



Scriptures and Doctrine :: Biblical Inerrancy- Your thoughts

Biblical Inerrancy- Your thoughts - posted by mikeymcdee, on: 2005/4/18 20:02

Eager to see both sides on the issue of Biblical Inerrancy. I am trying to find audio of anyone who has taught on that subject so if you know of any please e-mail me! Thanks

Re: Biblical Inerrancy- Your thoughts - posted by HakkaMin (), on: 2005/4/18 20:19

You might want to check out an audio series by Steve Gregg called "Authority Of The Scriptures." This 16 part series can be found at www.thenarrowpath.com under the "Tape Download Page." Hope this helps. And - by the way - welcome to the forum.

Re: - posted by mikeymcdee, on: 2005/4/19 3:42

Awesome! This was just what i was looking for and more! Thanks so much for your input and welcoming me! If anyone else has anything they think is worth sharing then go for it! God Bless!

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/19 4:11

Great to see this topic raised here. When you have listened, come back and we can talk! :-D

This is probably a 'bit over the top' to where you are at in your thinking but others might like to read THE CHICAGO STATEMENT ON BIBLICAL INERRANCY

Must read... - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/4/19 10:24

Dear Ron, this is a must read!

Thank you so much, Oh there is much, much more to be said ;-)

Re: Biblical Inerrancy- Your thoughts - posted by AndrewBruce (), on: 2005/4/19 16:56

Mikeymcdee,

Great question! I would definately suggest the link to the The Chicago statement given by philologos previously.

Also consider the fact that if all scripture is not God breathed then how do we know what is? To reject some of the Bible is to reject all of the Bible. If we pick and choose what parts to believe it becomes a work of man, not the Word of God.

If the Bible were not God's word than I would have no reason to be a Christian because without the Bible there is no Christianity, just the traditions of men. Take any scripture out of the Bible and say it shouldn't be there and then suddenly there is no absolute truth and without truth we cannot have an accurate grasp of reality.

Re:, on: 2005/4/19 17:08

AndrewBruce wrote:

"Also consider the fact that if all scripture is not God breathed then how do we know what is? To reject some of the Bible is to reject all of the Bible. If we pick and choose what parts to believe it becomes a work of man, not the Word of God."

The Fact?????!!! Try discernment, with prayer.

REjecting some is rejecting all?????!!!! Baloney! I reject the Revelation as a corruption and interpret the much of Old Testament as inspired metaphor but nevertheless find Truth in the New Testament revelation of God's love for all through the teachings and sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

Pick and choose?????!!!! Using the brains God gave us must be a sin, then.

Bubbaguy

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/4/19 17:31

Quote:
-----but nevertheless find Truth in the New Testament revelation of God's love for all through the teachings and sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

Hi Jake,

Pardon me if you have answered this before, but do you believe in the Great White Throne Judgment? If yes, do you believe that those whose name is not written in the Lambs Book of Life will be cast into the Lake of Fire?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/19 17:52

Quote:
-----Pick and choose?????!!!! Using the brains God gave us must be a sin, then.

Yes it is, if you use them to defy what God has said. Your brain is not the ultimate judge, but must itself be judged by the ultimate Judge.

Re:reason above revelation - posted by Compton (), on: 2005/4/19 20:19

Quote:
-----Eager to see both sides on the issue of Biblical Inerrancy.

It's funny, but biblical infallibility and inerrancy are so foundational that even the "neutral" wording of this question bothers me. It's like saying we want to consider both sides of the deity of Christ or the authenticity of His resurrection. I don't want to sound anti-intellectual but doubting the divine provision in scriptures is the proto-error for every form of apostasy ever conceived. (I'm not assuming that you are on this vector...just commenting on the neutrality of your question.)

If your research on this topic could benefit from some historical context you might look into the Downgrade Controversy that started in England during the 19th century. (...and never seems to have ended.) The history of this incident shows what happens when strong churches begin to allow biblical revelation and theology to be challenged by so-called empirical knowledge and natural theology. They "down-grade":)

I like Spurgeon's perspective on the scientific skepticism that leaks into our churches.

Quote:
-----"...the new views are not the old truth in a better dress, but deadly errors with which we can have no fellowship. I regard full-grown 'modern thought' as a totally new cult ..."

Here is an excerpt from a Shindler and Spurgeon article during the Downgrade Controversy.

"The first step astray is a want of adequate faith in the divine inspiration of the sacred Scriptures. All the while a man bows to the authority of God's Word, he will not entertain any sentiment contrary to its teaching. "To the law and to the testimony," is his appeal concerning every doctrine. He esteems that holy Book, concerning all things, to be right, and therefore he hates every false way. But let a man question, or entertain low views of the inspiration and authority of the Bible, and he is without chart to guide him, and without anchor to hold him.

In looking carefully over the history of the times, and the movement of the times, of which we have written briefly, this fact is apparent: that where ministers and Christian churches have held fast to the truth that the Holy Scriptures have been

given by God as an authoritative and infallible rule of faith and practice, they have never wandered very seriously out of the right way. But when, on the other hand, reason has been exalted above revelation, and made the exponent of revelation, all kinds of errors and mischiefs have been the result."

Blessings,

MC

Re:, on: 2005/4/20 9:59

Compton posted an excerpt from a Shindler and Spurgeon article. Quote:

"But when, on the other hand, reason has been exalted above revelation, and made the exponent of revelation, all kinds of errors and mischiefs have been the result."

God gave us reasoning ability and we should use it. When people deny their reasoning ability and put literal interpretations of the Scriptures above clear scientific discovery and knowledge THAT is an insult to God. When someone tells me the Grand Canyon was carved out after Noah's flood and not the Colorado river over millions of years, I know that I am not dealing with a reasonable person; I'm dealing with someone completely deluded. Someone deceiving themselves and others. Why are they doing this?? Because of their need to continue seeing the Scriptures as a perfect source of all knowledge. Well, the Scriptures are an invaluable source of knowledge about God and His Covenant with the Jews and the birth of Christianity, but it is a lousy source of information on geology and biology. The problem is in trying to make the Scriptures into something more than they are. They are a testimony of God to His people about how to live. That is sufficient for me.

Bubbaguy

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/4/20 10:58

Quote:
-----When someone tells me the Grand Canyon was carved out after Noah's flood and not the Colorado river over millions of years, I know that I am not dealing with a reasonable person;

I have seen the Grand Canyon from both north and south rim and wonder how the Colorado river could have even done such a thing. Why is not a canyon carved by the Mississippi or Missouri rivers?

Quote:
----- When people deny their reasoning ability and put literal interpretations of the Scriptures above clear scientific discovery and knowledge THAT is an insult to God.

