability of other strands of the evolutionary web to develop into higher intelligence.

There are studies that indicate a similar notion to evolution that deals with a cause and effect change in species. Are animals passing more than just "ingredients" to their posterity? Do animals pass along changes of the epigenome within the sperm? Recent studies have indicated that certain immediate changes are made by the environment upon the epigenome. These can be seen as quickly as in the children, grandchildren or even great-grandchildren of human beings. There are links that prove that individuals with drug or alcohol addiction can produce an addiction within their children or grandchildren. How is this possible? By mutating changes in the epigenome. The same is true with cancer. We have known for years that cancer can "run in the family." Why? Recent studies are considering whether or not a smoker today is altering the epigenome to an extent that it increases risk of certain diseases (like cancer) to children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Similarly, there are indications that Europeans developed a resistance to diseases like Smallpox, which might have been passed down to our grandchildren. But this is not to be confused with "evolutionary" biology. Rather, it is a result of the cause/effect relationship between our environment and our biological makeup (and how that makeup is passed on to our posterity). Some scientists have gone so far as to use this change in epigenome as to explain what was once considered "instinct." What causes an animal to search for the milk of its mother? Is this mere "instinct" - or is this related to changes that were passed on biologically within the cognitive inheritance of a creature? The same is being theorized as to why certain animals (like Pit Bulls or Beta fish) retain their "alpha male" aggress

sion.

While I don't know all of the science behind this, I am very much aware of the limits of scientists in such matters. One of my best friends is a senior scientist for GlaxoSmithKline at the Research Triangle in North Carolina. He is a great chemist and a strong believer. He is a rather firm believer in a literal six day idea of creation. Like you, he does not believe that we should place God in a box. But this goes both ways. We can easily attempt to confine God to a box of our limited understanding of science, or by our supposed advanced understanding of science. Most scientists are quick to point out that what is accepted fact today may be dismissed next week, next month or next century. Besides, God is not confined to the laws of science or nature. He invented these laws and processes. God is no more confined by the laws of science any more than an author is confined to the paper in front of him or the reader's knowledge of the book. The Author can "change the rules" as He sees fit – even if it contradicts what is expected, approved or commonly accepted.

It would be impossible for me to ever fully understand the nature or mind of God. An attempt to do so would render us incapable of true faith. This was what caused God's response to Job. Who are we to contend with the Almighty? He didn't consult us when He formed the Leviathan, so why should we try to consult Him now? After millions of years of supposed human evolution, we could never fully comprehend the mind of God. We can't even fully explain why a bumblebee flies. There are some things that we can simply never understand. We can attempt to understand the laws of nature, but we cannot attempt to confine nature's God to those laws of which He is an author.

As a result, I prefer to believe that God is more than able to have created the Earth, and all that is in it, within six physical days. How do I explain supposed contradictions in the age of the Earth (a literal interpretation of the Bible would say that it is about 6000 years old – more or less)? I really don't know. But it isn't my job or responsibility to defend the science of the Bible. It is my job and responsibility to contend for the God of the Bible.

:-)

Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/23 16:45

bubbaguy,

You ignored my post entirely, and I would like you to explain how if God used evolution, why it then contradicts the scriptures in the order of creation?

If evolution is true, it nullifies the scriptures.

Re:, on: 2007/10/23 17:39

Quote: "If evolution is true, it nullifies the scriptures."

Ben, this is exactly the kind of thinking that I am concerned about. evolution does not nullify the scriptures. rather, it illuminates upon the handiwork of God.

bub :-)

Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/23 17:49

bubbaguy wrote:

Quote:
-----Ben, this is exactly the kind of thinking that I am concerned about. evolution does not nullify the scriptures. rather, it illuminates upon the handiwork of God.

bubbaguy, you still have not answered my question, and the reason for that is that you do not believe the truth.

I posted an easy to understand post, you ignored it. Then I asked you to answer that same easy to understand post, and you sidestepped that quite beautifully.

You do not desire to hear the truth, but you rather desire to believe a lie. Every time you are asked a simple question, th

en you sidestep it.

