

The Book of Genesis: Should We Believe It?

by Richie Cooley

© 2011 Richie Cooley

ISBN: 978-1-4477-5428-2

Please contact the author with any questions or comments:

mashiachbook@live.co.uk

Some Scripture is taken from the Analytical-Literal Translation of the New Testament: Third Edition. Copyright © 2007 by Gary F. Zeolla of Darkness to Light ministry (www.DTL.org). Previously copyrighted © 1999, 2001, 2005 by Gary Zeolla.

Some Scripture quotations are from the Holy Bible, English Standard Version, copyright © 2001 by Crossway Bibles, a publishing ministry of Good News Publishers. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction (5)

II. The Flaws of Science

A. Big Bang, Big Problems (8)

B. Dissecting Life (11)

C. The Atheistic Worldview: Opposite of Eden (28)

III. God's Evidence

A. Explaining Our Age (36)

B. The Disregarded Redeemer (42)

IV. Conclusion

A. Until Shiloh Comes (53)

B. Remarks on the Resurrection (54)

C. A Personal Word to Richard Dawkins (55)

D. Complexities in Investigating (56)

E. Final Remarks (57)

Appendix (59)

Citations (61)

I. Introduction

In 2007 a father, mother, and son faced charges of fraud at Bolton Crown Court in the United Kingdom. They were the most successful art fraudsters in Britain's history. The remarkable thing is that they ran their operations from the garden shed of their council house while living on state benefits. The out-of-work son would create anything from sculptures to paintings to metal work that he would find in art history books (etc.) and his elderly father would arrange the sale. Some of the most prestigious institutions in the world of antiquities were completely duped.

He persuaded experts from some of the country's most famous museums, such as the British Museum and the Tate Modern, as well as auction houses Bonhams, Christie's and Sotheby's, into paying hundreds of thousands of pounds for them.

By far their most audacious and successful con was recreating a 3,300-year-old Egyptian statue called the Armarna Princess, which they sold to the Bolton Museum for almost £440,000 in 2003.*1

They got away with their crimes for years. One day however they took some phony Assyrian bas-reliefs to an auction house (Bonhams) that staffed a virtuoso in this particular field; one look and he knew the reliefs were fraudulent, thus ending their lucrative spree.

The lesson is this: the "professional" art world proved to be not so expert after all. When the falsified material finally did come across a true authority it was exposed for what it was, but it took a long time to stumble upon such a person. The fact that affectation is at a higher premium than erudition is a sad reality that appears in every genre of life, and is at the root of the problem when considering the validity of the book of Genesis....

There are few serious, independent thinkers. Not many are willing to go against the tide of ignorant platitudes and wishful theories that replace the simple scientific method with a subjective sideshow.

For it has been written, "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and the intelligence of the intelligent I will bring to nothing." [Isaiah 29:14, LXX] Where [is the] wise? Where [is the] scribe? Where [is the] skillful debater of this age? God made the wisdom of this world foolish, did He not (1 Corinthians 1:19-20 [*Analytical Literal Translation (3rd edition), which will be used throughout for New Testament quotes, unless otherwise stated*])?

This is all because people (whether lay or professional) follow a few leaders blindly without personal discernment. Around the heads of venerated figures in ancient religious pictures appear halos, surreal auras of light, representing the divine presence or illumination; nowadays the deference given to some evolutionary scientists smacks of the same bygone gaudiness.

In actuality these scholars are far from noble. John Lennox, a colleague of Richard Dawkins at Oxford, references a disturbing attitude in his terrific book, *God's Undertaker*:

...In his review of Carl Sagan's last book, the Harvard geneticist Richard Lewontin makes it abundantly clear that his materialistic convictions are *a priori* [meaning prior to proving through study and examination]. He not only confesses that his materialism does not derive from his science, but he also admits, on the contrary, that it is his materialism that actually consciously determines the nature of what he conceives science to be: 'Our willingness to accept scientific claims that are against common sense is the key to an understanding of the real struggle between science and the supernatural. We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs...in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment...to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our *a priori* adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated.'^{*2}

In rebuttal to the popularity of these "new atheists" this booklet has been written. There's no easy way to defeat these philosophers because their hypothesis is so broad and plastic:

- (1) There are no supernatural realities
- (2) Existence and order can be accounted for through some natural, material process

How can anyone really outwit such waffle? What I hope to do is simply recount the awful holes in their arguments; and, having put a divine foot through the door, demonstrate that Genesis is a completely trustworthy, God-authored book.

In particular, I wish to encourage Christians not to join the current wave of apostasy that is viciously attacking the doctrine of Biblical inerrancy at large. The notion of theistic evolution [*i.e., that God created evolution*], which, according to a recent Pew Forum poll, nearly half of the world's evangelical leaders believe^{*3}, is just as detrimental to the church as full-blown atheism. It is written that there was no death in the world until Adam (Romans 5:12; not speaking of cells but rather of full creatures), yet death must have occurred billions of times before there ever was an Adam if evolution is true. Also, it is written that man was created from the dust of the earth (Genesis 2:7), not from an ape-like ancestor. To be a believer in an

omnipotent God yet a disbeliever in his special revelation is both thoughtless and heretical...

And Elijah came near to all the people and said, “How long will you go limping between two different opinions? If the LORD is God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him” (1 Kings 18:21 [*English Standard Version, which will be used throughout for Old Testament quotes unless otherwise mentioned*]).

The Almighty is not in heaven blushing over his books, but the world should be blushing over theirs. The Christian doesn't need to join the masses in subscribing to fading glory, but should instead submit to the glory of the only begotten Son of God, “Christ Jesus, who became to us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification and redemption” (1 Corinthians 1:30).

II. The Flaws of Science

A. Big Bang, Big Problems

Where did everything come from? As you probably know, the best guess scientists can offer at the present is that a giant explosion caused all that there is, turning energy into matter, and setting the whole macrocosm in motion. There are at least three serious categoric snags with this theory. Before looking at these though let it be understood that the idea of a “Big Bang” really isn’t anti-Christian in and of itself; actually quite the opposite is true. Materialists would love the cosmos to be static and eternal instead of expanding from a beginning, for the latter certainly indicates a point of creation. The mindless Big Bang however just doesn't go far enough to honour the Bible or science.

1. It can't properly explain deep space or even our solar system as we know it.

Under the current model it is believed that a solar system begins as a cloud of dust and gas that collapses and forms a spinning nebula. It gathers more mass (creating a star like our sun) and the rest of the dust forms planets, etc. Common sense would argue that a bunch of spinning space junk couldn't be responsible for our masterfully created sun and its distinct planets. Moreover, if the sun was truly created by spinning rapidly then somehow it has lost its puff...

[A] significant problem with the formation of the solar system is caused by the spin of the forming system. As more of the mass is pulled toward the sun, the mass must spin faster according to the Law of Conservation of Angular Momentum. This law is easily demonstrated. Sit on an office chair with your arms and legs extended and have someone spin you. Pull your arms and legs into the center and you will spin faster. This is similar to what should have happened to the sun in the nebular hypothesis.

If the nebular hypothesis were accurate, the sun would be spinning much faster than it is. The sun has only 2% of the angular momentum and 99% of the mass of the solar system.*4

Also, Uranus and Venus have retrograde rotations (that is, they rotate in a different direction from the rest of the planets). How could this come about through any naturalistic model? There are many more such issues...

For example, if all the planets, as well as the sun, came from the same dust cloud -- as the Nebular Hypothesis claims -- then why does each planet have an entirely unique composition? Why do the planets' collective orbital velocities, trajectories, and distances combine to precisely balance the earth within a “habitable zone,” where just the right exposure to the sun’s rays ensures the presence of liquid water, which is vital for life?

And why does the solar system contain features that point to a relatively recent origin? For example, why does Saturn have decaying rings instead of a disk [*i.e.*, *Saturn's rings are too delicate to have existed for billions of years*]? Why is Mercury so unexpectedly dense, and why does it have a magnetic field when it is so small [*i.e.*, *any magnetic field of Mercury should have fizzled out long ago*]?

Regardless, the writers assert in *New Scientist* that the “delicate architecture” of the solar system came from a collapsed “molecular cloud.” A related hypothesis offered local patches of turbulence that enabled boulders to coalesce into planets without falling into the sun. But this ad hoc speculation does not explain why the boulders, which must be at least one kilometer in diameter to have enough gravity to attract one another, did not just grind themselves to dust in the effort.*5

Another great problem is that while considering the universe as a whole the mass doesn't add up to the amount predicted. About 90% of it is missing for gravitational assumptions to be justified; so what do scientists say? That most of all matter is invisible to perception; incredible! A criminal should borrow money from these people and then send them all checks made of “dark matter.” In a similar vein, if energy turned into matter at the Big Bang, then there should be just as much anti-matter in the cosmos; oops, astronomers can't find it.

2. The Anthropic Principle

As touched on already with planetary orbits, things are adjusted for intelligent life in a way that defies all explanation. The following quote succinctly details some more major findings:

- The electromagnetic coupling constant binds electrons to protons in atoms. If it was smaller, fewer electrons could be held. If it was larger, electrons would be held too tightly to bond with other atoms.
- Ratio of electron to proton mass (1:1836). Again, if this was larger or smaller, molecules could not form.
- Carbon and oxygen nuclei have finely tuned energy levels.
- Electromagnetic and gravitational forces are finely tuned, so the right kind of star can be stable.
- Our sun is the right colour. If it was redder or bluer, photosynthetic response would be weaker.
- Our sun is also the right mass. If it was larger, its brightness would change too quickly and there would be too much high energy

radiation. If it was smaller, the range of planetary distances able to support life would be too narrow; the right distance would be so close to the star that tidal forces would disrupt the planet's rotational period. UV radiation would also be inadequate for photosynthesis.

- [*As touched on above*] The earth's distance from the sun is crucial for a stable water cycle. Too far away, and most water would freeze; too close and most water would boil.
- The earth's gravity, axial tilt, rotation period, magnetic field, crust thickness, oxygen/nitrogen ratio, carbon dioxide, water vapour and ozone levels are just right.*6

Even Stephen Hawking has written of this phenomenon and the conclusions one could draw from it...

The laws of science, as we know them at present, contain many fundamental numbers, like the size of the electric charge of the electron and the ratio of the masses of the proton and the electron. We cannot, at the moment at least, predict the value of these numbers from theory - - we have to find them by observation. It may be that one day we shall discover a complete unified theory that predicts them all, but it is also possible that some or all of them vary from universe to universe or within a single universe. The remarkable fact is that the values of these numbers seem to have been very finely adjusted to make possible the development of life...Most sets of values would give rise to universes that, although they might be very beautiful, would contain no one able to wonder at that beauty. One can take this either as evidence of a divine purpose in Creation and the choice of the laws of science or as support for the strong anthropic principle [*what Hawking means here is the existence of multiple universes or a single universe with many different regions (pg. 124); nowadays the "weak" anthropic principle is often associated with these concepts*].*7

Information theorist William Dembski sums up the odds of such occurring accordingly...

