



News and Current Events :: Evangelicals Question The Existence Of Adam And Eve

Evangelicals Question The Existence Of Adam And Eve - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2011/8/10 12:12

According to the Bible (Genesis 2:7), this is how humanity began: "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." God then called the man Adam, and later created Eve from Adam's rib.

Polls by Gallup and the Pew Research Center find that four out of 10 Americans believe this account. It's a central tenet for much of conservative Christianity, from evangelicals to confessional churches such as the Christian Reformed Church.

But now some conservative scholars are saying publicly that they can no longer believe the Genesis account. Asked how likely it is that we all descended from Adam and Eve, Dennis Venema, a biologist at Trinity Western University, replies: "That would be against all the genomic evidence that we've assembled over the last 20 years, so not likely at all." ...

read more: <http://n.pr/pHMzj1>

Re: Evangelicals Question The Existence Of Adam And Eve, on: 2011/8/10 12:15

If this were true, then Paul's whole discourse about how sin entered thru one man goes right out the window... and there is no sin... and therefore Christ died in vain.

These people are fools. Oh, they should stop calling themselves Christians because they are not.

Krispy

PS: I didn't catch the first time that this comes from NPR... the mother of all liberal media. Should have known.

Re: , on: 2011/8/10 12:22

Quote:

-----"Venema is a senior fellow at BioLogos Foundation, a Christian group that tries to reconcile faith and science."

By the way, BioLogos does not try to reconcile faith and science... they are unbelievers masquerading as Christians. I've seen a lot of their stuff and they are primarily evolutionists first.

I will warn homeschoolers, BioLogos is trying to make inroads into the homeschool community with their own curriculum. DO NOT USE BioLogos curriculum!!

They just were on the bill to have BioLogos speakers at some of the homeschool conventions... and Ken Hamm called them out and called them what they are. Who got kicked off the circuit? Ken Hamm.

Avoid these people like the plague.

Krispy

Re: Evangelicals Question The Existence Of Adam And Eve - posted by DEADn (), on: 2011/8/10 12:40

I have tried figuring out the balance between the creation of the Earth and when Man was created against that which biology teaches. I have often wondered if Biology was interpreting some results wrong.

I also wonder, let's say science is correct is most of the stuff it is finding, how then can we prove that Adam and Eve were created at all? Is Genesis the only account we have for this?

Re: - posted by Renoncer, on: 2011/8/10 12:46

DEADn,
Please look up www.creation.com
They have great scientific resources proving the Biblical narrative.

In Christ,
Renoncer

Re: , on: 2011/8/10 12:49

The thing is, brother... science has proved nothing in the way of evolution. In fact, the farther science digs the more it proves the Bible correct.

There is a reason why evolution is called a "theory". A theory is not fact. But scientists have taken a theory they can't prove and made it a presupposition as if it were fact... and base all of their thinking upon that false presupposition.

Evolution is easily disproved.

Ken Hamm and Answers In Genesis disproves it daily. Check them out.

If evolution is true, and the Genesis account is false... then the entire Bible is false and you might as well live it up, sin as much as you want to... and die because there is nothing beyond this life.

Every doctrine in the Bible is false if evolution is true, especially the doctrine of sin, doctrine of man and soteriology (study of salvation).

Krispy

Re: - posted by Areadymind (), on: 2011/8/10 13:57

As an engineering student, most of my coursework has been in the sciences. After taking many of these courses I began to understand that what gets called "science" is only "science-so-called." And I am not just trying to cutely quote scripture here.

What people call science and what actually IS science are two completely different things.

Theory is not law.

There are very very few scientifically verifiable laws that scientists can be dogmatic about. But most of what passes as "science." Is really "theory" with an under-layment of scientific terminology and nomenclature. This nomenclature acts as a nearly impenetrable smokescreen, obfuscating the fact that there is really "nothing to see here." It acts kind of like the curtain hiding the true Wizard of Oz if you will.

Christians need to stop kowtowing to the pagan creation worshipers of our day. Just like God expected the children of Israel to do so in the Canaan land. Should we engage in synchronicity with these pagan creation worshipers we will also be forgoing the "land flowing with milk and honey." And it (the land) shall spit us out so to speak.

Re: , on: 2011/8/10 15:55

Amen... and Christians need to "mark and avoid" BioLogos! As well intentioned as they may be (I have my doubts!), they are unbelievers seeking to weaken and disprove the very Word of God.

They are liars on every level.