Show yourself to be a man of character, and answer the question.

Re:, on: 2007/10/23 18:00

ccchhrrriiiss,

i guess we won't come to terms on evolution/creation. i also don't put limits upon God, but neither do i accept that God created a universe that has laws of physics and geology that seemingly stretch and morph to meet with acceptable Biblical interpretation.

the real point that i have been trying to make here is that the Christian church has been letting clear instructions on public prayer and the swearing of oaths fall by the wayside, while insisting upon what seems to be a contrived or shoehorned (if you will) view of what nature and the cosmos tell us about life, accepting only what fits with a strict and literal reading of Genesis. the juxtaposition of these two points has been ringing alarm bells in my head for some time and i am quite concerned that the Church has set itself up for a bashing at the hands of atheist, agnostic or antiChristian forces, and that this bashing will be the undoing of the faith of many.

Bub

Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/23 18:07

well bubbaguy, you have proved once again, that you do not answer questions.

You make a statement from scripture that may or may not be true, and if confronted you run and hide.

Prayer is misused by much of the church, but your interpretation is incorrect. You have taken one passage, and not examined it in the light of the whole new testament.

While that is an issue that concerns me, (people misusing prayer)

The greater issue to me is churches that allow their people to believe false doctrine like evolution that is contrary to scripture.

This issue is far more rampant in present day society, as very few people are praying anyway, however many have been deceived by satan into believing the devils lie of evolution.

May God open your eyes to this problem, and that you might work to teach the truth of God's word to these people who are in darkness to God's word.

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2007/10/23 18:12

Acts 13:41 (NIV)

" 'Look, you scoffers, wonder and perish, for I am going to do something in your days that you would never believe, even if someone told you.' "

2 Peter 3:3 (NIV)

First of all, you must understand that in the last days scoffers will come, scoffing and following their own evil desires.

Re:, on: 2007/10/23 18:13

Ben,

the points you make in your listing are about comparing the details of scientific study with the details of an account of the creation of life written thousands of years ago. of course they do not fit together. how could they? you might as well compare Shakespear with morse code. the point i take from Genesis is that God created the heavens and the earth. that God intended for mankind to be here and live as His children, striving to love one another, overcome the adversity we brought upon ourselves, and to conquer death and hatred by honoring God and loving our fellow humans.

bub

Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/23 18:32

bubbaguy wrote:

Quote:
-----the points you make in your listing are about comparing the details of scientific study with the details of an account of the creation of life written thousands of years ago. of course they do not fit together. how could they? you might as well compare Shakespear with morse code. the point i take from Genesis is that God created the heavens and the earth. that God intended for mankind to be here and live as His children, striving to love one another, overcome the adversity we brought upon ourselves, and to conquer death and hatred by honoring God and loving our fellow humans.

bubbaguy, do you know what the definition of science is?

It is the gathering of information from "observation" encompassing the whole issue.

Evolutionists have absolutely no evidence that they have gathered verifiably, and certainly not from observation of anything.

They are not scientists, they are people who believe in a false religion. They call it science however, and contrast it with the Bibles teaching for one main purpose, do you know what that is?

Their purpose is to say look, creation is not true, it is a fairy tail, and then it digresses to, and so is God, and then it further digresses to and neither is all of scripture true.

Evolutionist have yet to produce one piece of testable evidence to show that it is true. If there is one, show it to me. There are none whatsoever.

Re:, on: 2007/10/23 20:41

Ben, ccchhrrriiisss is correct that scientific theories are continually being revised to incorporate new discoveries and new findings, but that doesn't mean that evolution is false.

Evolution cannot be proven, as with most scientific theories. But since you asked, here is some basic information on evolution for your consideration:

First, scientists are very skeptical. The approach many scientists take is to try to disprove a theory. That way they know it is false. Evolution is a theory that has not yet been disproved. It is always best to define one's terms before explaining something. Evolution, in this context, is how life in general changes over time. There is little doubt that life on earth has changed over time. It is believed that 99% of all the species that have lived on earth, are now extinct.