Scientists change their opinions like socks. Darwin is the voice of ignorance and deception the likes of which have never been seen in human history. His falsehood has been a miasma of lies. The fossil record refutes his theory hands down. And natural selection could not possibly account for the infinite complexity of the creation. I have no confidence in a scientist who is willing to look at the evidence and still believe time + chance is the creator. The universe is winding down- not up. The time would fail me to level the doctrine of evolution into nothing. The only way to buttress it is in the courts. I suggest Behe's "Darwin's Black Box" for those who have not read it. It is a good introduction to these things.

Re:, on: 2005/4/20 12:00

Robert and I will never agree on this, although we agree on much about salvation through Christ. I've read Darwin's Black Box and the only thing I can say is that it is written to disprove a point rather than trying to prove a point. Anybody can tear down.

In any regard, I've beaten this topic to death on this site and already made my points on other threads. Crosscheck recently posted some of these.

One curiosity though. The vast majority of the scientific community including physicians believe in the workings of evolution. This same scientific community produces our medicines, space flight, hubble telescope, and in general has established a base line of information for understanding of our world and universe. We trust these scientists to get things right and, in general, they do. Why is evolution the only theory you contend with? YOU don't dispute gravity or the speed of light or the revolution of the planets around the sun or the mechanics of our physiology or the basis of biology. Why dispute this one particular thing? Because it collides with your interpretation of the Bible. And your interpretation of the Bible has to be correct in order for your salvation. SO you have a personal bias that affects and inhibits your conceptualization of life and your thinking.

My main point on this has to be that you can be a Christian and believe in the Bible and also believe in evolution.

Bubbaguy

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/20 13:32

Quote:
-----God gave us reasoning ability and we should use it. When people deny their reasoning ability and put literal interpretations of the Scriptures above clear scientific discovery and knowledge THAT is an insult to God. When someone tells me the Grand Canyon was carved out after Noah's flood and not the Colorado river over millions of years, I know that I am not dealing with a reasonable person; I'm dealing with someone completely deluded. Someone deceiving themselves and others.

When people, professing to be spiritual, put their own reason ahead of the revelation of the word of God, that is an insult to God. When someone tells me that his own inner light is more reliable than the testimony of God in the scripture, I know that I am not dealing with a man of faith. I am dealing with someone who is totally earth-bound. Someone who has deluded himself and now wants to delude others.

You don't have to change many words to see why you and I will never have any agreement.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/20 13:35

Quote:
-----One curiosity though. The vast majority of the scientific community including physicians believe in the workings of evolution. This same scientific community produces our medicines, space flight, hubble telescope, and in general has established a base line of information for understanding of our world and universe. We trust these scientists to get things right and, in general, they do. Why is evolution the only theory you contend with?

This question shows how thoroughly you misunderstand the scientific process and method. All the other 'theories' are demonstrably true. By definition, it is impossible to prove that 'darwinian evolution is true'. It is not possible to subject the hypothesis to any scientific test. That is why consistent scientists admit that it is a hypothesis.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/4/20 14:05

Quote:
-----Why is evolution the only theory you contend with? YOU don't dispute gravity or the speed of light or the revolution of the planets around the sun or the mechanics of our physiology or the basis of biology. Why dispute this one particular thing? Because it collides with your interpretation of the Bible.

Evolution is the preferred religious philosophy of the public school system that reigns unthwarted. It is the reference point from which scientific determinations are made. If the reference point is off- the whole structure will be off.

Behe uses the analogy of a mousetrap to prove his point. He shows that a mousetrap has a certain number of components that must exist or the trap cannot function. Take away ANY of the basic components and the machine breaks down. Cells also have a certain number of components that MUST be in place or the machine breaks down. Unless ALL of these components leap into existence at once there is no possibility of life to exist. This is known as *irreducible complexity*. When the machine is reduced past a certain number of necessary components- it ceases to function. Case in point- if you go out to your car tonight and pull out the ignition system it will not start (unless it is a diesel engine). So in order for your engine to work it must have 3 things:

- 1) Fuel
- 2) Compression
- 3) Ignition

If any of these are missing or somehow impaired you will not start the engine.

Now imagine how complex the human body is. It staggers the mind just to try to think about it. What about trees? What about flowers? And a host of millions of other living organisms that have unique characteristics. Every one of them has irreducible complexity. Even systems within the body are irreducibly complex. Take away one component from your bloodstream and your blood will not clot and you will bleed to death.

Many other like things far too numerous to mention.

Re:, on: 2005/4/20 14:36

You seem to think that I believe that God had little or nothing to do with the development of life on earth. This is incorrect.

Life evolving on earth was rigged by God from the beginning. Thousands of comets, which are made of ice and dust, deposited water on earth during the bombardment. The other basic constituents of living things -- complex carbon molecules -- arrived on the tails of these comets. Add lightening as a catalyst and there you go.

Far from being improbable, the evolution of life on earth was a foregone conclusion.

Bub

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/4/20 15:09

Quote:
-----Life evolving on earth was rigged by God from the beginning. Thousands of comets, which are made of ice and dust, deposited water on earth during the bombardment. The other basic constituents of living things -- complex carbon molecules -- arrived on the tails of these comets. Add lightening as a catalyst and there you go.

Far from being improbable, the evolution of life on earth was a foregone conclusion.

Where are the transitional forms? If this is true they would be in as great of abundance as any other common fossil. Yet, Stephen J. Gould admitted that they were not there and made up the theory punctuated equilibria. His theory states that forms went through RADICAL transitions in one generation or so. Personally, I don't have enough faith to believe those theories.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/20 15:12

Quote:
-----Life evolving on earth was rigged by God from the beginning.

Now, Jake, you are either a Darwinian evolutionist or you are not, but you can't have random mutations and the survival of the fittest and an 'earth rigged by God from the beginning'. Time to make your mind up? You can't put 'random mutations' and 'rigged by God' into the same sentence'.

Re:, on: 2005/4/20 16:23

God can't use random mutations? Perhaps we see them as random, but they have a purpose and direction.

In order to dismiss evolution, seven day Creationists (I know you are an "old earther" so this doesn't apply to you, Ron) have to dispute many valid scientific findings in fields such as geology. It took millions of years for earth's geology to get where it is today. Oil deposits came from where????? Oil deposits are made from ancient living things compressed over millions of years. No serious scientist will dispute this.

Robert, the answer to your question about transitional forms is that it happened through a process called neotony, the retention of juvenile characteristics. Here's a demonstration that I previously linked (but that was a while ago.)

http://www.mun.ca/biology/scarr/Neoteny_in_humans.htm

The Juvenile is the transitional form, not the adult. Each subsequent generation retains juvenile characteristics further into adulthood. Thus transitional forms would not leave much in the way of a fossil record and it would appear that there was no transition, just the appearance of a new animal.

Bub

Re: - posted by AndrewBruce (), on: 2005/4/20 16:47

Sorry I've been out of this discussion for so long, it seems that if I miss a day I miss a webpage worth of discussion!

I have a few questions that I hope you will meditate on and pray over. How can you say that life evolved on earth and still believe the Genesis account? I can see no possible way that you can rectify these obviously opposing positions.