They have been called out by Bible believing ministries around the country, yet Christians... known for their ignorance and gullibility... head right into trouble by checking these guys out.

Dont be fooled.

Krispy

Re: - posted by Areadymind (), on: 2011/8/11 1:38

I love how the article makes this blanket statement:

"But others say Christians can no longer afford to ignore the evidence from the human genome and fossils just to maintain a literal view of Genesis."

"This stuff is unavoidable," says Dan Harlow at Calvin College. "Evangelicals have to either face up to it or they have to stick their head in the sand. And if they do that, they will lose whatever intellectual currency or respectability they have."

Both of these statements are boiler plate arguments which the article conveniently avoids giving any evidence to back up. There is no evidence in the fossil record. I am admittedly not up on the "Genetic" proof of primate evolution, but due to the severe lack of source citing, as well as my knowledge that the human genome necessitates, by its design, as well as all other genomic materials, an Engineer to make it work, all arguments without actual observation of the past is an argument from silence.

Here is another quote from the article that is a minor pet peeve of mine:

"There was no historical Adam and Eve, no serpent, no apple, no fall that toppled man from a state of innocence."

Just once I would appreciate it if someone could tell me where the book of Genesis states that the fruit of the tree of knowledge was an "apple."

And another quote to consider:

"That's only true if you read the Bible literally, says Dennis Venema at Trinity Western University. But if you read the Bible as poetry and allegory as well as history, you can see God's hand in nature — and in evolution."

I whole-heartedly agree with the Atheists who claim that if you believe that God created the world through evolution, you attribute a cruelty to God that is tantamount to making Him a God not worthy of our worship. Evolution is cruel, brooding, and brutal in all of its facets. I cannot see "God's hand in evolution." If God used evolution to create this world...he is certainly not the God described in scripture, but is far more capricious and wanton than the Bible claims. Secondly, he could be more related to the Gods of myth than Yahweh as revealed in scripture.

The Institute for Creation Research is also another great resource when considering the questions put forth here.

"This debate over a historical Adam and Eve is not just another heady squabble. It's ripping apart the evangelical intelligentsia."

I was not aware that there was an "evangelical intelligentsia." So I guess if it gets ripped apart, it might not be much skin off my back. I thought the gospel was foolishness to the Greeks...but then again, I guess I am just one of those moon-eyed loons that takes the bible "literally."

I will admit there are many things I do not understand the "how" to. But I am not holding my breath by buying into the notion that the belief in a literal Adam and Eve as a believer is tantamount to the Galileo incident. Galileo's case was proven.

ble by observable phenomena, and the scriptures themselves never said anything that would contradict what Galileo observed...it was "Church doctrine" that opposed Galileo. The major difference here is that we have scripture clearly saying one thing, and a theoretical postulate which could NEVER be observed in any way in nature. Plain and simple. One argument does not equal the other.

When people attempt to piece together something that happened in ancient history, without being able to scientifically observe what they are attempting to understand, they are doing two things: 1) they are breaking the rules of the "Scientific Method." (they cannot "Observe" what they are theorizing about, thus the fundamental tenet of the scientific method is brushed aside for theoretical expediency) 2.) They are attempting to play a game of 3 dimensional "connect the dots" when they can't even see the dots.

If you want to better understand the concept of the scientific method, Wikipedia has a pretty good article on it. Also you can look up "Dissent from Darwin" on Google and find a fascinating website where hundreds of PhD scientists have signed a petition/list, where they officially have dissented from Darwin.

This conversation is obviously far more complex than a forum discussion could handle well, but I just thought I would poke a few holes in the article, I tend to not like it much when men who call themselves believers cause "little ones to stumble." I know from personal experience that one of the most stumbling things you can do for an impressionable "little one," is to introduce the question, "Hath God really said?"

"So called" Evangelicals Question The Existence Of Adam And Eve - posted by White_Stone (), on: 2011/8/11 12:30

This thread title makes a statement that is not true and should be voiced to reflect doubt in its veracity if it needs to be posted at all.

There should be some responsibility on the Moderators part when choosing the titles to these type of posts.

Is this the headline we want visitors to see, before they even get to know Jesus?

Titles that offend are popping up on all these forums and the replies keep them on the top of the list. Every time I see a title that casts doubt on any of the characteristics of God Almighty I feel personally offended.

This is not positive reinforcement, it is negative reinforcement and there is no good in it!

Granted it gets people posting and increases traffic, if that is the intent, then, I suppose management achieved their target.