Extinction of a species is one way in which life evolves. That evolution occurs within populations of life forms on earth is well supported. Scientists measure gene frequencies and protein structures in a group of organisms, and then see how those frequencies and structures change over time.

Another term you might have heard is "natural selection." It is not the same as evolution. Natural selection simply means that some individuals reproduce more than others, and which leave the most offspring is due to forces at work in nature. If a rabbit made a lot more noise than its neighbor, then it might be more at risk of getting eaten by a lynx or an eagle.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: public prayer?

If it gets eaten, it will not reproduce anymore. Natural selection has also been shown to occur in nature in many instances. Charles Darwin proposed that this process of natural selection might cause evolution in nature. And that this evolution by natural selection could have been the major force that made so many species of organisms. This was a controversial theory then because it was contrary to what most people believed about how God created each species himself. To day, most people familiar with the evidence for evolution of life on earth, accept it as the best explanation for the diversity of life.

There are two large lines of evidence to support this theory. The first is fossils. The other is HOMOLOGY. All life on earth, according to evolutionary theory, evolved from common ancestors. All life on earth is related to each other; we are all of the same family. Modern whales have hip bones in their flesh that they do not use because they do not walk. They probably evolved from mammals that did walk. Paleontologists have found a fossil whale called Pakicetus that has more developed rear legs. Older whales should look more like their ancestors if evolution is correct. Without evolution, we could not understand why whales have hip bones.

Homologous structures do not have to be used for the same purpose. Whale flippers and human hands are homologous, but are used in very different ways. Another interesting fossil is Archaeopteryx. This was a dinosaur that had feathered wings, like birds. Bird and dinosaurs have a common ancestry. This fossil has teeth, although no bird has teeth. It has the skeleton of a dinosaur, but the feathers of a bird. It shows that there was a time when the difference between birds and dinosaurs was not obvious. Birds are the only remaining species from the dinosaur line.

Homology is a complicated concept. It means that two structures are similar because they are related genetically. If two structures are similar but not related then they are only analogous. The wings of birds and insects are analogous. They both are used to fly, but in different ways. They are not related animals. Many differences between their structures make this apparent to the observer. But the wing of a bat and the wing of a bird are homologous. They both contain the same bones. Both have an upper arm bone (humerus), both have a radius and ulna (lower arm bones), and both have wrist bones and metacarpals and digits. They were both derived from the same genetic plan. Look up homology in a biology text for more examples.

There is a growing mountain of evidence that supports evolution. It will never be proven true because we can not know for sure. But by using the scientific method, we can make a good guess, based on careful observations of the earth as it exists today.

Hope this is helpful.

Bub

EVOLUTION? - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2007/10/23 23:40

Brethren

Greetings in Jesus' Name by Whose Blood we are Saved and by Whose Hands all things were made.AMEN.

if life-forms evolved from one to another, where are all the half-done ones? :-?

i guess bro Bub can believe as he wishes, bro Bub, if you're right there is nothing to worry about, have you considered that maybe you may be wrong?What will you do if this proves to be the case?

Grace and Peace are ours in Jesus.AMEN.

Re: EVOLUTION?, on: 2007/10/24 9:04

Ironman,

the whale's hip bone seems to be an example of the half-done. why is it there?

i evolution turns out to be false, i guess i'll have to eat a monkey's uncle. :-P bub

Re: uh, excuse me... - posted by vsuarez, on: 2007/10/24 10:26

This thread has been cut and replaced by a completely new one. If possible, please change the Topic and the category so as not to mislead others. Thanks.

Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/24 12:40

bubbaguy wrote:

Quote:
-----There is a growing mountain of evidence that supports evolution. It will never be proven true because we can not know for sure. But by using the scientific method, we can make a good guess, based on careful observations of the earth as it exists today.

I understand that just because we can't prove everything, doesn't mean the whole theory should be thrown out, but...

Evolutionists have yet to produce 1 piece of testable, verifiable evidence that can be duplicated, or seen happening today.