What happens when we try to assign a probability to the fine-tuning of these constants? Such a probability would look like $1/N$ (one over N). How big is N ? Oxford physicist Roger Penrose concluded that if we jointly considered all the laws of nature that must be fine-tuned, we would be unable to write down such an enormous number because the necessary digits would be greater than the number of elementary particles in the universe.*8

3. Who created the "Big Bang?" Who created the energy that exploded? Evolutionists will quickly reply, "Well who created God?" God claims to be eternal (cf. Deuteronomy 32:27; Psalm 90:2), energy does not. In fact, we

know that energy cannot be eternal; how? The 1st and 2nd laws of thermodynamics.

The 1st law dictates that energy can be changed into other forms but cannot be created nor destroyed. The 2nd law dictates that when energy is used it loses a bit of its utility. So put these laws together: if new energy cannot be created and when energy is employed a bit of it becomes useless, then there is a finite amount of available energy, not an infinite amount.

Nevertheless, Dawkins clung to the “who created God” idea while debating Lennox in Alabama, and also made it clear that he considered a multiverse theory as being a more intellectually satisfying explanation of origins. As mentioned earlier, some scientists are stating that there must be much more out there than the universe we presently see, perhaps even billions and billions of them, and we just happen to be in the right one. Obviously this idea doesn’t explain anything. Dawkins might consider belief in God’s operative force to be childish, but it is at least an explanation. Saying there are a zillion universes doesn’t tell us where ours came from; rather, the problem is then only compounded.

By coming up with various “anthropic principles” in trying to stave off conviction, academics are deceiving the world in an amazing display of sinful stubbornness and pride. Scientific terminology is the new fig leaf. The root of the problem is that the average atheistic lay person is a lot wiser than the “cutting edge” physicist, but the atheist isn’t aware of this, so he or she trusts the physicist blindly. People don’t realize that an unbalanced intellectualism often warps the reason of “great minds” in many fields (especially those deluded by quantum mechanical indulgences). We laugh at the absurdities of ancient pagan philosophers; we have no need to look beyond our own culture to enter into fits of hysterics...

If symmetry is perfect on a cosmic scale, the total amount of energy in the universe is actually zero. Does this mean that nothing caused the universe? If our universe is an absolute zero, absolutely nothing seems required to cause it! Is our universe such an ultimate absolute accident? Is it nothing that was caused by nothing for no reason at all? Extreme Big Accident Cosmology answers affirmatively. This cosmology is advocated by Quantum Cosmologists like Edward P. Tryon, Peter Atkins, A. Vilenkin, Victor J. Stenger, Quentin Smith, and a few others for whom the origin of the universe was a stupendous accident, having no cause whatsoever (R.B. Edwards).⁹

B. Dissecting Life

1. When Did Matter Begin to Live?

Aristotle was one of the most influential philosophers to promote the idea that some living things came about spontaneously:

Now there is one property that animals are found to have in common with plants. For some plants are generated from the seed of plants, whilst other plants are self-generated through the formation of some elemental principle similar to a seed; and of these latter plants some derive their nutriment from the ground, whilst others grow inside other plants, as is mentioned, by the way, in my treatise on Botany. So with animals, some spring from parent animals according to their kind, whilst others grow spontaneously and not from kindred stock; and of these instances of spontaneous generation some come from putrefying earth or vegetable matter, as is the case with a number of insects, while others are spontaneously generated in the inside of animals out of the secretions of their several organs.*¹⁰

The invention of the microscope (A.D. 1590) made such ideas questionable and Louis Pasteur later (around 1860) conducted experiments that definitively proved living things don't come about automatically, but that they can only descend from other life. Where did life originally come from then? Science's answer is that after a cooling-down period which followed the Big Bang, despite Pasteur's law, somehow there was "spontaneous generation" anyway.

This is an outlandish assertion. Many diseases were made much worse in the past because of ignorance as to the existence and origin of microbes. Yet to make evolution tenable we must become forgetful of helpful advances and march back to Aristotle. If the Big Bang falls will they want to resort to the earth-on-a-tortoise theory? Perhaps we'll dress it up a bit and call it the "cosmological terrapin kinetic synthesis?"

Of course all this talk of "life" is a bit antiquated; science sees no difference anymore between a piece of metal and a metal-worker. Anything that is said to characterize life can also be simulated by a machine (at least that is the goal of modern robotics). The neo-Darwinists understand this and therefore have no problem calling humans mere biological robots. The greatest oxymoron in the English language is the term "humanistic atheist"...

What are all of us but self-reproducing robots? We have been put together by our genes and what we do is roam the world looking for a way to sustain ourselves and ultimately produce another robot child.*¹¹

But let's just consider life as we know it classically for a while and revisit this enormous problem later.

2. Proteins

When considered on a miniature scale the building blocks of life are just as spectacular as the galaxies. Yet according to the evolutionary theorist there must have been simple organisms before natural selection could begin to

have any sort of effect, so the original kernel of this wonderful microcosm could only have come about by chance. We are going to see how unlikely this is.

Let's briefly consider the enormous complexity of one of the most important components of living matter. Darwinists don't think proteins came first; nevertheless, they had to be present before the first real cell could have existed...

Proteins themselves are built from *amino acids*. A protein molecule is actually a long chain of linked amino acids...In nature there are 80 types of amino acids; however, only 20 of these are found in living organisms. If any of the other 60 amino acids would be in the chain, it would actually make the protein not viable for use in a living organism. It takes about 100 or so correctly "selected" amino acids to assemble one protein molecule.

To make things more complex: amino acids come in equal amounts of so called *right- and left-handed orientation*...So, any primordial soup would not only contain a random distribution of the 80 different amino acids, but also each amino acid would be present in a random distribution of right- and left-handed orientations. For some, not yet scientifically understood reason, proteins found in viable living organisms only contain left-handed amino acids.

...A calculation for the chance of one functional protein molecule forming randomly would be:

$1/80$ (select the right amino acid, one out of 80 possible choices) multiplied by $1/2$ (only left-handed amino acids are usable) = 1 in 160. This is the probability of selecting the correct first amino acid for the protein. This needs to be repeated 100 times, since there are about 100 amino acids required to assemble one protein molecule. This chance is: $1/160$ times $1/160$...(one hundred times) = $1/160$ to the power 100 = 2.6×10^{220} .

Compare this to the fact that there are only 10^{80} atoms in the whole universe.*12

3. Dependency

Even if against all odds a basic ingredient somehow formed at the most primary of levels, it wouldn't have been useful. Other properties would have had to come about by chance around the same time and then somehow all of these different elements would have needed to combine. Jerry Bergman, a man who has earned five degrees, including a PhD in biology, sums it up like this...

Oversimplified, life depends on a complex arrangement of three classes of molecules: *DNA*, which stores the cell's master plans; *RNA*, which

transports a copy of the needed information contained in the DNA to the protein assembly station; and *proteins*, which make up everything from the ribosomes to the enzymes. Further, chaperons and many other assembly tools are needed to ensure that the protein is properly assembled. All of these parts are necessary and must exist as a properly assembled and integrated unit. DNA is useless without both RNA and proteins, although some types of bacteria can combine the functions of the basic required parts.

The problem for evolution caused by the enormous complexity required for life is quite well recognized, and none of the proposals to overcome it are even remotely satisfactory (Spetner, 1997)...For life to persist, living creatures must have a means of taking in and biochemically processing food. Life also requires oxygen, which must be distributed to all tissues, or for single-celled life, oxygen must effectively and safely be moved around inside the cell membrane to where it is needed, without damaging the cell. Without complex mechanisms to achieve these tasks, life cannot exist. The parts could not evolve separately and could not even exist independently for very long, because they would break down in the environment without protection (Overman, 1997).

Even if they existed, the many parts needed for life could not sit idle waiting for the other parts to evolve, because the existing ones would usually deteriorate very quickly from the effects of dehydration, oxidation, and the action of bacteria or other pathogens. For this reason, only an instantaneous creation of all the necessary parts as a functioning unit can produce life. No compelling evidence has ever been presented to disprove this conclusion, and much evidence exists for the instantaneous creation requirement, such as the discovery that most nucleotides degrade rather fast at the temperatures scientists conclude existed on the early earth (Irion, 1998).^{*13}

All of this would be disputed by Darwinists, but they are unable to come up with any other plausible scenario (amazingly the August 6, 2011 edition of *New Scientist* even invoked the zombified "group selection" fable). Consider one of the several far-fetched candidates the new atheists have chosen for a more simplified starting point of life: RNA World. Many are pinning their hopes on RNA's rather remarkable ability to perform many basic functions. They assume this is what happened until the better building blocks were eventually formed. I can't believe scientists are driven to such madness.

I looked up the plausibility of RNA forming by chance and it is no more likely than what was discussed of proteins above (there's a great piece on this issue floating around online by Cairns-Smith, a molecular biologist who sharply disagrees with the theory. It's from his book -- *Genetic Takeover: And the Mineral Origins of Life*). Then, if it did form, why would it go to the bother

of performing various functions on a grand scale? Also, how could RNA plus RNA ever equal anything else? And above all, just because something can be imagined, or even simulated in some small way on a computer program, doesn't mean that's how it happened!

If scientists would be sensible and cause mind-numbing speculation to cease they would realize that every cell in every organism fulfils Darwin's own curse upon himself..

If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down.*¹⁴

On a footnote, in *The Greatest Show on Earth*, Richard Dawkins rejoices that in a complex E. coli experiment two mutations occurred that allowed the bacteria to take in a food source other than glucose. He claims this could be irreducible complexity at work. Yet it was about generation 20,000 that the first change took place and generation 30,000 that the second took place; linear microevolution is not irreducible complexity according to Darwin's description. As we shall see later, E. coli experimentation shouts that evolution is a fraud, yet Richard rejoices over something so trivial? This is like a man who owes a trillion dollars being excited because he stumbles upon a penny (after searching for 20,000-30,000 generations; moreover, since the bacteria was always capable of using this food source without oxygen, it's more like finding a hay penny. Also, bacteria can gain information and pass on its changes to others in the community in amazing ways, so these experiments could never teach much about the transmutation of complex living things anyway).

4. The Exclusivity of Selection

As we saw above, it is impossible to think that a simple cell formed because there are simply too many processes that would have had to develop simultaneously by chance. When we start talking of large organisms we can begin to factor in natural selection, but this actually hurts instead of helps.

First of all, let's give a simple definition for natural selection. If a small number of giraffes exist, half having short necks and half having long necks, and the only available leaves are high up in trees, obviously only the long-necked giraffes will survive. This is a basic principle found in nature that both evolutionists and creationists regard as legitimate. We must be aware of this however, and I definitely think this is where so many go wrong: natural selection is simply a term for a mindless process, not a tangible force. Modern science must prove how something as complex as the pituitary gland with its amazing array of hormones evolved and not just say "natural selection did it" or speculate via some imaginative story. All the term describes is the very predictable idea that the fit survive.

It was stated that natural selection actually hurts the odds of evolution instead of helping it, and this is why: when it is factored in, non-essential structures are more than likely to vanish off the scene.