If God didn't create the earth in seven days then you need to cut out the ten commandments from your Bible because in Exodus 20 when God is giving the ten commandments to Moses He says in verse 11, "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day..." Moses also wrote the Creation account, Jesus says that he wrote the law, if Moses is lying about God giving him the ten commandments and wrong about creation

n then what are we to believe?

Jesus said in John 10:35 that "scripture cannot be broken" If Jesus was wrong then He was not the Son of God and if He was not the Son of God then we are all fools in need of much pity.

Another thing, our God is a God of order. He would not create half humans. Did they have souls or were they animals? Also, if the first sin isn't until Genesis 3 then why did these "missing links" apparently die? Or do we need to throw out Genesis 3 too? If Adam and Eve were initially innocent then their supposed ancestors must have been too.

As for the flood account...

Jesus says:

"and they unaware until the flood came and swept them all away, so will be the coming of the Son of Man" Matthew 24:39

"...and the flood came and destroyed them all." Luke 17:27

Once again we have a big problem, if the flood recorded in Genesis (written down by Moses) did not destroy all of mankind then Jesus is not the Son of God.

Just as Jesus did, II Peter 3 compares the flood in Noah's time to the final judgment. Both are worldwide.

Once again I ask you to pray over these thoughts and ask the Lord to help you as you think about what exactly is your basis for truth. Is it science? Or is it God's word? Science changes, but "... the word of our God will stand forever." Isaiah 40:8

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/4/20 16:49

Quote:
-----Oil deposits came from where????? Oil deposits are made from ancient living things compressed over millions of years. No serious scientist will dispute this.

The problem with oil deposits is that the porosity of the rock is not sufficient to contain the pressure that the deposits are under for that length of time. The top blowing off of an oil rig is case in point. what sealed up that pressure all those years?

Re:, on: 2005/4/20 17:00

AndrewBruce:

The creation story was believed to be literal by the people in the days of Moses and of Jesus, so they spoke of creation in this manner. In fact there is no way they could have spoken to people of that time in any other way. It would have made no sense whatsoever. Next, it is said that we should not put the Father to the test. You are getting close though when you say things like: "If Jesus was wrong then He was not the Son of God and if He was not the Son of God then we are all fools in need of much pity."

Jesus could only speak to the condition of the people who lived at that time.

Bub

random or rigged? - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/20 17:25

Quote:

-----God can't use random mutations?

think Jake, think, how can a 'random' mutation be part of God's 'rigging'? It is either 'random' or 'rigged'; you can't have it both ways.

Re: - posted by Smokey (), on: 2005/4/20 19:13

Bubbaguy

In all the time I have been reading your posts, I never knew that you had such a well developed sense of humor. Because if you are not "pulling our leg" in this discussion, you are a very confused man in need of much prayer. I believe the explanation of your confusion is found in Mat. 13:12. But while the man slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way.

I know that this will cause an uproar, but why are we so slow in calling a tare a tare??

LOL Greg :-?

Re: - posted by AndrewBruce (), on: 2005/4/20 20:35

Quote:

bubbaguy wrote:

AndrewBruce:

The creation story was believed to be literal by the people in the days of Moses and of Jesus, so they spoke of creation in this manner. In fact there is no way they could have spoken to people of that time in any other way. It would have made no sense whatsoever. Next, it is said that we should not put the Father to the test. You are getting close though when you say things like: "If Jesus was wrong then He was not the Son of God and if He was not the Son of God then we are all fools in need of much pity."

Jesus could only speak to the condition of the people who lived at that time.

Bub

Bubbaguy

I asked that you pray and consider these things, in light of how quick and incomplete your response was I do not believe that you did either.

In an answer to your response...

In all of the time that Jesus was on earth He spoke the truth, sometimes His hearers did not understand Him sometimes they did. When He said that scripture cannot be broken He meant it. When He said that Noah's flood happened and it swept them all away, it did.

As for my comment being too "close," consider:

"And if Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile and you are still in your sins. Then those also who have fallen asleep in Christ have perished. If in this life only we have hoped in Christ, we are of all people most to be pitied." I Corinthians 15:17-19

By making these comments I am not testing our Lord but merely pointing to the obvious conclusion of your beliefs. Just a few verses later in this passage Paul says that death entered the world through Adam... Please refer to my earlier post for the completion of this thought.

Now, please examine and pray over all that is being said here and take your time in responding.

Re:, on: 2005/4/21 13:39

AndrewBruce,

Please don't be offended by my too prompt response. I have been studying the evolution/creation issues for many years and have been asked these questions before.

There was a regional flood and there was a Noah. There's good evidence for this regional flood but not a worldwide deluge. So Jesus was speaking truth.

When you say you are "merely pointing to the obvious conclusion of your beliefs" my response is Huh? not obvious to me.

More and more I find the Christian faith as a balancing act. The deeds, directives and truths spoken by Jesus are mostly self-evident: Love your enemies, Do unto others as you would have them do unto you, etc. These are the important things about Him, He challenged the corrupt, rich, vain, self-loving, and gave honor and comfort to the poor and downcast. He was without sin and offered Himself up for our salvation. I cling to these things tightly and will not let go.

But the world we live in also speaks truths to us and they cannot be ignored. Fossils of living things found in bedrock deep in the earth are clearly millions of years old. The complexity of these fossils move in a linear direction toward more complex forms. Birds and reptiles are clearly descended from dinosaurs. Humans and the chimpanzees share 98% of their DNA and this is not a coincidence, genetics are the engine that drives life.

So, I view much of the Bible as a reflection of the beliefs of the people who lived at that time and did not know about evolution. They sincerely believed their story and no doubt much of it is true.

Christianity is about faith in Jesus, not faith in the literalness and inerrancy of the creation story. Don't let the later shake any confidence in the former.

Bubbaguy

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/21 14:13

Quote:
-----There was a regional flood and there was a Noah. There's good evidence for this regional flood but not a worldwide deluge. So Jesus was speaking truth.

I don't know whether Jesus should feel gratified by your endorsement or not. Jesus was speaking the truth because the evidence satisfies you? What arrogant nonsense. Time and again you reveal just where you stand on these issues. The ultimate test is your power of reason. Jesus must bow to Jake's mental prowess. Well, Jake, I will tell you He won't and unless you bow to His Lordship you will die in your sins.

Re: - posted by dann (), on: 2005/4/21 15:10

Quote:

AndrewBruce wrote:

Also consider the fact that if all scripture is not God breathed then how do we know what is? To reject some of the Bible is to reject all of the Bible. If we pick and choose what parts to believe it becomes a work of man, not the Word of God.

When I first became a Christian, I refused to believe everything I read in scripture. I reasoned (much like bubbaguy) that all science was truth, and the bible could only be trusted in those areas that I personally deemed relevant.