Every aspect of evolution is guesswork and belief, none of it has any bearing in the word of God.

The word of God has stated the creation in plain literal form detailing it precisely so that there is no mistake about it.

You have minimized the word of God, and gone seeking after other things. Is it so hard to believe that God did what he said?

You mention a whale hip bone, and say that is evidence, for what? All that proves is that a whale has a hip bone.

Where are the remains of the half whale half human, I know you don't believe that that is the progression, but you see my point.

you say that 99% of all creatures are extinct, it looks like a lot more of them than that are here.

For example, go look up the world population, and then multiply that times 99% and see how many of us there would be on earth, and that is just a matter measure of humans, you are talking about species the size of 15 semi trucks.

If you were really an honest man, you would research this from every angle, but you are not, you are a deceived man. The Christian science institute has so much verifiable, duplicatable, and testable evidence that disproves evolution, it is almost laughable to think that people are so blind.

Why don't you look them up, and then go visit them, and see what they have to show, that proves the account in Genesis to be true.

But I doubt you will do that, you like the idea of evolution, because it seems more mystical to you. Well God forgive you for believing a lie instead of the truth.

half done and monkey's uncle... - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2007/10/24 14:38

bro Bub
Greetings in Jesus' Name by Whose Blood we are Saved.AMEN.

you said:

Quote:
-----the whale's hip bone seems to be an example of the half-done. why is it there?

Scriptures and Doctrine :: public prayer?

if it wasn't there the whale wouldn't be the whale as we know it. i think it's all the way done serving whatever purpose God had in mind even if it is unknown to us.

Quote:

-----i evolution turns out to be false, i guess i'll have to eat a monkey's uncle. bub

well i was going to say you'd have to eat crow...but monkey's uncle seems a bit more apt here :-P

Grace and Peace are ours in Jesus.AMEN.

Re:, on: 2007/10/24 15:57

Bubbaguy, having read slowly through this thread and seen the evolution (no pun intended) of it, I'm struggling with the simple fact that many of your ideas contradict the Bible.

A good example:

Quote:

-----The real danger of biblical literalism is that it claims that God spoke and acted in our world within the confines of the words of the Bible, as interpreted by strict constructionalism. God is put into a straightjacket by doing so. and when this straightjacket is removed, what will underpin the beliefs of those who rely upon this manner of viewing the Bible? this is shaky ground upon which to pin a belief system. if Genesis is confounded in this view, all of the Bible becomes suspect. (because "all of it is true, or God is a liar") (someone actually said this to me once.)

I spoke with a Jew a long while ago, and he told me about how Christ cannot have been the Son of God. He said this because while Jesus would have grown up reading the Bible or the books of it that were available at the time, He would have read the prophecies about a Saviour of the world coming. Now somehow, from this, the Jew concluded that Jesus cannot be the Son of God, because He would have been reading the prophecies that spoke in the future tense, and Jesus being the Son of God would therefore require a present tense for Jesus to be reading.

I think this is ludicrous, and I also think that what you have said is ludicrous. By being too narrow-minded in reading your Bible, you have decided, which may seem logical to you, that if the Bible states that God said something, then that is constricting God and putting him 'into a straightjacket'. If I continue the line of thinking that you hold, we then have to conclude that **anything** the Bible says God did therefore constricts God and therefore the Bible cannot say anything about God for fear of constricting Him. The Bible is therefore pointless.

The truth is, Jesus **is** the Son of God, God **did** do what the Bible says He did, and the Bible **is** God's Holy, Perfect and True Word. Bible literalism does not place God in a straightjacket, because He Himself wrote it, and I have a little feeling that God knows exactly what He did. When the authors wrote the Bible, they didn't write what they think happened. They write what God **knows**, because He inspired the authors' writing of it.

If your reasoning for believing evolution is for not taking the Bible literally because it puts Him in a straightjacket, then I better go and pray for you now (phew, long sentence). If the Bible is symbolic, then who's interpretation of it should I believe, study and follow?