It may be said that natural selection is daily and hourly scrutinising, throughout the world, every variation, even the slightest; rejecting that which is bad, preserving and adding up all that is good; silently and insensibly working, whenever and wherever opportunity offers, at the improvement of each organic being in relation to its organic and inorganic conditions of life (Darwin).^{*15}

The classic example is the eye. Unless the eye is complete (or nearly complete) it isn't useful. If it did begin to develop, natural selection would have cancelled it out for being a wasteful anomaly in its early stages.

Think about the engineering feat of reproductive organs. How did male and female reproductive organs evolve separately and yet be compatible? Natural selection couldn't have had the foresight to "create" the different sexes for some sort of beneficial end. Also, selfish genes (which neo-Darwinists think rule the world in order to copy themselves) would not want to go down that path for it instigates an unnecessary struggle for duplication. But again, I'm sure some fairy story will suffice to explain the whole; oh, I mean, some "nature" story.

5. Coming Soon: Mutant Ninja Turtles?

Another logic problem is the means of evolution. The only hope Darwinists have is that beneficial mutations take place at high rates and that they cause there to be new features which are retained by natural selection. The hindrance is that mutations of the genetic code are nearly always harmful, not helpful. This is why medical science takes precautions to protect people from radiation that could cause mutations. Add a random letter to this sentence or take one away. What are the odds of making an improvement so blindly (given that my writing skills are subpar the odds are probably higher than they should be)?

Over time a wolf can be turned into a Boston terrier through breeder-induced selection because of the genome that's already there. Due to adaptation through natural selection a bear will be white at the Arctic Circle and brown in a North American woodland. Neither the dog nor the bear however can gain all sorts of new features to "progress" to another creature.

Neo-Darwinists don't really believe in progression anyway, and this is one of their more dangerous ideas. The erasing of the line between humans and animals has serious implications in the precarious world of genetic engineering. Scientists are already inserting human genes into animals. It

doesn't take much imagination to foresee the worst sort of horror movie becoming reality if the sanctity of human life is completely undermined.

Given this fact, it's amazing that the sociobiologists are so eager to want to erase the line anyway. Are they misanthropic? Or are they just obtuse, being blind to the law of cause and effect? They certainly do not understand this rule as it applies to cosmology and biology, and it's becoming obvious that they don't understand it when it comes to sociology either.

So glibly do the phrases 'higher animals' and 'lower animals' trip off our tongues that it comes as a shock to realize that, far from effortlessly slotting into evolutionary thinking as one might suppose, they were -- and are -- deeply antithetical to it. We think we know that chimpanzees [*our nearest ancestors according to evolutionists*] are higher animals and earthworms are lower, we think we've always known what that means, and we think evolution makes it even clearer. But it doesn't. It is by no means clear that it means anything at all. Or if it means anything, it means so many different things as to be misleading, even pernicious (Dawkins).^{*16}

How can we keep celebrating such toxic notions and survive?

Getting back to the point, Darwin, as shown by a quote in a forthcoming racism section, believed that usage played a part in evolution. That is to say, if I strained to reach fruit in tall trees this deficiency would be somehow corrected in my offspring, who would perhaps be a bit taller or be able to jump higher, etc. Or if I were a hypothetical rat/bat-like ancestor that sprung a few ribs on my back, if I constantly used them they would grow bigger from generation to generation until eventually I had wings and thus would be a bat. This was an important teaching because it gave evolution through natural selection some sort of "guiding force" mechanism.

Science now knows that "use" cannot change DNA and become hereditary (although out of desperation this is still entertained by a minority). So if ribs appear marvellously through mutation, there must be a completely blind mutation that would add to the rib later on (this was seen with the two *E. coli* mutations above). Can we really entertain the thought that lightning struck every ancestral creature countless times?

This is lunacy, yet the new atheists are unable to come up with anything that would fill the void. For example, Richard Dawkins in *The Blind Watchmaker* described a computer program he designed that sharply brought down the odds of a monkey randomly typing a short line from Shakespeare. Yet the program included features of intelligent design, as each guess from the monkey was weighed against what the final outcome was supposed to be, with any successes along the way being retained. Thus the process wasn't blind at all; it had a goal while guarding its "improvements" towards that

goal. Randomness is an inescapable reality for atheists no matter how much abstract reasoning is offered to the contrary...

...Some students and teachers at Plymouth University actually decided to put the monkeys-typing-Shakespeare theory to the test. In 2003, they placed six Sulawesi crested macaques in Paignton Zoo along with a computer and allowed them to get creative for four weeks.

The first monkey whacked the computer with a rock. Others urinated and defecated on the keyboard. In that time, the monkeys produced the equivalent of five typed pages but not a single word in the entire text. The text contained mainly strings of Ss and the occasional A, L, M, and J. The literary efforts of the six monkeys have been printed in a limited edition book entitled *Notes Toward the Complete Works of Shakespeare*.^{*17}

In attempt to salvage the theory of evolution scientists are even tinkering with very anti-Darwinian ideas. Instead of small steps to ascend mount improbable some look to leap up instead. Such notions are very provocative, for evolution through gradualism is supposed to be “fact, *fact*, FACT!” Yet in attempting to be successful at immediate “macroevolution” they’ve come across major dead-end snags. For example, they can get a fruit-fly to sprout extra wings, but the new feature is good for nothing, not being supported by muscles, etc.

The truth is, gradualism is the only hope for evolution, but it has been conclusively proven to be false...

...It is not surprising that he [*Grasse, an esteemed Zoologist*] argued that microevolution [*i.e., gradualism*] could not bear the weight that is often put upon it.

More recent work on the E. coli bacterium backs this up. In this research no real innovative changes were observed through 25,000 generations of E. coli bacteria. Biochemist Michael Behe points out that now more than 30,000 generations of E. coli have been studied [*the number is currently above 40,000*], equivalent to about a million human years, and the net result is that evolution has produced: ‘Mostly devolution. Although some marginal details of some systems have changed during those thirty thousand generations, the bacterium has repeatedly thrown away chunks of its genetic patrimony, including the ability to make some of the building blocks of RNA. Apparently throwing away sophisticated but costly molecular machinery saves the bacterium energy. Nothing of remotely similar elegance has been built. The lesson of E. coli is that it’s easier for evolution to break things than to make things.’^{*18}

As beforementioned, Dawkins has gone into some detail about E. coli experimentation. He claims that it actually supports Darwinian evolution.

After describing a 20 year process of inducing E. coli life he states that the bacteria was then better at exploiting food sources. Yet it was still just E. coli; how is this impressive? Surely if Richard's grand thesis is true, that the Platonic notion of an "ideal E. coli" is merely the illusion of our day, shouldn't it have transformed into something else after so many generations?

To close, even if a beneficial mutation does take place with an organism, the same exact mutation would need to appear across a sizeable portion of the population or each and every mutant would need to become isolated. Not likely.

6. Complexities in the Animal Kingdom

The film *The March of the Penguins* showcased the amazing dedication that the emperor penguins have for their young, enduring the most unbelievably bitter of winters in order for their eggs to be safe; why do they do this? You will say, because they are interested in preserving their kind. Materialism can't account for that (even though reproduction is supposed to be the foundation of Darwinism). If creatures are only bent on survival, on fulfilling the lowest needs, this wouldn't have anything to do with childbearing; how could it? Most animals are not physically benefited by having offspring.

We see this even with the human race. Countless are the young men who are willing to impregnate the world due to lust yet are unwilling to change a dirty diaper (and many women aren't much better). Childbearing is looking forward to the preservation of your kind, but that isn't *personal* survival. Rather, that is an instinct, an instinct to "plan ahead" for a higher purpose. Who did the planning? Genes seem to be the scientific flavour of the week (and many are trying to cut that week short), but this is preposterous. David Stove (a 20th Century philosopher) and the art critic Roger Kimball have memorable words on these "immortals" ...

...Consider Richard Dawkins, another eminent sociobiologist and author of *The Selfish Gene*, a hugely popular book whose basic message is that "we are...robot-vehicles blindly programmed to preserve the selfish molecules known as genes." (Yes, he really says this.) Of course, as Stove points out, "genes can no more be selfish than they can be (say) supercilious, or stupid." The popularity of Dawkins's book lies in the powerful appeal that puppet-theories of human behavior always exercise on those who combine cynicism with credulousness; but genetic puppet theories are no more credible than those propounded by Freudians, Marxists, or astrologers.^{*19}

Of course Dawkins would argue that he doesn't mean selfish in a literal sense. Yet genes don't care if they replicate and aren't able to manipulate anything to that end no matter what scientific terms are swapped with

"care" and "manipulate." The astronomers have their ridiculous big bang, the biologist their ridiculous spontaneous generation, and the sociobiologist their aloof yet passionite, complex yet random, replicator:

At some point a particularly remarkable molecule was formed by accident. We will call it the replicator. It may not necessarily have been the biggest or the most complex molecule around, but it had the extraordinary property of being able to create copies of itself...Four thousand million years on, what was to be the fate of the ancient replicators? They did not die out, for they are past masters of the survival arts. But do not look for them floating loose in the sea; they gave up that cavalier freedom long ago. Now they swarm in huge colonies, safe inside gigantic lumbering robots sealed off from the outside world, communicating with it by tortuous indirect routes, manipulating it by remote control. They are in you and in me; they created us, body and mind; and their preservation is the ultimate rationale for our existence (Dawkins).^{*20}

Anyway, back to reality, why create offspring who are going to rival you for food and water? The only explanation is that God commanded people and animals to breed successfully (cf. Genesis 1:22-28), which implies the imparting of the instinct to nurture if necessary. Darwin recognized the danger to his theory that instincts posed yet did little to answer them. Read his introduction to a section where he attempts to discuss the issue in a very shallow and unsatisfying way...

The subject of instinct might have been worked into the previous chapters; but I have thought that it would be more convenient to treat the subject separately, especially as so wonderful an instinct as that of the hive-bee making its cells will probably have occurred to many readers, as a difficulty sufficient to overthrow my whole theory. I must premise, that I have nothing to do with the origin of the primary mental powers, any more than I have with that of life itself.^{*21}

He then goes on to describe instincts as habit or necessity for the most part, which is ludicrous. A spider spinning a web from birth skillfully with no teacher or a butterfly navigating a two thousand mile migration route without a guide can't be fobbed off so easily. All these things underline the fact that there is more to the world than material elements; there must be an inner being.

7. The Trinity Type

Esteemed scientists like Albert Einstein have stated the insufficiency of mere elements to explain the human experience:

...The concepts which arise in our thought and in our linguistic expressions are all -- when viewed logically -- the free creations of

thought which cannot inductively be gained from sense experiences. This is not so easily noticed only because we have the habit of combining certain concepts and conceptual relations (propositions) so definitely with certain sense experiences that we do not become conscious of the gulf -- logically unbridgeable -- which separates the world of sensory experiences from the world of concepts and propositions.*²²

Einstein's comments are expounded upon in an article by PhD linguist John Oller...