Thankfully, the Lord showed me (through a godly brother's good counsel) very early in my walk that this sort of practice was the most profoundly arrogant, self exalting, and anti-Christian practice that I could possibly have embarked upon. I was setting myself up as the judge of what was true in scripture. Those things that I liked - these I considered truth, and those things that I didn't like, or disagreed with my scientific opinion - these I cast aside as negligible - had the author's had the benefit of science, I felt certain that they would have written the bible differently.

I presumed that they were wrong, and presumed that science was correct.

Can you imagine the supreme arrogance?

But as Andrew Bruce remarks, so it was remarked to me - if I pick and choose what I am going to believe, I am making my own Jesus - and worshipping my own, 'home-made' Jesus.

Naturally, my home-made Jesus was all love, and no justice. Naturally my home-made Jesus agreed with everything that was popularly believed by modern science (and when scientific opinion changed - my Jesus' opinion changed too). I thought that anyone who believed in the infallibility and inerrancy of scripture was zealous without knowledge - that is, they felt they had to throw common sense out the window in order to be a Christian.

But that all changed the day I repented of this arrogance, and submitted myself to the possibility that God's word was 100% true.

Like Bubbaguy, I had cut out my own version of what was truth, and no doubt, bubbaguy is satisfied and happy with his own religion - I certainly was. But the day I determined to believe the bible was the day it finally made sense (though I previously thought it had made sense - I had no idea what I was missing, and would have argued until I was blue in the face that it made entire sense - at least the parts I chose to believe...)

I determined one day that if God was not able to keep the bible accurate He wasn't God at all. So I allowed for the possibility that the bible was true - and determined to give God the benefit of the doubt. The moment I did, my understanding of scripture exploded - I mean things which never connected before suddenly became knit together in meaning - everything, --every-- --thing-- opened up like a rose.

Before I was willing to believe, I thought I understood - but the day I humbled myself before the word of God, that is the day I really started to understand.

Bubbaguy, you think you have something, but from where I am standing, having been in your shoes, you look so much like a cloud without water, it is painful to see.

Bubbaguy, Do you even understand that you have invented your own Jesus? Do you not acknowledge that by setting your own reason as the determining factor in "what is truth" that you have set yourself above God in authority? Do you not see how you presume a superior understanding because you presume to be right?

The beginning of wisdom for me, that is, the day that I realized I was wrong, was the day I was willing to honestly consider the thought that I could be wrong - it was an act of humility.

It is my opinion sir, that if you do not humble yourself enough to realistically allow for the possibility that bible is in fact unerring and infallible, you shall never understand it except in that beggarly, spiritually ineffective way, in which I previously had so great a proficiency, and in which I can only assume you still are mired in.

Dan
/V
V\

Re:, on: 2005/4/21 15:33

So, its God in a box with a pretty bow. All neat and tidy for you. No light from outside can enter. The explanation for everything under the sun is in this one book.

You are adding to what Jesus required of believers and you (will) repell many thinking people away from God by your insistence on a literal seven day creation story. This kind of thinking and beliefs are driving people who may otherwise have come to God and Jesus towards agnosticism at best.

For anyone who has a different opinion on the Scriptures the door to your fellowship is CLOSED.

I'd say that, perhaps unknowingly and even in good intention, this belief system works against God and Christ.

Bub

Re: - posted by dann (), on: 2005/4/21 15:36

Quote:

bubbaguy wrote:

I'd say that, perhaps unknowingly and even in good intention, this belief system works against God and Christ.

I would agree - it works entirely against home-made Gods (read: idols). ;-) but exalts God as He revealed Himself in scripture.

I for one do not care if the world has fewer false religions.

Dan

/V

\V

Re:, on: 2005/4/21 16:06

Let me get this straight. If you don't believe in an inerrant Bible, literal seven day creation, you are an idol worshiper.

YOu just relegated millions of Christians, the vast majority of the faith, to idolotry. No better than devil worshipers.

Moreover, you constrain the Holy Spirit in your life. Shackles you don't need. Take them off. Deal with the real world.

Bub

Re: - posted by modivarch, on: 2005/4/21 16:23

(Eph 4:29) Do not let any unwholesome talk come out of your mouths, but only what is helpful for building others up according to their needs, that it may benefit those who listen.

I believe we should defend the bible, but I know that we have no place in slandering each other, especially a brother in Christ while doing this. Claiming that someone is deluded and unreasonable because he doesn't believe in evolution or saying that your gonna burn in hell if you do is completely wrong.

Re: - posted by Globachio (), on: 2005/4/21 17:51

philologos wrote:

Quote:

-----Pick and choose?????!!!! Using the brains God gave us must be a sin, then.

Yes it is, if you use them to defy what God has said. Your brain is not the ultimate judge, but must itself be judged by the ultimate Judge.

Though I don't normally engage in these exchanges, I read the entire thread and found this comment by Philologos to be the most interesting. So I thought I would respond.

First of all, I completely agree with Philologos. Martin Luther once referred to reason as a "whore" because it will give itself to anyone for any reason. For evidence one need only look at the way science and technology has been used in the 20th century. At the end of the 19th century many of the greatest minds in the world were convinced that we were on the verge of creating a veritable paradise on earth due to the advances made in medicines, industry, etc. But then came WWI and science and technology was used to develop chemical warfare, more efficient machine guns, fighter and bomb planes, etc. I think we need not go further, e.g, into WWII.

As a pastor I was efficiently and effectively trained in the historico-critical method of biblical exegesis in not one, but two seminaries (Roman and then Lutheran). I devoured every scholar from Achtemeier and Bultmann to Westermann and VanRaden. I was convinced that scripture was largely myth, as I invested heavily into the JEPD framework for much of the Old Testament, and the Two-Source Theory with evident redactionism regarding the Gospels. (Paul was considered merely a misogynistic freak.)

However, after several years in the pastorate I encountered orthodox thinkers who didn't fit the stereotyped framework my seminaries had given me (stupid, knuckle-dragging, backwoods fools). In fact, these men and women not only knew the historico-critical method BETTER than I did, but they had an exegetical method (the historico-grammatical), a theology, and a spiritual depth that put me to shame.

Consequently I now hold firmly to the plenary inerrancy and infallibility of the Scriptures.

To abandon (or refuse to accept) plenary inerrancy is indeed to make oneself into a godlet. The reason being is that now *I* must judge Scripture itself; I must judge what is, and what isn't, worthwhile, or true, or applicable. And that's not merely dangerous, it's absolutely disastrous.

I recently met with another pastor who does not hold to inerrancy; who is convinced that the Bible contains contradictions, myths, is culture-bound - i.e., all the historico-critical assumptions. I told him that if his position is true, then everything he ever taught from the pulpit, every word he ever spoke in both pastoral counseling sessions and pastoral teaching events - in fact everything he ever said about Christ and Christianity - was nothing more than his own mere opinion; that it has no more authority than mere opinion. And because no one's opinion ever carries more weight than anyone else's (after all, it's merely an expression of subjectivity), then the opinion of the Nazis, KKK, Al-Qaida, etc., carries every bit as much weight as his.