Re: - posted by seanjol (), on: 2007/10/24 16:33

sorry guys, I have to say this. I believe in the big bang

God said it, and bang it happened :-P

You honestly have to have a greater faith to believe in the big bang theory and evolution than one has to have to become a believer in Jesus Christ.

Bubba, I have a degree in Biology and Agronomy and have been well pounded with the dogma. Romans 1 is a perfect

picture of those who push and believe in evolution.

18 For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who **hold** the truth in unrighteousness;

19 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.

It's amazing that something God had Paul write 2000 years ago pegs evolutionists today.

May God open your eyes.

Sean

Re: "evolution" - actually devolution!, on: 2007/10/25 17:35

Hi again Bub

How did we get from the question of public prayer to Evolution?

We have been round and round the Evolution issue many times, and you don't seem any more interested than before in finding out the truth on this subject.

You seem like so many people who believe that the pundits (scientists, theologians or whatever) must be right because they are the "experts".

Isn't it time you started thinking for yourself, instead of blindly believing the lies that most of us have been drip-fed almost from infancy?

Even scientists can be brainwashed into believing lies, (I was, as stated before in this forum) so it isn't surprising that you have been too, but I wish that you would be willing to at least try to consider objectively the scientific evidence against Evolution in the broader sense. Living things do change and adapt, but that isn't the same as acquiring totally new genetic characteristics (such as a creature, that never had them, developing eyes or wings from scratch. The only definite evidence is of *loss* of characteristics, not gain, which, can't possibly produce evolution because it's heading in the opposite direction! For example, blind cave creatures "evolved" from ancestors with eyes, some kinds of flightless birds "evolved" from those that could fly; but there is no evidence whatsoever that it happened the other way around.

Re public prayer, the disciples (recorded in Acts) did it often. When they met together they broke bread, prayed, read and had teaching from, the Scriptures. Where you get the idea that they didn't I can't imagine!

in Him

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/10/25 18:18

Jeannette:

my point is that many Christians ignore the plainly stated word of Jesus such as: 'when you pray go to your room, close the door and let only your Father who is in heaven hear your words' and 'do not swear, but let your yes be yes and your no be no.' (these are not direct quotes, but are from memory.)

on the other hand they take literally the creation story in Genesis, which Jesus has told us is a parable.

Mat 13:34 All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables; and without a parable spake he not unto them: 35 That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world. (Meaning Genesis)

The prophesy mentioned here is from Psalms 78:2-5

2 I will open my mouth in a parable: I will utter dark sayings of old: 3 Which we have heard and known, and our fathers have told us. 4 We will not hide them from their children, shewing to the generation to come the praises of the LORD, and his strength, and his wonderful works that he hath done.

The truth here is that much of the Old Testament stories are meant to be taken as parables, while the commands and instructions of Jesus are to be taken literally. SO many Christians have these two points jumbled up. They readily swear oaths in court, in signing documents for purchase of their homes, and in many other areas of legal activity. They don't know that many Quakers spent their lives in jail and prison to win the right to "affirm" in court and on legal documents instead of swearing oaths. Their religious services are filled with lofty prayers spoken from the pulpit.

and they continue to argue that observable, testable science is false because of their insistence on a literal Genesis.

one of the best evidences for evolution are vestigial organs and bones. these are things like wings on the ostrich, which cannot fly. they once had usefulness but because of evolution, the animal has changed in such a manner that these are no longer useful. thus they atrophy.