A small part of the evolutionists' problem is that hard objects are never observed spontaneously to transform themselves (on their own recognizance) into abstract ideas. The sun cannot sky-write the fact that it is about 93,000,000 miles from the earth. Neither do events transform themselves automatically into propositions. The meteor that collided with the earth leaving the crater out near Winslow, Arizona, cannot appear on CNN to tell of its journey, or to announce how hot it got streaking across the sky. Nor do space-time relations perceive, define, or narrate their unfolding over time. Events and relations between objects in time and space do not come stamped with date, time, and place of manufacture. While the earth may be affected by the moons of Jupiter in ways that science might detect, a planet is no more able to announce its age or recount its history, or declare the forces to which it is subject, than a dog can recite his pedigree or pronounce his mother's name.*²³

Thoughts, even the ability to reason about simple facts such as colours or shapes, are not physical properties, and therefore materialistic evolution (real "orthodox" evolution) is unable to explain them. This is rarely understood among Darwinian scientists simply because they do not really hold themselves to a strict naturalistic interpretation as much as they profess to. Their language continually betrays a belief in mystical forces, just as Dawkins told Lennox in Alabama that there was "something in the air" which made society somewhat moral, a theme which we shall take up later.

I think the best way to feel the force of this argument is to offer an allegory from the Bible. It is clear from the Scriptures that man consists of a body, soul, and spirit. The fact that man has a soul *and* a spirit might not be common knowledge and even disputed within church circles, but Paul makes it abundantly clear...

For the word of God [is] living and effective and sharper than every double-edged sword and [is] penetrating as far as [the] division of both soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow, and [is] able to discern [the] thoughts and intentions of the heart (Hebrews 4:12).

We all know what the body is, but what about the soul and spirit? I'll attempt a general definition, but of course to be dogmatic about such things borders on arrogance.

The soul is best described as the “animating principle,” true life, consciousness. The Hebrew term *nephesh* appears about 750 times in the Old Testament: 475 times in the *King James Version* it is translated “soul,” 117 times it is translated “life,” 29 times “person,” 15 “mind,” 15 “heart,” along with a handful of minor uses. In order for the dust of the earth to be a living, conscious person, it needs a soul...

And 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 (Genesis 2:7; *Revised Version*; this action was probably ceremonial, just as the Lord Jesus blew on the disciples several days before receiving the Holy Spirit -- John 20:22).

The spirit on the other hand is best described as the information of an individual, its “personal principle”...

But God revealed [them] to us through His Spirit. For the Spirit searches all [things], even the depths of God. For who among people knows the [things] of the person, except the spirit of the person, the [one] in him? In the same way also no one knows the [things] of God, except the Spirit of God (1 Corinthians 2:10-11).

Look at a computer; it is made up of three parts. First is the hardware, which is everything you see physically from the monitor to the mouse, printer, microphone, speakers, etc. Then there is the software which consists of two different types. The most vital is the operating system, that which controls the whole computer, such as Windows or Linux. Then there are the individual data files, the programs that you run on the computer.

So the hardware is the body, the operating system the soul, and the files/programs the spirit. (Incidentally, the fact that the operating system is itself a collection of data files is comparable to the terms *soul* and *spirit* sometimes being interchangeable in the Bible.) How can we test this? We can do so in the Word and in the world.

Let's see if this fits the Scriptural model by looking at the ultimate triple-person: God. The Godhead consists of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, exactly the same as to their essence, but different as to their roles.

The Father is as the soul, the one who gives life and operates all...

For even as the Father has life in Himself, so He gave also to the Son to be having life in Himself (John 5:25).

[The following passage comes at the end of a statement directly describing the Trinity; after mentioning the Holy Spirit and the Son it is written concerning the

*Father...*And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all (1 Corinthians 12:6; *King James Version*).

The Son, Jesus Christ the Righteous, has the role of being the physical member of the Trinity; he represents divinity to all of creation...

...Because in Him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily (Colossians 2:9).

This is why the hardware of the computer exists -- to turn the software into a form that can be interacted with.

Last is the Holy Spirit, and we have already seen from 1 Corinthians above that he is said to know all the thoughts of the Godhead.

Yet there is one more piece to the computer puzzle: what are the processors, memory, and all such necessary internal components? They're technically a part of the hardware but are also where the software is located and utilized; ah, these things are the brain. We have spiritual properties, and their home is in the mind. The brain is the medium of communication internally and externally, but not the originator of the thought process itself. Science in doing away with the existence of the spiritual is left with a body on one side, information on the other, without any way to combine the two. Now the example from the world is a very pertinent one. Never have occult and Eastern religious practices been so prevalent in the West. Through transcendental meditation, yoga, reiki, and blatant witchcraft, society is passionately seeking altered states of consciousness to tap into another world. Yet playing with parts of the mind, seeking "altered states" through mystic practices (or drugs), opens the brain to be tampered with by any spirit (it's like browsing the internet without antivirus software)...

A four-day symposium of the American Academy of Religion, the Society of Biblical Literature, and the American School of Oriental Research also noted the dangers of the occult in relation to mental health. In a paper delivered before the symposium, Roger L. Moore, a psychologist of religion at Chicago Theological Seminary, observed that there are "haunting parallels" between the paranoid schizophrenic and the deeply involved occultist. He warned that "participation in the occult is dangerous for persons who are the most interested in it because they are the least able to turn it on and off....And a lot of them have become paranoid psychotics."

Alice McDowell Pempel of Cornell University delivered another paper on the consequences of drug-induced altered states of consciousness (ASC), and noted the "possibility for madness is ever present" if those who meet up with monsters and demons in these states view them as real. Of course, psychic and occult practices characteristically induce altered states of consciousness and this in itself poses risks. Psychiatrist

Arnold M. Ludwig points out, "As a person enters or is in an ASC, he often experiences fear of losing his grip on reality and losing his self-control."²⁴

The simple fact that the occult could have the same effect upon one's mind as strong narcotics proves the reality of spiritual forces, including demons. The only explanation that someone may try to offer in refutation is to say that those involved with the occult are more likely to see ghosts and ghouls and devils because they are seeking such. This isn't true. Most people who mess about with Ouija boards or "the Alpha state" are trying to amuse themselves, know the future, or even "get in touch with God." So why do they see monsters?

Let's take a look at a case which is like thousands of others. It begins with a young woman being taught the art of transcendental meditation and to seek "spirit guides" within the ASC.

...We were told these counselors could be anyone we chose from Buddha to Grandma Moses, but we were not to be surprised by who actually showed up. They frequently were not the ones expected. (One rabbi taking a previous course had reportedly asked for Moses and Rebekah and wound up with a belly dancer and some pharaoh.)

[After describing that she wanted Jesus and Sarah Bernhardt to be her guides]...We were counted slowly down to our Alpha level by Tom and entered our now fully established laboratory. We each sat in our chair and by means of a control switch located on the arm, slowly brought down the special door of our special compartments to reveal -- little by little -- our counselors.

[After describing that Sarah Bernhardt and a radiant "Jesus" indeed appeared as her spirit guides, she recounts a subsequent experience which she initiated without supervision]...The chamber door began lowering -- the same radiance shining from behind it -- but something was wrong...The hair was wild and matted, the forehead was covered with a coarse fur and the eyes were...gleaming and wild...Fresh blood smeared the muzzle and oozed down long white fangs; the droplets splattered down the front of the tunic...A numbing cold paralyzed my body on the bed.

"Oh, God -- let me out -- let me out!" my mind screamed, but I wasn't able to come out of level. Minutes (hours?) of suffocating horror...^{*25}

Before moving on I'd like to stick in a disclaimer. There are limits to what binary code and all such things can mimic. For example, IBM can program the supercomputer Deep Blue to beat anyone in the world at chess, yet it isn't aware that it has ever played a single match; it isn't "conscious."

Some say that given the time and the advancement in robotics every facet of mentality can be completely recreated. Is this really what we want? That's

another nightmare scenario waiting to happen. On the positive side I think this is very unlikely to occur because consciousness is so incredibly complex...

The modern Darwinian theory of evolution is defective in that it does not even recognize the extraordinary problem that is presented by living organisms acquiring mental experiences of a non-material kind that are in another world from the world of matter-energy, which formerly was globally comprehensive...

It is disturbing that evolutionists have largely ignored the tremendous enigma that is presented to their materialistic theory by the emergence of mentality in the animal evolution...

Popper (1982; 150) states that: "The emergence of consciousness in the animal kingdom is perhaps as great a mystery as the origin of life itself. Nevertheless, one has to assume, despite the impenetrable difficulty, that it is a product of evolution, of natural selection."

I believe that the emergence of consciousness is a skeleton in the cupboard of orthodox evolutionism.*²⁶

These words of the Nobel Prize winning John Eccles are interesting, but even moreso is his belief in three worlds: one completely physical, the second that of consciousness/mentality, and the third information-based...

[*Quoting from a book by Eccles and Popper...*] In this section, I have talked of physical states and of mental states. I think, however, that the problems with which we are dealing can be made considerably clearer if we introduce a *tripartite* division. First, there is the physical world -- the universe of physical entities...this I will call "World 1." Second, there is the world of mental states, including states of consciousness and psychological dispositions and unconscious states; this I will call "World 2." But there is also a *third* such world, the world of the contents of thought, and indeed, of the products of the human mind; this I will call "World 3"..."*²⁷

What could push a human being to become so advanced? Evolutionists do not believe "Lucy" appreciated music, wrote books, mixed paint, or could even discuss such concepts. Darwin says it is the struggle for life, the struggle to reproduce that rose man to new heights. Stove rings in clearly on the insufficiency of Darwin to explain the current state of humankind:

A biological error, or error of heredity, is an organism which does not have as many descendents as it could have, or a characteristic of an organism which prevents it having as many descendents as it otherwise could.

Among plants there is no biological error at all, and in most species of animals there is none worth mentioning. A cockroach, a fish, or a snake,

hardly ever has fewer descendents than it could. They do not waste their time or their health on biology, or philosophy, or religion, or art, or social reform, or any such foolishness. They don't smoke, drink, or gamble either, nor yet do they practice contraception, or fret themselves about over-population or the environment. They concentrate all their efforts, from the earliest possible moment, on having as many descendents as they can...^{*28}

Why does our species fall so short in comparison? This is reminiscent of the Angular Momentum law. The upward swing towards reproduction should be greater in beings that are high in terms of ability. We should therefore be consumed, obsessed, and unbelievably successful with making babies.

Does that seem like an accurate picture? If it were there would be no homosexuality, no abortions, no monogamy, no bad habits, no putting off having children for career or altruistic missionary efforts or caring for a sick relative, or anything else. Breed and bread would be our lives, but such is not the case.

8. Fossils Don't Bear Evidence to Gradualism

Darwin was very apprehensive about this subject. He tried to come up with excuses and possible scenarios to explain the overt problems, yet the doubts he expressed intermittently are still very candid and intriguing. A hundred and fifty years later, the major obstacles that Darwin specifically touched on have never been overcome.

Following is an article by a creationist (John Morris) with Darwin's doubts intermixed. Also, in the portion of the writing that I've used from Morris he is just focusing on the marine section of fossils, which indeed make up well over 95% of them all. (There's a bit more on fossils later)...