Hence the inevitable result of rejecting plenary inerrancy.

Anyway, back to lurk mode. Thank you for your time.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/21 18:02

Wow Globachio, that's quite a pilgrimage. You surely must have some things worth passing on? Please don't stay in 'lurk mode' for too long.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/4/22 0:24

Quote:

-----You just relegated millions of Christians, the vast majority of the faith, to idolotry. No better than devil worshipers.

Didn't Christ say that even some of those who prophesied and cast out demons and did other signs and wonders IN THE SPIRIT would not enter heaven? If even some of these will be turned away, there will likely be a LOT of people joining them in hell, some of which call themselves "Christians"

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/4/22 0:33

globachio

Quote:

-----To abandon (or refuse to accept) plenary inerrancy is indeed to make oneself into a godlet. The reason being is that now *I* must judge Scripture itself; I must judge what is, and what isn't, worthwhile, or true, or applicable. And that's not merely dangerous, it's absolutely disastrous.

Godlet...I like that term :-P It seems that we have allowed our minds to take the place of the holy spirit as it comes to interpreting scriptures. If we all agree that the bible is the Word of God and breathed by His very spirit, should it not follow that the Holy Spirit should breathe on us the interpretation and revelation that comes from scripture? I believe there are no errors in the bible of any kind, only contradictions and other such things that rear their heads when we don't let the Holy spirit minister to us the things of God. The errors only crop up when we become little godlets (if I may use your term) and interpret scripture for ourselves and by ourselves.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/4/22 0:38

oh to answer the question on the thread, I don't believe the bible to be inerrant, I KNOW it to be so.

Re: - posted by AndrewBruce (), on: 2005/4/22 16:57

Before I say anything else in this thread I must first ask that we not attempt to judge whether or not someone that we know only through the computer is a believer. Let us just leave that one to the Father and do our best to make this a discussion and not an argument.

Which leads to my second point, what is our goal in this discussion? I have no problem with bubbaguy using science in this discussion. I also have done much, much study in this area. But those of us that are on the other side of the fence, what is our weapon? Is it science or is it God's word? I do not say that we abandon science but only that it is not our exclusive basis. But rather that it be used less than the Holy Scripture. For if we only use science in our discussion with Bubba we will make it into an argument and not a discussion. But if we use scripture and he reads and prays over the Bible, which we say is so powerful, how much more likely is his heart to be changed? Is your goal to win an argument or change a heart?

Re: - posted by AndrewBruce (), on: 2005/4/22 22:06

Bubbaguy:

"Please don't be offended by my too prompt response. I have been studying the evolution/creation issues for many years and have been asked these questions before."

Do not worry about offending me, I was just a little disappointed that you did not fully respond to my questions. But you say you have heard these question before so please give me your answers so I can understand where your coming from.

- 1.Please explain why God says He created the earth in Seven days when He gives the ten commandments in Exodus 20
- 2.What does Jesus mean when He says that the scripture cannot be broken in John 10:35
- 3.Why does Romans 5:12-21 say that death and sin entered the world through Adam? (see also I Corinthians 15:20-23)
- 4.Why does Jesus and II Peter compare the final judgment to Noah's flood saying that both are worldwide?

I have more questions but I will stop there... If you could please answer these for me first then if you wish I will talk science with you. If you would rather communicate through e-mail my address is at the bottom.

Quote:

bubbaguy wrote:

Christianity is about faith in Jesus, not faith in the literalness and inerrancy of the creation story. Don't let the later shake any confidence in the former.

Here is the problem with what you say. If God's word is not God's word than Jesus is not God's son. Our faith is based in this: That Jesus, God made flesh, came to earth lived a perfect life, died for our sins and rose and again and now sits at the right hand of the Father in heaven. If He says one thing that is not true He is not perfect and all falls apart.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/4/22 22:19

Quote:

AndrewBruce wrote:

Before I say anything else in this thread I must first ask that we not attempt to judge whether or not someone that we know only through the computer is a believer. Let us just leave that one to the Father and do our best to make this a discussion and not an argument.

Which leads to my second point, what is our goal in this discussion? I have no problem with bubbaguy using science in this discussion. I also have done much, much study in this area. But those of us that are on the other side of the fence, what is our weapon? Is it science or is it God's word? I do not say that we abandon science but only that it is not our exclusive basis. But rather that it be used less than the Holy Scripture. For if we only use science in our discussion with Bubba we will make it into an argument and not a discussion. But if we use scripture and he reads and prays over the Bible, which we say is so powerful, how much more likely is his heart to be changed? Is your goal to win an argument or change a heart?

you've got a point there. At the end of the day the work of conversion is not our own but a work of God through the HOLY spirit so we should leave it at that. I've tangled with Bubba before and GOD showed me the error in my approach and also that I should leave bubba to Him. Perhaps I'm not the only one who has been instructed as such.

Re:, on: 2005/4/25 9:45

1. Please explain why God says He created the earth in Seven days when He gives the ten commandments in Exodus 20

Seven days is our God assigned schedule for life. Seven days in a week. It is symbiotic of God's work. In fact, the creation is still unfolding. Just read about the Hubble telescope in the papers. New solar systems are forming continually. The Universe is a reflection of God's workings and earth is not an exception.

2. What does Jesus mean when He says that the scripture cannot be broken in John 10:35

It means that the writings of the prophets are being protected by the Holy Spirit. But it does not say they are literal and Jesus used metaphorical parables in His teachings. I think other parts of the Bible -- in particular the Creation story -- are also a kind of parable.

3. Why does Romans 5:12-21 say that death and sin entered the world through Adam? (see also I Corinthians 15:20-23)

Adam means MAN and is both representational of all men and also an individual forerunner. Sin entered through Man.

4. Why does Jesus and II Peter compare the final judgment to Noah's flood saying that both are worldwide?

The flood of Noah's age was sent as punishment and as a Message. The enormous problem with your views here are race diversity in humans. 6000+ years is not enough time for all the different races of humans to have evolved. Next is a lot of water. If it covered the whole earth it would not have anywhere to retreat to. Moreover, if Noah and his family were the only survivors, where in the world did all of the rest of the religions come from? The only teachers of any faith were Jewish. What about languages? There are hundreds of thousands of them. You can see the constraints this puts on the flood story. It requires supernatural explanations at every point in order to make sense, and from what I can see in the world today God works through people and does not move around heaven and earth on a regular basis.

Natural laws were made by God for a reason. We were given brains for a reason.

Lastly, you wrote:

"If God's word is not God's word then Jesus is not God's son."

This is unsound logic. Saying that God's word is not literal is not saying anything about its truthfulness.

Bub

PS. here's an interesting link on the subject

<http://www.calvin.edu/~lhaarsma/week5.html>

Re: - posted by AndrewBruce (), on: 2005/4/25 16:59

Thanks so much bub! Now I begin to understand where you are coming from. As for the website, is there any one particular view from that list that you hold to about creation?