I mentioned the hip bones of the whale before. the whale is a mammal and its predecessors were clearly land animals. but they adapted, changed and now fit into a new ecological niche in the sea. here is a link to more about this.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vestigial#Examples>

I should say that the Bible is a foundational part of my faith and i derive much of my faith from it. but just because some of it is written in a manner that I don't comprehend or cannot understand doesn't mean i throw it all out!

my point to Christian participants on this site is to get real. evolutionary and biological scientists are not out to void the Word or undermine your faith. they are extraordinarily self-critical of their own findings and continue to revise theories as new evidence is discovered. my point is also that Christians should pay attention to the instructions of Christ and stop accepting public prayer as a routine part of their worship services and stop swearing oaths in legal proceedings and documents.

bub

Re:, on: 2007/10/26 5:39

Bubba, I'm struggling to understand you. You claim that we are ignoring Jesus' words by praying out loud and with others, but Jesus does not say anywhere in Scripture that the **only** way to pray is on your own in your bedroom. If you are quoting Jesus and saying that 'when you pray go to your room, close the door and let only your Father who is in heaven hear your words', then I guess that you also only ever pray to God in your bedroom with the door shut?

Many times in the Bible, prayers have been said out loud. Solomon's Prayer of Dedication (1 Kings 8:22-onwards) is an excellent example. New Testament examples include Jesus Himself praying out loud in John 17, and Peter and John in Acts 4:23-31.

Quote:
-----evolutionary and biological scientists are not out to void the Word or undermine your faith. they are extraordinarily self-critical of their own findings and continue to revise theories as new evidence is discovered.

Please don't use scientists' self-criticism of their findings to back your belief in evolution up. They may be self-critical, that does not make what they are doing right.

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2007/10/26 10:03

Man = evolution
Creation = God

I believe God.

Christiaan

Re:, on: 2007/10/26 12:10

Richard,

well i guess my concern is that it doesn't say "sometimes, when you pray", but "when you pray." moreover, the Kings example you provide is before Jesus' time, and the other two NT examples are not public prayer, but rather prayer within a closed group of believers.

I don't think it necessary to be shut up in your room, but rather that your prayers are silent and between you and God alone. the problem with public prayer is that it gives way so quickly to grandstanding. how many times have you heard prayer for world peace?? do you actually think God will answer such prayers?? those who pray thusly are speaking to their audience in order to gain their favor; they are not praying to God. the real danger is that in doing so they undermine the real power of and belief in prayer, which is a private communication between the supplicant and God.

bub

Re:, on: 2007/10/26 12:26

Quote:

-----the other two NT examples are not public prayer, but rather prayer within a closed group of believers

You need to provide me with your definition of 'public prayer' then.

Quote:

-----I don't think it necessary to be shut up in your room, but rather that your prayers are silent and between you and God alone.

According to your own sayings, you are therefore disobeying Jesus.

Quote:

-----do you actually think God will answer such prayers?? those who pray thusly are speaking to their audience in order to gain their favor; they are not praying to God

A blanket statement which means nothing to me. I have heard many prayers by dear brothers and sisters asking for universal peace and endings of violence. Who are you to ban public prayer because you've decided that these types of prayer are never genuine?

Quote:

-----the real danger is that in doing so they undermine the real power of and belief in prayer, which is a private communication between

the supplicant and God.

Give me a scripture proving your statement that prayer is 'a private communication between the supplicant and God'. And don't make it the one from Jesus saying 'and when you pray, go into your room...' You are using those verses to support your point (that public prayer is wrong), when it is evident that they do not.

Re:, on: 2007/10/26 13:00

If anyone wants to continue the evolutionary debate, I started a new thread (don't think the title of this one can be changed).

I find it very irritating when people claim that Evolution is scientific. (Sorry Bub) Scientists should know better - even if they aren't Christians.

As Paul says in Romans 1, "professing themselves wise they became fools..."

Blessings

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/10/26 14:44

Richard, who is Jesus really addressing in John 17? his followers. he is telling them that His task is completed.

i ask you, what is the point of the passage in Matt if not instruction about prayer?

but i guess you win here, so okay, pile it up in public. as it says, you will have your reward.

bub

Re:, on: 2007/10/26 16:37

Quote:

bubbaguy wrote:

Richard, who is Jesus really addressing in John 17? his followers. he is telling them that His task is completed.

i ask you, what is the point of the passage in Matt if not instruction about prayer?

but i guess you win here, so okay, pile it up in public. as it says, you will have your reward.

bub

If you think I'm discussing this subject in order to 'win' an argument, then I have nothing to say to you.