(Morris) -- For decades students have been shown a representation of the fossil record appearing as a vertical column with marine invertebrates on the bottom, overlain by fish, then amphibians, reptiles, and mammals, with man on the top. The column is a column of time, they are told, with the long ago past on the bottom and the present on top. The fossil column (or similar figure) is presented without question as if it were true -- as if it were real data. Students are led to believe that the order of first appearance of the fossils over time proves evolution.

I suggest that it does no such thing, for several reasons. First, the fossils do not occur in this order, simple to complex from bottom to top. The fossils at the bottom (i.e., long ago) are equally as complex as any animal today, and are essentially the same as their modern counterparts.

...Diverse forms continue up the column (i.e., throughout time) with much the same appearance possessed at the start. The term *stasis*

describes the tendency to "stay" the same, remain "stationary" or "static." Some body styles go extinct as you come up the column, but no new basic styles are introduced.*²⁹

(Darwin) -- Geological research, though it has added numerous species to existing and extinct genera, and has made the intervals between some few groups less wide than they otherwise would have been, yet has done scarcely anything in breaking down the distinction between species, by connecting them together by numerous, fine, intermediate varieties; and this not having been effected, is probably the gravest and most obvious of all the many objections which may be urged against my views.*³⁰

(Morris) -- Second, the evolutionary presentation in the textbook column implies that all life has come from one (or perhaps a few) common ancestor(s). But the Cambrian System, the lowest (i.e., oldest) level containing extensive multicellular fossils, exhibits a virtual explosion of life. Suddenly (by this I mean without the necessary ancestors lower in the column), every phylum of life is found -- every basic body style, including vertebrate fish. The abrupt appearance of *diverse* forms of life does not match with evolutionary predictions of one form descending into many.*²⁹

(Darwin) The abrupt manner in which whole groups of species suddenly appear in certain formations, has been urged by several palaeontologists, for instance, by Agassiz, Pictet, and by none more forcibly than by Professor Sedgwick, as a fatal objection to the belief in the transmutation of species. If numerous species, belonging to the same genera or families, have really started into life all at once, the fact would be fatal to the theory of descent with slow modification through natural selection.

...There is another and allied difficulty....I allude to the manner in which numbers of species of the same group, suddenly appear in the lowest known fossiliferous rocks. Most of the arguments which have convinced me that all the existing species of the same group have descended from one progenitor, apply with nearly equal force to the earliest known species. Consequently, if my theory be true, it is indisputable that before the lowest Silurian stratum was deposited, long periods elapsed, as long as, or probably far longer than, the whole interval from the Silurian age to the present day; and that during these vast, yet quite unknown, periods of time, the world swarmed with living creatures. To the question why we do not find records of these vast primordial periods, I can give no satisfactory answer. The case at present must remain inexplicable; and may be truly urged as a valid argument against the views here entertained.*³⁰

C. The Atheistic Worldview: Opposite of Eden

1. The Loss of Innocence, Collectively

People (such as me) who believe that the Lord Jesus Christ very well might return in their lifetime are accused of being deluded; yet think of the bizarre hope of the evolutionist. Their science has forced them to believe that our universe is about 15 billion years old and that it is only one of perhaps billions of universes. Total it all up and they're saying that out of a trillion trillion planets and out of at least 15 billion years, we happen to live in a 150 year window (since *Origin of Species* was published) on just the right planet that has figured it all out. Is that not the height of wishful thinking? Of course some might ignore the cosmos and just assume that there are other life forms out there with such knowledge (which would seem to do away with the need for the comical multiverse theory), but that doesn't stop one having to make a similar bombastic statement concerning this planet...

Living organisms had existed on earth, without ever knowing why, for over three thousand million years before the truth finally dawned on one of them. His name was Charles Darwin.*³¹

This is tantamount to a modern hero story. Indeed, the campfire has given way to the halogen bulb, and Finn McCool has given way to Charles Darwin.

Society has proven to be very flaky when considered en masse. A few decades ago the earth was cooling off a bit and many feared that we would soon enter a massive ice age. Recently the earth has been heating up a bit and many are afraid the ice caps will melt and flood us all. Darwinism is no better. Evolutionary theory is simply a product of the industrial revolution. The reason why it took man so long to come up with the daft idea of transmutation through natural selection has to do with politics and economics, not science...

In the nineteenth century, the picture changed with the idea of dynamic, evolutionary change, based on competition and struggle. 'Nature red in tooth and claw' was the image for a new age of rapid industrialisation, aggressive business practices, and intensifying struggles between capital and labour. Organisms were approached in a different light as the products, not of design, but of millennia of competition with other species, in which the better adapted eventually outbreed their competitors.*³²

Moreover, the suggestion from the above quote that Darwin figured out why we're here is quite a misstatement! Richard Dawkins candidly admitted that scientists don't understand the cosmos.*³³ Darwin said he didn't understand life or the primary mental powers. So space, origins, and mentality aren't presently understood; then what is?!

Despite these stupendous gaps in knowledge, the doctrine of naturalism is being spread with tremendous evangelical fervour at the hands of God-haters. Let's note a few of the problems with this that effect everyday life.

First, if atheists truly believe that they could be a breath away from dying and ceasing to exist forever, with no hope of an afterlife in any way, then what motivates them? Why do men like Phillip Pullman have the zeal of the apostle Paul to spread a message of utter hopelessness? Why do they have a zeal for anything?

James said that if we believe in the truth then that belief should change our behaviour (2:14-26). John also said that if we expect the Lord to return then we should try to purify our lives in the present time (1 John 3:3); thus belief should be manifested in a person's observable qualities.

So why do atheists care about anything if they know life to be ultimately futile? Why do they have wives or husbands or children? Why do many of them dedicate their lives to studying the sciences, labour at writing books, and engage in exhausting speaking schedules? It doesn't add up. If one truly believes that everything is pointless, that society is one great big meaningless accident, destined to be annihilated and never thought of again, there wouldn't be the slightest concern to "achieve."

Either these people don't really believe what they say or the truth of authentic nullity, in the pointlessness of all things, is too great for them, so they cling to out-of-place platitudes about "making the most out of life." Many evolutionists talk about how lucky we are and say that we should "live it up" while we have a chance. These people must be living a life that I'm not. Generally speaking, I think existence is very exhausting and filled with depressing problems. If I'm struggling through the days simply to enjoy the beauty of a sunset or the taste of a Big Mac, I'd rather not bother.

Evolution is truly a teaching of utter hopelessness, and it is spreading like wildfire. Although the teachers of this theory might be rich and powerful enough to hide their hearts from its implicit message, yet multitudes of young people are not. They are sucking in this horrible view on the absence of purpose and turning all the more to drugs and sex as a way of escape.

Just look at the U.K., Darwin's homeland; is it a bastion of tranquil piety? No, rather, Scotland leads the world in cocaine consumption^{*34} and England's rate of teenage pregnancy is double the average for the other nations of Western Europe.^{*35} (During my days of believing in theistic evolution I would have contributed to both categories for the U.S. stats.) The opiate of the people is now actual opium. How can anyone read the following words, believe them, and not turn mad under the weight of the despair they advertise...

This is one of the hardest lessons for humans to learn. We cannot admit that things might be neither good nor evil, neither cruel nor kind, but simply callous -- indifferent to all suffering, lacking all purpose...In a universe of blind physical forces and genetic replication, some people are going to get hurt, other people are going to get lucky, and you won't find any rhyme or reason in it, nor any justice. The universe we observe has precisely the properties we should expect if there is, at bottom, no design, no purpose, no evil and no good, nothing but blind, pitiless indifference (Dawkins)...*36

The second problem flows from the first, as seen in the above quote: it is the question of morality. The assertions from atheists on this point are never-ending. They are adamant that there can be integrity without God, and say that we should just be good for the sake of goodness. Uh, hello, you're not supposed to believe in goodness! Have you forgotten yourself, or do you not really believe in the tenets of your religion? If evolution is true, if material elements are all there is, then good or bad, right or wrong, are all just myths.

Stating that an atheist can be a good person is side-stepping the issue. I'm sure an atheist can be a "good" person (*i.e., display regular altruistic characteristics; we all can because we are created in the image of God, though fallen*), and I'm sure there are presently millions that have lived purer lives than I, but in the world of evolution a true moral code doesn't exist. Moreover, if the universe is pointless then there would be no motivation to follow such a code even if it did.

But someone might say, "Why is a code needed?" Simple. Apart from the fact that passions often lead to irrational choices that destroy individual lives, society collectively often goes very astray and needs something objective, something outside itself, to regulate its actions. For example, some of the ancient Central American peoples practiced mass human sacrifice. Or note the horrid racism of the Western world in the 19th century...

2. Charles Darwin: Loving Father, Devoted Husband, and Reprehensible White Supremacist

Let's look at a few of the quotes that prove Darwin put some races above others...

Man is liable to numerous, slight, and diversified variations, which are induced by the same general causes, are governed and transmitted in accordance with the same general laws, as in the lower animals. Man has multiplied so rapidly, that he has necessarily been exposed to struggle for existence, and consequently to natural selection. He has given rise to many races, some of which differ so much from each other, that they have often been ranked by naturalists as distinct species.*37

There is, however, no doubt that the various races, when carefully compared and measured, differ much from each other, - as in the texture of the hair, the relative proportions of all parts of the body, the capacity of the lungs, the form and capacity of the skull, and even in the convolutions of the brain...Their mental characteristics are likewise very distinct; chiefly as it would appear in their emotional, but partly in their intellectual faculties.*³⁷

We thus see that many of the wilder races of man are apt to suffer much in health when subjected to changed conditions or habits of life, and not exclusively from being transported to a new climate. Mere alterations in habits, which do not appear injurious in themselves, seem to have this same effect; and in several cases the children are particularly liable to suffer. It has often been said, as Mr. Macnamara remarks, that man can resist with impunity the greatest diversities of climate and other changes; but this is true only of the civilised races. Man in his wild condition seems to be in this respect almost as susceptible as his nearest allies, the anthropoid apes, which have never yet survived long, when removed from their native country.*³⁷

With civilized nations, the reduced size of the jaws from lessened use -- the habitual play of different muscles serving to express different emotions -- and the increased size of the brain from greater intellectual activity [*this is the "usage" example I referred to earlier*], have together produced a considerable effect on their general appearance when compared with savages.*³⁷

The great break in the organic chain between man and his nearest allies, which cannot be bridged over by any extinct or living species, has often been advanced as a grave objection to the belief that man is descended from some lower form; but this objection will not appear of much weight to those who, from general reasons, believe in the general principle of evolution. Breaks often occur in all parts of the series, some being wide, sharp and defined, others less so in various degrees; as between the orang and its nearest allies -- between the *Tarsius* and the other Lemuridae -- between the elephant, and in a more striking manner between the *Ornithorhynchus* or *Echidna*, and all other mammals. But these breaks depend merely on the number of related forms which have become extinct. At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilised races of man will almost certainly exterminate, and replace, the savage races throughout the world. At the same time the anthropomorphous apes, as Professor Schaaffhausen has remarked, will no doubt be exterminated. The break between man and his nearest allies will then be wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilised state, as we may hope, even than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as

a baboon, instead of as now between the negro or Australian and the gorilla.*37

Now I don't want to present an unbalanced picture. Above, when Darwin said the white race would exterminate Africans and native Australians and thus widen the gap between humans and monkeys, he didn't mean hunting and killing. He meant rather that they would be susceptible to disease and sterility as a result of colonization, for he believed them to be inferior and therefore unable to cope with change.