Quote:
-----"If God's word is not God's word then Jesus is not God's son." This is unsound logic. Saying that God's word is not literal is not saying anything about its truthfulness.

Would I be right in saying that you do believe in the inerrancy of the Bible or you still do not?

Here are my thoughts as I see it from God's word.

1. "Seven days is our God assigned schedule for life. Seven days in a week. It is symbloomatic of God's work. In fact, the creation is still unfolding. Just read about the Hubble telescope in the papers. New solar systems are forming continually . The Universe is a reflection of God's workings and earth is not an exception."

Genesis 2:1-2 "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God finished his work that he had done, and he rested on the seventh day from all his work that he had done."

If we are going to accept Genesis chapter two as literal I think we must accept also that God was/is finished His work that he had done (note the word finished two times). I would definitely agree with you that the universe is expanding out from the earth, not the sun, but the earth which I think that definitely shows that God made the universe for man (are you familiar with the anthropic principle?).

You said "It is symbloomatic of God's work." What do you mean?

2. "It means that the writings of the prophets are being protected by the Holy Spirit. But it does not say they are literal and Jesus used metaphorical parables in His teachings. I think other parts of the Bible -- in particular the Creation story -- are also a kind of parable."

Here is the difference between the parables of Jesus and the writings of the prophets- Jesus called His parables. When Jesus is sharing a parable, we know it because the scripture says it and then He explains it.

"I think other parts of the Bible -- in particular the Creation story -- are also a kind of parable."

How do we know what is literal and what is not? Context, the style of writing, and cross references! Genesis 1 and chapters 6-8 cannot be interpreted as poetical or symbolic because it is not written that way nor is any other part of Moses' writings also whenever any other part of the Bible talks about them they are never referred to as symbolic. Other things like circumcision and the sacrifices are called types in the New Testament whereas the creation and flood accounts are always believed to be literal by other passages found in the Bible.

3. "Adam means MAN and is both representational of all men and also an individual forerunner. Sin entered through Man."

Romans 5:12 says "...sin came into the world through one man..."

Romans 5:17 "If, because of one man's trespass, death reigned through that one man,..."

Romans 5 plainly states that sin entered through one man and death through that sin.

4. "The flood of Noah's age was sent as punishment and as a Message. The enormous problem with your views here are race diversity in humans. 6000+ years is not enough time for all the different races of humans to have evolved. Next is all that water. If it covered the whole earth it would not have anywhere to retreat to. Moreover, if Noah and his family were the only survivors, where in the world did all of the rest of the religions come from? The only teachers of any faith were Jewish. What about languages? There's hundreds of thousands of them. You can see the constraints this puts on the flood story. It requires supernatural explanations at every point in order to make sense, and from what I can see in the world today God works through people and does not move around heaven and earth on a regular basis"

Well, I must first say that that did not answer my question about why the final global judgment is compared to the global judgment in Noah's time. In my next post I will list both why from scripture I believe in a global flood and why scientifically I do as well.

"Natural laws were made by God for a reason. We were given brains for a reason."

It is also logical to assume that He who made those natural laws is above those laws and can "break" them at any point, if He wants to make the sun stay up an extra few hours for a battle He can do that. Our God is not some cosmic watchmaker who sets it and forgets about it or even fails to outlive His creation but rather a personal being who is not bound

by His creation nor is He bound by time itself.

Also I think you would admit that our brains cannot begin to fathom everything about creation. So how can we begin to fathom the Creator?

Re: - posted by AndrewBruce (), on: 2005/4/25 17:12

Flood stuff:

Gen 7:18-24 "The waters prevailed and increased greatly on the earth, and the ark floated on the face of the waters. 19 And the waters prevailed so mightily on the earth that all the high mountains under the whole heaven were covered. 20 The waters prevailed above the mountains, covering them fifteen cubits deep. 21 And all flesh died that moved on the earth, birds, livestock, beasts, all swarming creatures that swarm on the earth, and all mankind. 22 Everything on the dry land in whose nostrils was the breath of life died. 23 He blotted out every living thing that was on the face of the ground, man and animals and creeping things and birds of the heavens. They were blotted out from the earth. Only Noah was left, and those who were with him in the ark. 24 And the waters prevailed on the earth 150 days."

Not much way around that, it must either be thrown out or taken literally.

Where did the water go?

Psa 104:5-9 "He set the earth on its foundations, so that it should never be moved. 6 You covered it with the deep as with a garment; the waters stood above the mountains. 7 At your rebuke they fled; at the sound of your thunder they took to flight. 8 The mountains rose, the valleys sank down to the place that you appointed for them. 9 You set a boundary that they may not pass, so that they might not again cover the earth."

Science stuff:

Have you ever heard of the Plate Tectonics model for the flood?

<http://www.icr.org/research/as/platetectonics.html>

I think this site will answer the questions you posted. If there are any more please let me know and If I do not know the answer I will do my best to find one for you.

(<http://www.icr.org/research/as/platetectonics.html>) Plate Tectonics Model

Re:, on: 2005/4/26 11:17

Quote:

Gen 7:18-24 "The waters prevailed and increased greatly on the earth, and the ark floated on the face of the waters. 19 And the waters prevailed so mightily on the earth that all the high mountains under the whole heaven were covered. 20 The waters prevailed above the mountains, covering them fifteen cubits deep. 21 And all flesh died that moved on the earth, birds, livestock, beasts, all swarming creatures that swarm on the earth, and all mankind. 22 Everything on the dry land and in whose nostrils was the breath of life died. 23 He blotted out every living thing that was on the face of the ground, man and animals and creeping things and birds of the heavens. They were blotted out from the earth. Only Noah was left, and those who were with him in the ark. 24 And the waters prevailed on the earth 150 days."

This was written from a local perspective, not a global one. Noah and those on the ark did not survey the whole earth to see if everything was killed. They saw everything in their region destroyed and concluded that this was worldwide. But they knew nothing of North America at the time or the rest of the continents and could not have traveled to these places to determine if a flood happened there.

In interpreting writing, especially writing that is not from your cultural perspective, it is essential to attempt to understand the experiences and environment of the author. If you take everything at face value and don't look for perspective and potential bias you will get things like this wrong a lot.

Bubbaguy

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/26 14:13

Quote:
-----In interpreting writing, especially writing that is not from your cultural perspective, it is essential to attempt to understand the experiences and environment of the author. If you take everything at face value and don't look for perspective and potential bias you will get things like this wrong a lot.

You don't say! How are things in down-town Ur these days? The neighbourhood as probably changed a bit since Abraham was there?

Re: - posted by modivarch, on: 2005/4/26 16:21

Just curious how someone might explain the constant decrease of energy in the sun. at the rate it is decreasing it would have been big enough as early as 50,000 years ago (give or take a few thousand) to burn up life on the earth. Also the moon was said to have about 35-50 feet of dust on it before the astronauts landed. Neil Armstrong (or it might have been the other guy) was actually quite certain that they would die if they landed due to the gathered dust. Luckily there was only about 2-3 inches. 8-12 thousand years is just enough time for that amount of dust to gather.