Also, it can be said in Darwin's favour that he was anti-slavery. Nevertheless, I think Africans and native Australians should be horrified that a major teaching of the world's universities makes them out to be intellectually inferior and on the low end of the human race in general. Though he might have been an advocate for human rights in some ways, he still was a racist; why do modern intellectuals try to deny it?

And just why was Darwin anti-slavery? Well, he witnessed first-hand the brutality of slavery and his heart was stirred against it. Yet naturalism can't believe in "stirred hearts." It probably had much more to do with the good influence of holy men and women on English society as seen in a similar attitude by John Wesley (1703-1791) and C.H. Spurgeon (1834-1892)...

The famous English preacher Charles Spurgeon had some of his sermons burned in America due to his censure of slavery, calling it "the foulest blot" and which "may have to be washed out in blood" [*in reference to war*]. Methodist founder John Wesley denounced human bondage as "the sum of all villainies," and detailed its abuses.*38

Moving on, Darwinism also reasonably leads to a troubling conclusion: there is no real, potent God, so someone or something else must be God, normally, the state. When the survival of the human being is no longer to be left in the hands of an almighty deity, then men must step in and take control. This has led to untold death and destruction....

By the 1890s and especially in the early twentieth century, the eugenics movement gained popularity, especially in medical circles, in Europe and the United States. Eugenics was driven in part by fears that modern institutions had set aside the beneficial aspects of natural selection. Eugenicists continually played on the specter of weak and sickly humans being preserved through modern medicine, hygiene, and charitable institutions, while the more intelligent and supposedly better human beings were beginning to voluntarily restrict their reproduction. This was producing biological degeneration, according to many eugenicists. Their solution? Introduce artificial selection by restricting the reproduction of the so-called "inferior" and encouraging the "superior" to procreate. Biological determinism permeated the eugenics movement, which pressed for marriage restrictions, compulsory sterilization, and

sometimes even involuntary euthanasia for the disabled, because they were deemed biologically inferior.

Another prominent feature of the biological determinism of the early twentieth century was its stress on racial inequality. In Europe racist ideologies proliferated in the 1890s and early 1900s, partly under the influence of Darwinism and biological determinism. Many biologists, anthropologists, and physicians considered black Africans or American Indians less evolved than Europeans. As Europeans colonized vast stretches of the globe, many scientists proclaimed that non-Europeans were culturally inferior to Europeans. Further, they believed that these cultural differences were manifestations of biological inferiority...

Just as one form of environmental determinism -- Marxism -- produced unfathomable misery for millions of humans, so did biological determinism. Hitler's National Socialism was based on a biological determinist vision of humanity that stressed racial inequality. Nazism endorsed discrimination -- and ultimately even death -- for those with allegedly inferior biological traits. On the other hand, it hoped to promote evolutionary advance for the human species by fostering higher reproductive levels of those considered superior biologically. Hitler's regime ended up killing about 200,000 disabled Germans, 6 million Jews, and hundreds of thousands of Gypsies in their effort to improve the human race.*³⁹

And David Stove said:

It is less well known, but still is fairly well known, that Adolf Hitler found or thought he found an authorization for his policies in the Darwinian theory of evolution. He said, for example, that "if we did not respect the law of nature, imposing our will by the right of the stronger, a day would come when the wild animals would again devour us -- then the insects would eat the wild animals, and finally nothing would exist except the microbes. By means of the struggle the elites are continually renewed. The law of selection justifies this incessant struggle by allowing the survival of the fittest. Christianity is a rebellion against natural law, a protest against nature."⁴⁰

You might put it like this: ignorant Mayans killed a multitude of unoffending people to appease their false gods. Ignorant Europeans killed a multitude of unoffending Jews to appease their science (*along with the occult practices of Hitler and a warped, nominal Christendom*). Yet my God killed himself to save a wretch like me!

I want to pause and address in a bit more detail "Christian" violence. Any major religion that has been around a while undergoes entropy in some quarters to the point that a group bends it to produce destruction. The early Christians weren't murderers, they were murdered, just as modern Bible

believers are in India, Nepal, Tibet, China, Vietnam, the Middle East, Northern Africa, and in many other places. It's when quasi-Christians forget the Bible and pretend to be kings and queens in this age that the sword is brandished:

...Whose god [is] the belly [fig., their appetites; cp. Rom 16:18] and [whose] glory [is] in their shame, who set their minds on the [things] of the earth. For our citizenship exists in [the] heavens, from where also we eagerly await a Savior, [the] Lord Jesus Christ (Philippians 3:19-20).

All religious people must cultivate the ability to sharply disagree with the tongue without resorting to sticks or stones. If society cannot do that then it is too immature for peace. What we need is not wishy-washy ecumenism but grown-ups with thick skin and warm hearts. At least the new atheists must admit this: if religion is dangerous and can be used for evil purposes, the short and bloody history of Darwinistic thought proves that it is no better! Although Darwin didn't advocate extremism directly, it's hard to imagine that he didn't foresee the natural outflowings of his hellish philosophy...

When a race of plants is once pretty well established, the seed-raisers do not pick out the best plants, but merely go over their seed-beds, and pull up the 'rogues,' as they call the plants that deviate from the proper standard. With animals this kind of selection is, in fact, also followed; for hardly any one is so careless as to allow his worst animals to breed (Darwin).^{*41}

...The weak members of civilised societies propagate their kind. No one who has attended to the breeding of domestic animals will doubt that this must be highly injurious to the race of man. It is surprising how soon a want of care, or care wrongly directed, leads to the degeneration of a domestic race; but excepting in the case of man himself, hardly any one is so ignorant as to allow his worst animals to breed...but if we were intentionally to neglect the weak and helpless, it could only be for a contingent benefit, with an overwhelming present evil. We must therefore bear the undoubtedly bad effects of the weak surviving and propagating their kind; but there appears to be at least one check in steady action, namely that the weaker and inferior members of society do not marry so freely as the sound; and this check might be indefinitely increased by the weak in body or mind refraining from marriage, though this is more to be hoped for than expected (Darwin).^{*42}

Again, this sadistic "science" is why we need a legal standard that transcends society's whims. We need a law to stand as an independent guard of our actions; one that is based upon the existence of an immutable, holy God, and our relationship to him...

If anyone shall say [or, claim], "I love God," and shall be hating his brother, he is a liar; for the one not loving his brother whom he has seen, how is he able to be loving God whom he has not seen? And this [is] the commandment we have from Him, that the one loving God should also be loving his brother (1 John 4:20-21).

III. God's Evidence

A. Explaining Our Age

Faith in the Bible is not blind faith. This is a document that was written by someone who truly knows all.

1. Law and Order

Let's begin demonstrating this with a few scientific laws/truths that have already been featured, showing how Genesis stated their existence thousands of years ago...

The universe had a beginning (Genesis 1:1; Hebrews 1:10-12). Starting with the studies of Albert Einstein in the early 1900s and continuing today, science has confirmed the biblical view that the universe had a beginning. When the Bible was written most people believed the universe was eternal. Science has proven them wrong, but the Bible correct...

The Bible states that God created life according to kinds (Genesis 1:24). The fact that God distinguishes kinds, agrees with what scientists observe -- namely that there are horizontal genetic boundaries beyond which life cannot vary. Life produces after its own kind. Dogs produce dogs, cats produce cats, roses produce roses. Never have we witnessed one kind changing into another kind as evolution supposes. There are truly natural limits to biological change...

Our bodies are made from the dust of the ground (Genesis 2:7; 3:19). Scientists have discovered that the human body is comprised of some 28 base and trace elements -- all of which are found in the earth...

The First Law of Thermodynamics established (Genesis 2:1-2 [*"Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them..."*])). The First Law dictates that the total quantity of energy and matter in the universe is a constant. One form of energy or matter may be converted into another, but the total quantity always remains the same. Therefore the creation is finished, exactly as God said way back in Genesis...^{*43}

One more thing that I'd like to mention akin to this is the Bible's predicting the speed of light and the vastness of outer space. There's a problem with the universe being so large: the light from stars would take a very long time to get to earth. So how do we see it if creation was only about 6,000 years ago?

A question from Genesis 1 that has always baffled theologians is why did Moses speak of light being formed in day one (*this passage finds its most noble expression allegorically in Christ, but all such Scriptures have a literal meaning as well*) and the stars being formed in day four? The answer is that God must have created not only the stars, but also the light between the stars and the earth.

Next we shall look at two larger mysteries of earth's history which find an explanation in the book of Genesis. Afterward we shall consider the present global regularity that the book predicts, leading finally to the discussion of Joseph (Genesis 37-50) as an astonishing Messianic foreshadowing.

2. Translating Babylon

One of the most puzzling differences between the nations is that of language; where did all the different tongues of the earth come from? (I mean the major groups of course, not every single dialect.) Why are some so drastically different from others if we all came from a common ancestor? The Bible has the only feasible explanation...

Now the whole earth had one language and the same words. And as people migrated from the east, they found a plain in the land of Shinar and settled there. And they said to one another, "Come, let us make bricks, and burn them thoroughly." And they had brick for stone, and bitumen for mortar. Then they said, "Come, let us build ourselves a city and a tower with its top in the heavens, and let us make a name for ourselves, lest we be dispersed over the face of the whole earth." And the LORD came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of man had built. And the LORD said, "Behold, they are one people, and they have all one language, and this is only the beginning of what they will do. And nothing that they propose to do will now be impossible for them. Come, let us go down and there confuse their language, so that they may not understand one another's speech." So the LORD dispersed them from there over the face of all the earth, and they left off building the city (Genesis 11:1-8).

The only alternative is typical of what we've seen before...

If anthropologists insist on an evolutionary explanation for the different languages, then they must likewise postulate extremely long periods of isolation and inbreeding for the different tribes, practically as long as the history of man himself. This in turn means that each of the major language groups must be identical with a major racial group. Therefore, each "race" must have had a long evolutionary history, and it is natural to assume that some races have evolved more than others. This natural association of racism with evolutionary philosophy is quite significant and has been the pseudo-scientific basis of a wide range of racist political and religious philosophies that have wrought untold harm and misery over the years.^{*44}

And there's also a very interesting truth about the nature of language that proves the accuracy of the Tower of Babel account...

Chomsky [*a highly revered linguist*] holds that the grammar of a language is a system of transformational rules that determines a certain pairing of

sound and meaning. It consists of a syntactic component, a semantic component, and a phonological component. The surface structure contains the information relevant to the phonological component, whereas the deep structure contains the information relevant to the semantic component, and the syntactic component pairs surface and deep structures. Hence, it is merely the phonological component that has become greatly differentiated during the course of human history (Stent)...*44

Why is it that only the surface language has been changed but there remains a deeper universal language?

3. The Primacy of Noah

A lot of the world's topography and sedimentary layers are best explained by a global flood. The problem with testing this scientifically in detail is that few people have had the belief coupled with the boldness to take this stand, therefore there's not a lot of scholarly research to go on. Let's at least look at a few pieces of evidence that do exist...