Re: - posted by modivarch, on: 2005/4/26 16:25

I just think that evolution is a pretty weak case to make against biblical inerrancy.

Re: - posted by AndrewBruce (), on: 2005/4/26 20:41

Bub,
I must ask that if you wish to discuss this topic with me that you show me the same respect that I have shown you in fully responding to the previous post.

The one thing you did say- Noah did not write the book of Genesis, Moses did.
Please see Exodus 17:4, 24:4 and 34:27 along with the comments made by Jesus about the author of the first five books of the Bible in Luke 24:44 and John 7:19. The Genesis account is not written from Noah's perspective but rather from God's.

What did you think of the plate tectonics model? One of the contributors, Kurt Wise has written a book I think you would enjoy. The name of it is "Genesis: Faith, Form and Time."

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/4/26 22:57

andrewbruce
before you get too far I thought you might like to know that with bubbaguy, you're wasting your time.

Re: whats wrong with creationism, on: 2005/4/27 14:32

Ironman, I could say the same thing about a number of Slers.

"The claim that equity demands balanced treatment of evolutionary theory and special creation in science classrooms reflects a misunderstanding of what science is and how it is conducted. Scientific investigators seek to understand natural phenomena by observation and experimentation. Scientific interpretations of facts and the explanations that account for them therefore must be testable by observation and experimentation.

Creationism, intelligent design, and other claims of supernatural intervention in the origin of life or of species are not science because they are not testable by the methods of science. These claims subordinate observed data to statements based on authority, revelation, or religious belief. Documentation offered in support of these claims is typically limited to the special publications of their advocates. These publications do not offer hypotheses subject to change in light of new data, new interpretations, or demonstration of error. This contrasts with science, where any hypothesis or theory always remains subject to the possibility of rejection or modification in the light of new knowledge.

No body of beliefs that has its origin in doctrinal material rather than scientific observation, interpretation, and experimentation should be admissible as science in any science course. Incorporating the teaching of such doctrines into a science curriculum compromises the objectives of public education. Science has been greatly successful at explaining natural processes, and this has led not only to increased understanding of the universe but also to major improvements in technology and public health and welfare. The growing role that science plays in modern life requires that science, and not religion, be taught in science classes."

From National Academy of Scientists website.

Bub

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/27 17:31

Quote:

-----Scientific interpretations of facts and the explanations that account for them therefore must be testable by observation and experimentation.

Which neatly eliminates darwinian evolution as being 'scientific', it being quite impossible to 'test it by observation and experimentation'.

Quote:

-----Creationism, intelligent design, and other claims of supernatural intervention in the origin of life or of species are not science because they are not testable by the methods of science.

Neither is Darwinian evolution, for the exact reasons stated.

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2005/4/27 17:51

Quote:

-----Creationism, intelligent design, and other claims of supernatural intervention in the origin of life or of species are not science because they are not testable by the methods of science....The growing role that science plays in modern life requires that science, and not religion, be taught in science classes."

I know we all are trying to play nice around here these days but that is just hypocritical nonsense. Macro-evolution is simply unprovable by the evidences of micro-evolution. In fact evolution is a pseudo-science precisely because its proponents will not tolerate any doubt to their beliefs. Darwinian scientists, with their whips and chairs, won't be able to hold back other more advanced ideas forever. What is wrong with admitting that darwinian evolution was not the final theory of everything?

I agree that Intelligent design leads to some religious territory. So does evolution. The truth is that evolution is as much religion as intelligent design. Both recognize visible evidence of a common origin of all life. The difference is that evolution attributes this to astonishing creative powers of blind natural selection while ID attributes this common origin to an intelligent mind. Both ideas simply reveal a personal metaphysical commitment to how one interprets nature.

Scientists are not all knowing gurus. A scientist outside of his or her narrow specialty is nothing more than a lay person with an opinion. They should stop acting like they are the only ones worthy of deciding truth for human civilization.

Hey, I'm open to reason. Just be reasonable about it.

MC

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/4/27 23:07

bubbaguy, I'm a scientist and I know for a fact that evolution is not possible. The physics and chemistry don't work. Without those there can be no biology. If you don't want to believe in creation then don't, just spare the rest of us your rantings. Since this is a forum concerning God, you're not likely to convince anyone that evolution is at all feasible nor are any of us likely to convince you that creation is how it happened so let's all just leave this alone coz we will end up going round and round in circles endlessly.

You are spewing venom from the enemy himself in a bid to cause problems among the brethren and cause them to lose focus on what is truly important. This poisons those who are new to the faith and on that last day when you have to give an account of your life you will have nothing to say in your defense and there will be hell to pay for misleading the young saints. If you want that on your head fine, you have been warned.

Re: God grace the scientists - posted by Compton (), on: 2005/4/27 23:59

Quote:

-----I'm a scientist and I know for a fact that evolution is not possible. The physics and chemistry don't work.

Thank you Ironman for showing us that not all scientists believe in the immaculate conception of self-organized life from matter. May your tribe increase.

Blessings

MC

Re:, on: 2005/4/28 10:13

Guys,

Dating techniques that are used to measure the age of fossil life are verifiable. The progression of complexity of forms in the geology of the earth is observable. The basic constituents of living things are known to exist in the tails of comets. This is all verifiable and testable. Darwin came to his theory not out of whole cloth but from observations on the Galapagos Islands where animals had evolved entirely separated from their mainland predecessors.

Compton, believing in evolution does not mean I question the existence of God or that God created everything. There is no conflict that I see in being a Christian and believing in evolution and I would hazard to guess that the majority of Christians believe in evolution.

Bub

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/4/28 22:56

Bub

Quote:

-----Compton, believing in evolution does not mean I question the existence of God or that God created everything. There is no conflict that I see in being a Christian and believing in evolution and I would hazard to guess that the majority of Christians believe in evolution.

there is one thing, albeit a small one to some, a thing called blasphemy of the Holy Spirit. Giving credit to something/one else for something God did.

Re: - posted by Svineklev, on: 2005/4/29 0:31

Hey, Bub--

I'm kinda in a middle place in this debate. I'm coming to the conclusion that theistic evolution may not be theologically tenable (which more or less scares me because creationism doesn't have the greatest reputation in the world for intellectual integrity!)

I agree with you that the ID movement hasn't shown much positively. They've spent their time trying (and to some extent succeeding) in shooting holes in neo-Darwinism. Many--if not most--of them, including Behe, actually believe in evolution (even macro- if I'm not mistaken) but wish to assail natural selection as the mechanism.

You can poeticize Genesis all you want, but there appear to be a couple of things that are inviolable:

1. God's act in creating the cosmos is an intervening in Nature not an infusing.
2. Man is a special creation, not just another more highly evolved animal.