(A) The Strange Subterranean Witness

In Genesis 6 and 7 Noah is told to build an ark for him, his family, and a couple of every animal "genus" (or "kind;," Dawkins in *The Greatest Show on Earth* thinks it is a belief of creationists that every single minor species was aboard the ark). After this, a flood of water covered the earth. Towards the end of chapter 7 we see that the initial inundation killed every land animal and human. The waters then kept decreasing up until day 150. At that time the sea level was again low enough for the tops of mountains to appear, and after several more months the world was back to a normal state, Noah having sent out birds to test the dryness of the ground. So let's think about this.

Imagine the entire globe being one gigantic ocean. Although it would have been the time of death for humans, mammals, and reptiles, the sea would have experienced a boom in population. The whole world was now its feeding trough and marine life was also able to spread out everywhere.

We should find therefore an unbelievable, amazing, uncanny amount of marine life in the "fossil record;" and that's precisely the case...

- 95% of all fossils are shallow marine organisms, such as corals and shellfish.
- 95% of the remaining 5% are algae and plants.
- 95% of the remaining 0.25% are invertebrates, including insects.

- The remaining 0.0125% are vertebrates, mostly fish. (95% of land vertebrates consist of less than one bone, and 95% of mammal fossils are from the Ice Age after the Flood.)*⁴⁵

A lack of fossils from mammals doesn't upset the creation model, but poses a bit more of a problem for Uniformitarianism. If fossilization has occurred at a steady rate since the dawn of time, one would expect to find more candidates for missing links than just Lucy and a few others. The August 2011 edition of *National Geographic* had a telling article on the state of humanoid transitional fossils. Although the piece was upbeat for evolution's sake, it did admit the possibility that the latest finds (*Australopithecus sediba*) threaten to push the "shoebox" full of *homo* genus fossils completely off the table from being considered a link to "*Homo erectus*" [the only "ancestor" between the "southern apes" and modern man]. Ouch.

At the end of the day, anyone can point at an extinct monkey and say, "Ah, a missing link," but unless it is supported by a close-knit chain of clear evolutionary descent it's just speculation. And given the fact that paleontologists are digging up the planet to prove their theory and coming back with question marks and empty hands, this is never going to happen.

(B) Cultural Evidence

Biblical archaeology really begins with the Sumerian civilization of about 2500 BC. To date, numerous sites and artifacts have been uncovered that reveal a great deal about the ancient Mesopotamian culture. One of the most dramatic finds is the Sumerian King List, which dates to approximately 2100 BC. This collection of clay tablets and prisms is most exciting because it divides the Sumerian kings into two categories; those who reigned before the "great flood" and those who reigned after it. The lists are also dramatic because they include the ages of the kings before and after the "great flood," which show the same phenomenal life span changes mentioned in the Bible. Actually, records of a global flood are found throughout most ancient cultures. For instance, the Epic of Gilgamesh from the ancient Babylonians contains an extensive flood story. Discovered on clay tablets in locations such as Ninevah and Megiddo, the Epic even includes a hero who built a great ship, filled it with animals, and used birds to see if the water had receded.*⁴⁶

(C) What is a Fossil?

Countless textbooks state that the fossils are great proof of evolution. As we have seen, this is a far cry from what Darwin himself asserted. What's more puzzling is the legendary status that's been given fossils; they are unequivocally declared to be artifacts that are millions of years in age. What makes that a true statement? Nothing! It's simply an assumption that has become adopted as fact.

I'm aware of radiometric dating and things of that nature, but there's no scientific control to prove that such procedures could possibly be accurate when applied to very ancient material; the idea is rather far-fetched. This type of dating has been done on modern volcanic rock (such as from Mt. St. Helen's and New Zealand's Mt. Ngauruhoe) only to give a date of over a million years. Because of such anomalies these "clocks" must be given back to the blind watchmaker for repairs.

In reality, for a fossil to be formed it must be buried very quickly. The fact that there are so many fossils proves that a tremendous amount of the planet's living organisms became imbedded right around the time of death; how? Something that really drives this home is the dinosaur graveyards discovered in many places around the globe; note a sample report...

As the layer was exposed (the workers cut a large scallop into the hillside) it revealed a most remarkable dinosaurian graveyard in which there were literally scores of skeletons one on top of another and interlaced with one another. It would appear that some local catastrophe had overtaken these dinosaurs, so that they all died together and were buried together.*⁴⁷

(D) How was Coal Formed?

Coal is the result of a massive amount of plants having become trapped together. It is very easy to prove that it was formed rapidly and not gradually. A lot of coal is found in numerous seams imbedded within a section of rock; i.e., there is the appearance of coal then rock then coal then rock -- on and on. How could this have happened gradually?

Evolutionists will say that there wasn't enough vegetation in Noah's day to account for all the coal; yet the pre-flood world had less ocean and no waste places. Marine animals have been found in coal beds, as have trees which extend through many layers of coal and rock. Both occurrences are completely unexplainable by gradualism.

4. The Record of Constancy

An innumerable amount of celestial bodies are hung upon the nothing of outer space, perpetually moving. An innumerable amount of electrons pop (it's no longer couth to say they spin) around an innumerable amount of nuclei. Between the laws and the energy that keeps all this going it's easy to see why Paul said the Lord upholds all things through the Word of his power (Hebrews 1:3). And what about human history? Yes, he has that in the palm of his hand as well; it must obey his every desire...

For as the rain and the snow come down from heaven and do not return there but water the earth, making it bring forth and sprout, giving seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall my word be that goes out from my mouth; it shall not return to me empty, but it shall

accomplish that which I purpose, and shall succeed in the thing for which I sent it (Isaiah 55:10-11).

And again:

...I am watching over my word to perform it (Jeremiah 1:12).

It's astounding that all the pronouncements concerning the major themes in life that we find in Genesis are still valid. For example, Adam was told that he would only eat bread by the sweat of his brow, and that thorns and thistles would spring up for him (Genesis 3:18-19). After thousands of years and after all the advances via technology, we are all still plagued by the weariness of the world of work and the constant little problems that spring up in the midst of our labours.

Eve was told that childbearing would be a very painful experience (Genesis 3:16). Despite all the epidurals and various other helps, medical science has still not been able to make this pronouncement void.

The years of man were set at the maximum of 120 years in Genesis 6:3; very few get close to this number, and how many transgress it? Again, medical science is no match for God's Word.

In Genesis 8:22 it states: "seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night, shall not cease." Every season is a tribute to his faithfulness.

Why do we wear clothes? What is modesty? What is shame? Why do we feel bad when we transgress sound morality? Only Genesis can answer these questions.

Couple all these constants with the other bits of foreknowledge we read about at the beginning of this section and one sees a world remarkably predicted by God from the beginning. Compare this to the olden poems of the pagans. They are filled with gore, carnal superstition, and the most banal allegorical explanations for the mysterious things of life...

For, the whole universe consisting of moisture, and animals being generated therein, the deity above-mentioned took off his own head: upon which the other gods mixed the blood, as it gushed out, with the earth; and from whence were formed men. On this account it is that they are rational and partake of divine knowledge (*from the History of Babylonia*).^{*48}

Pressing forward, we shall now take a look at one of the most important themes of this particular book and of the Bible at large: the Jew.

Why after thousands of years of recorded history is the little nation of Israel still the focal point of the world? Why is one small race still the most important? It's been about 4,000 years since Abraham (Abram) was called

out from Shinar to be the father of God's inheritance; how did Moses know that this would be a decisive act?

These people have been the object of the world's hatred since that time, and yet they still thrive. Why have they had so many various enemies throughout history? Why do so many currently wish to see the nation of Israel pushed into the Mediterranean?

Their enemies cannot succeed because the Lord has sworn to multiply their number as the stars of the heaven and as the grains of sand on the earth. Incidentally, herein is found another interesting bit of science...

The Bible compares the number of stars with the number of grains of sand on the seashore (Genesis 22:17; Hebrews 11:12). Amazingly, gross estimates of the number of sand grains are comparable to the estimated number of stars in the universe.*⁴⁹

Yet before the advent of the telescope, when only a few thousand stars were visible to the naked eye, who would have thought this?

Getting back on track: Abraham begat Isaac, Isaac begat Jacob (Israel), who had twelve sons: Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Zebulun, Gad, Asher, Dan, Naphtali, Joseph and Benjamin. More chapters in Genesis are dedicated to the telling of the story of Joseph than to any other theme. The reason is that this particular son of Jacob would become a mighty allegorical prophecy for God's Son, the Lord Jesus.

(Since I've written short books entitled Mashiach ben Elohim that deals with Messianic prophecy and The Book of Revelation: A Sketch of the Apocalypse that deals with end times prophecy, I don't want to dwell on either of these subjects too much here. If you'd like a free electronic copy of either booklet send an email to the address provided on the copyright page. Alternatively, I hope to have all three books posted online soon; visit richie-cooley.tripod.com to download free of charge).

B. The Disregarded Redeemer

Many would laugh at the idea that the people in Genesis even existed, which is why we'll look at a few archaeological facts before getting started with Joseph. When considering his life we shall first examine the similarities to the first advent of Jesus Christ via a review of Genesis 37; afterward we shall note the allusion to his glorification and the second advent covered in the latter chapters.

1. Life from the Dust

A. Ebla

In 1964 Italian archaeologists began excavating a mound in northern Syria. Eventually they would come across a vast store of clay tablets, dating back to 2500-2000 B.C. The name of the city was called Ebla, and in its documents many gems of Biblical significance were found.

An Eblaite creation hymn was discovered among the tablets, existing in three distinct versions, all of which contain the following verse:

Lord of heaven and earth:

The earth was not, you created it

The light of day was not, you created it

The morning light you had not [yet] made exist...

... Archaeologist Giovanni Pettinato has noted a change in the theophoric personal names in many of the tablets from "-el" to "-yah." For example "Mika'el" transforms into "Mikaya." This is considered by some to constitute an early use of the divine name Yah, a god who believed to have later emerged as the Hebrew deity Yahweh...

...Many Old Testament personal names that have not been found in other Near Eastern languages have similar forms in Eblaite [*this means that the Bible is accurate in using such names, not that these are records of the patriarchs/matriarchs themselves*], including a-da-mu/Adam, h'â-wa /Eve, Abarama/Abraham, Bilhah, Ishmael, Isûra-el, Esau, Mika-el/Michael, Mikaya/Michaiah, Saul, and David. Also mentioned in the Ebla tablets are many biblical locations: For example, Ashtaroth, Sinai, Jerusalem (Ye-ru-sa-lu-um), Hazor, Lachish, Gezer, Dor, Meggido, Joppa, and so on.^{*50}

B. Sinuhe

Some say that the tale of Sinuhe is the world's first novel (there's a debate as to whether it's fiction or non-fiction). It certainly is very old (c. 2000-1800 B.C.) and very interesting to students of the Bible. The main character flees Egypt and ends up in the land of Canaan; therefore we have a primary source of what life was like in the time of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob...