So, tell me, how do you come up with the God of the Bible through theistic evolution? A God who says, "Let there be light" and produces the "Big Bang" is at best a deistic or panentheistic being. Unless you're willing to buy into Process Theology or the like, we need a deity who involves himself directly in creation (miracles, answered prayer, the special creation of Man) not just one who enacts some natural laws, kicks back, and enjoys the scenery.

The ID movement itself (as well as the "emergent evolution" espoused by the likes of Philip Clayton at Claremont, and Stuart Kaufmann, et al at the Santa Fe Institute) are teleological in nature and will fit with theistic evolution...but may not be compatible with Scripture.

I hope you are able to see that "Science" and "Evolution" as they are currently held are often clung to as religious systems. We could have gotten all of our modern technology without ditching the idea of telos in Nature. Methodological Naturalism is not necessary for objective Science to take place. With most experiments, methodological supernaturalism will not vary anything in the slightest. What it does change is perspective.

The National Academy of Science is clearly an anti-Christian institution with 90% of its members de-facto atheists.

My problem with evolution in the schools is that it is being taught religiously. A naturalistic system antithetical to Christian belief is being endorsed by a government entity. (By the way, according to the recent article in National Geographic "Was Darwin Wrong?" the author--who answers with an emphatic NO, by the way--cites the statistic that 44% of the American public disbelieves in evolution. My guess is that the majority of Christians disavow the theory.)

Your material from the NA of S website bothers me because it lies. ID publications do indeed "offer hypotheses subject to change in light of new data, new interpretations, or demonstration of error," but they are considered out of bounds by the scientific establishment on clearly religious grounds (i.e., ID does not mesh with the scientific community's commitment to atheistic Naturalism). Yes, Science tolerates theistic evolution, but only because TE's god is properly distanced and irrelevant.

I have always felt I could have my cake and eat it, too. I am increasingly less sure. I'm not in the market to becoming a Deist...and I can't bridge the gap metaphysically and theologically between evolution and the biblical God.

By the by, I know a goodly number of Christian professors (in the sciences) here at the University of Georgia who have all kinds of trouble with evolutionary theory. (The reason many can't put this theory in with Gravity, Relativity, Atomic, Heliocentric, or even Quantum theories is that its evidence is culled mostly from the remains of the past...most such theories are inherently as philosophical as scientific. In our lifetimes we have gone from what, a steady-state to an oscillating to a big-bang model for cosmology...and Hawking seems to be distancing himself from the big-bang in "A Brief History of Time." Continental drift and carbon-dating look cool but are not in any way truly verifiable. Last time I checked, we can't go back in time. We can come up with reasonable theories based on the evidence we have...but it seems to me they are nowhere near as substantial/significant as theories wherein our evidence gathering and evaluation are repeatable. Evolution is speculative at best and such should be admitted (and would be admitted if there were not the fervent--almost fanatical--commitment to it).

Look, I'm no scientist. Scientists keep telling me that if I look at the evidence it will become clear that evolution is the only

y answer. They claim it's not that hard to see. Well, I can't see it! It still looks like hocus-pocus fantasy-land stuff to me, and I've really tried. The bit on neotony helps a bit, I guess...though there should still be transitional forms as the change creeps slowly from the juvenile into the adult...when you're half-way there, voila: transitional form. (BTW, are there any reasonable explanations for the Cambrian explosion?)

I truly am sorry if I come across as antagonistic toward either or both sides. It's something I'm honestly trying to come to grips with...and I'm not that fond of the options I've been given.

Some will think I'm dishonoring to God and Scripture. Some will think I'm sticking my head under an anti-intellectual rock as regards the evidences of Science and Nature. I'm merely trying to make sense of them both, and I refuse to compromise. I believe theistic evolution compromises Scripture. I believe that most forms of creationism compromise the Creator's actual creation. Here's hoping someone will help me out of this (seemingly) inextricable morass!

God only knows,

--Eric

Re: The cone of increasing absurdity - posted by Compton (), on: 2005/4/29 1:44

Quote:
-----I truly am sorry if I come across as antagonistic toward either or both sides. It's something I'm honestly trying to come to grips with...and I'm not that fond of the options I've been given.

Eric, I can relate. If all we have to go on is our scientific reason without resting in the faithfulness and unseen wisdom of God we would be quite distressed. I believe these questions we ask are the result of being honest about the limitations of the scientific data given. My conclusion is that science can't measure all of reality...only materiality. What drives me crazy about hardcore evolutionists is that they resign all of what science can't measure to unreality. That is unreasonable. This is where the ID guys, in my opinion, have an advantage.: They are accepting the reasonable proposition that there is existence beyond the elements of energy and matter without deciding what that is. Obviously that is all honest science can do...without becoming "religious".

Darwinian evolutionists make an unqualified declaration that there is nothing else. Thus they intrude into the area of religion all the while resenting religions response. Hence the hypocrisy. They create the science of cladistics not to prove us something but to inform us of something...namely cladogenesis. (The mythical belief in the splitting of a daughter species from an ancestral species.) This isn't verifiable or even falsifiable science at all.

Quote:
-----(... ID does not mesh with the scientific community's commitment to atheistic Naturalism). Yes, Science tolerates theistic evolution, but only because TE's god is properly distanced and irrelevant.

I agree Bubba, that not all evolutionists are athiests (just it's leading authorities). Yet if we make room for God, then why the staunch exclusive loyalty in evolution? I mean if we accept God, then why not other models for His creation?

Quote:
-----Last time I checked, we can't go back in time.

Apparently we don't need to. All we need is the experts to agree upon assumptions such as uniformitarianism and rate of decay and instantly we have a metric by which to "verify" our ideas. The early history of uniformitarian geology was concerned with rejecting models that did not supply the required time needed to make evolution credible. It wasn't until well into the 20th century that someone finally supplied the right "evidence" for the 19th century conclusion.

Quote:
----- (BTW, are there any reasonable explanations for the Cambrian explosion?)

Not unless some one like Gould comes up with a nifty idea like "decimation and diversification" to explain away the incredible problems the Burgess shale creates for evolution. Just like "Punctuated Equilibria" which contradicts the gradualism

m (phyletic) of uniformity, and conveniently explains away the lack of transitional fossils.

However, there is one place that we can look to find a fossil record that never contradicts evolution: in the paper strata of science text books. When I look at evolution I observe a house of cards...or should I say a house of scientific papers.

Bubba, please forgive me if I sounded disrespectful in any way. My tongue and cheek comments aren't directed at you personally but towards the dogmatic elitism of the NAS.

Blessings all

MC

Re:, on: 2005/4/29 11:02

So, Erik, are you trying to say your thoughts on creationism and evolution are going through the process of evolution?

Bub

Re: - posted by Svineklev, on: 2005/4/30 14:39

Bub--

Not in any biochemical sense....

--Eric