Certain insights can be drawn from the account of Sinuhe's years in Palestine. For example, Sinuhe's father-in-law, Ammi-enshi, has an Amorite name. Therefore, the Amorites had definitely arrived in Palestine by the time of the story...

The story reflects a tribal society similar to that pictured in the Book of Genesis. In each account, one man controlled an extended family. When Sinuhe prepared to return to Egypt he turned his property over to his eldest son. The primacy of the eldest son is obvious in the patriarchal stories, most noticeably in the lives of Jacob and Esau.

The setting of the story was a time of tribal armies, serfs, and servants. The full story of Sinuhe reveals a Palestine in which there was crime, attack, plunder, murder, and captivity -- conditions also found in the patriarchal narratives. The story of Sinuhe mentions bows and arrows, shields, battle-axes, javelins, and daggers. This array provides some idea

of the weaponry available to Abraham's militia in Genesis 14. Like Abraham, Sinuhe never lost his outsider status. Abraham considered himself a sojourner in Palestine, and the people of Sodom called Lot an "alien." Later on, Jacob worried that the local populace would unite against him. The story of Sinuhe illustrates how threatening life could be for an outsider.*51

C. Nuzi

Another ancient Mesopotamian city of Biblical significance is the city of Nuzi. It is located near the Tigris River and dates back to as early as the late third millennium B.C. About 5,000 tablets have been recovered from this site. Many of its customs have been learned, and some of these explain the occasional peculiar behaviour displayed by the people of Genesis, such as the selling of Esau's birthright to Jacob. It also explains the evil treatment of Hagar...

One law stipulated that if a married couple did not bear children, the wife would permit her husband to lie with a handmaid to produce a child. This will help us to understand why Sarah told Abraham to have relations with Hagar.

The law also stated that if friction arose between the wife and the mistress, the wife could order both the mistress and the child to leave [*which Sarah also did; see Genesis 20:10*].*52

D. Mari

A find similar in content to that of Ebla is the site of the city of Mari. It was a Sumerian and Amorite town on the western bank of the Euphrates. It flourished from about 2900 B.C. to 1759 B.C. Many tablets have been discovered there...

The value of the Mari texts for Biblical studies lies in the fact that Mari is located in the vicinity of the homeland of the Patriarchs, being about 200 mi (320 km) southeast of Haran. It thus shares a common culture with the area where the Patriarchs originated. Some documents detail practices such as adoption and inheritance similar to those found in the Genesis accounts. The tablets speak of the slaughtering of animals when covenants were made, judges similar to the judges of the Old Testament, gods that are also named in the Hebrew Bible, and personal names such as Noah, Abram, Laban and Jacob. A city named Nahur is mentioned, possibly named after Abraham's grandfather Nahor (Gn 11:22-25), as well as the city of Haran where Abraham lived for a time (Gn 11:31-12:4). Hazor is spoken of often in the Mari texts and there is a reference to Laish (Dan) as well.*53

E. The Hittites

Hittites are mentioned many times in Scripture, including the book of Genesis. Until archaeological finds proved their existence the Bible's credibility was called into question...

...In 1870 evidence began to come to light. The Tel el-Amarna tablets...were found in Egypt. They mentioned the activities of a Hittite army in Palestine. These letters hinted that the Hittite people were based north of Palestine in Asia Minor. In the early 1900s in Boghazkoy, central Turkey, God produced "dead Hittite stones" with living messages. As the archaeologists excavated, inscriptions on massive stone buildings showed that the Hittite Empire flourished in Abraham's day and that it formed a worthy third with two other empires of importance -- Babylonia-Assyria and Egypt.*⁵⁴

F. A Narrow Time Frame

Another interesting archaeological detail confirming the Biblical narrative's depiction of the lives of the patriarchs is the fact that excavations of places where Abraham lived have shown that these places were occupied only during his lifetime. Places such as the Negev, which in the biblical narratives was frequently visited by Abraham, were not occupied earlier than Abraham's day or for some eight hundred years later.

Furthermore, the freedom with which Abraham moved through the territories of the ancient Near East is a true reflection of the times in which he lived. Such free access to various lands and countries, such as Syria and Egypt, would not have been possible at other periods of time...

...Joseph was sold into slavery in Genesis 37:28. The biblical narrative records that price as twenty shekels of silver. From the laws of the Babylonian king Hammurapi, a contemporary of Joseph, we know that the price of a slave was precisely twenty shekels.*⁵⁵

2. Genesis 37

Jacob lived in the land of his father's sojournings, in the land of Canaan. These are the generations of Jacob. Joseph, being seventeen years old, was pasturing the flock with his brothers [1]. He was a boy with the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah, his father's wives. And Joseph brought a bad report of them to their father. Now Israel loved Joseph more than any other of his sons [2], because he was the son of his old age. And he made him a robe of many colors [3]. But when his brothers saw that their father loved him more than all his brothers, they hated him and could not speak peacefully to him [4]. Now Joseph had a dream, and when he told it to his brothers they hated him even more. He said to them, "Hear this dream that I have dreamed: Behold, we were binding sheaves in the field, and behold, my sheaf arose and stood upright. And

behold, your sheaves gathered around it and bowed down to my sheaf.” His brothers said to him, “Are you indeed to reign over us? Or are you indeed to rule over us [5]?” So they hated him even more for his dreams and for his words. Then he dreamed another dream and told it to his brothers and said, “Behold, I have dreamed another dream. Behold, the sun, the moon, and eleven stars were bowing down to me.” But when he told it to his father and to his brothers, his father rebuked him and said to him, “What is this dream that you have dreamed? Shall I and your mother and your brothers indeed come to bow ourselves to the ground before you [6]?” And his brothers were jealous of him, but his father kept the saying in mind. Now his brothers went to pasture their father's flock near Shechem. And Israel said to Joseph, “Are not your brothers pasturing the flock at Shechem? Come, I will send you to them [7].” And he said to him, “Here I am.” So he said to him, “Go now, see if it is well with your brothers and with the flock, and bring me word.” So he sent him from the Valley of Hebron, and he came to Shechem. And a man found him wandering in the fields. And the man asked him, “What are you seeking?” “I am seeking my brothers,” he said. “Tell me, please, where they are pasturing the flock.” And the man said, “They have gone away, for I heard them say, ‘Let us go to Dothan.’” So Joseph went after his brothers and found them at Dothan. They saw him from afar, and before he came near to them they conspired against him to kill him [8]. They said to one another, “Here comes this dreamer. Come now, let us kill him and throw him into one of the pits. Then we will say that a fierce animal has devoured him, and we will see what will become of his dreams.” But when Reuben heard it, he rescued him out of their hands, saying, “Let us not take his life.” And Reuben said to them, “Shed no blood; throw him into this pit here in the wilderness, but do not lay a hand on him” -- that he might rescue him out of their hand to restore him to his father. So when Joseph came to his brothers, they stripped him of his robe, the robe of many colors that he wore [9]. And they took him and threw him into a pit. The pit was empty; there was no water in it [10]. Then they sat down to eat [11]. And looking up they saw a caravan of Ishmaelites coming from Gilead, with their camels bearing gum, balm, and myrrh, on their way to carry it down to Egypt. Then Judah [12] said to his brothers, “What profit is it if we kill our brother and conceal his blood? Come, let us sell him to the Ishmaelites, and let not our hand be upon him, for he is our brother, our own flesh.” And his brothers listened to him. Then Midianite traders passed by. And they drew Joseph up and lifted him out of the pit, and sold him to the Ishmaelites for twenty shekels of silver [13]. They took Joseph to Egypt. When Reuben returned to the pit and saw that Joseph was not in the pit [14], he tore his clothes and returned to

his brothers and said, "The boy is gone, and I, where shall I go?" Then they took Joseph's robe and slaughtered a goat and dipped the robe in the blood [15]. And they sent the robe of many colors and brought it to their father and said, "This we have found; please identify whether it is your son's robe or not." And he identified it and said, "It is my son's robe. A fierce animal has devoured him. Joseph is without doubt torn to pieces." Then Jacob tore his garments and put sackcloth on his loins and mourned for his son many days. All his sons and all his daughters rose up to comfort him, but he refused to be comforted and said, "No, I shall go down to Sheol to my son, mourning." Thus his father wept for him. Meanwhile the Midianites had sold him in Egypt to Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh, the captain of the guard [16].

(1) [*Jesus said*] I am the good shepherd! The good shepherd lays down His life on behalf of the sheep (John 10:11).

(2) and (3)

And having been baptized, Jesus went up immediately from the water. And look! The heavens were opened to Him, and he [*i.e., John*] saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and coming upon Him. And listen! A voice [comes] out of the heavens, saying, "This is My Son -- the Beloved -- in whom I am well-pleased" (Mathew 3:16-17)!

The Lord Jesus Christ was cloaked with the Holy Spirit's approval and power, due to his Father's love for him.

(4) Envy played a major part in the Messiah's condemnation:

But Pilate answered to them, saying, "Do you* [*an asterisk indicates a 2nd person plural*] desire [that] I release to you* the King of the Jews?" For he knew that because of envy the chief priests had handed Him over (Mark 15:9-10).

(5) and (6)

There are two dreams concerning Joseph's future glory. One is where his brothers (represented as sheaves) bow to him in a field; the second is where all his family (represented as the sun, moon, and stars) bow in the sky. Thus earthly things are contrasted with heavenly things. This fits the idea of the God-man who all of heaven and earth will worship one day (Philippians 2:9-11). Also of interest is that Jacob interprets the second dream as relating to Joseph's mother even though she had long been dead...

Therefore, I strongly urge [you] before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, the One being about to be judging [the] living and [the] dead at His appearing and His kingdom (2 Timothy 4:1)...

And He gave strict orders to us to preach to the people and to solemnly testify that He is the One having been designated by God [to be] Judge of living [people] and of dead [people]. To this One all the prophets bear

witness [that] through His name every[one] that is believing [or, trusting] in Him receives forgiveness of sins (Acts 10:42-43).

(7) In many passages the Messiah calls himself the sent one (Matthew 10:40, 15:24, 21:37, Mark 9:37, 12:6, Luke 4:18, 4:43, 9:48, 10:16, John 3:34, 4:34, 5:23, 5:24, 5:30, 5:36, 5:37, 5:38, 6:29, 6:38, 6:39, 6:40, 6:44, 6:57, 7:16, 7:18, 7:28, 7:29, 7:33, 8:16, 8:18, 8:26, 8:29, 8:42, 9:4, 10:36, 11:42, 12:44, 12:45, 12:49, 13:20, 14:24; 15:21, 16:5, 17:3, 17:8, 17:18, 17:21, 17:23, 17:25, 20:21).

(8) After the rulers saw the signs of his power and piety manifested they plotted his death...

And the Pharisees having gone out, immediately they began creating a plot with the Herodians against Him in order that they should destroy Him (Mark 3:6).

And immediately, in the early morning, the chief priests having created a plot with the elders and scribes and the whole High Council [or, Sanhedrin], having bound Jesus, they led [Him] away and handed [Him] over to Pilate (Mark 15:1).

(9) And having stripped Him, they put around Him a scarlet cloak...And when they [had] ridiculed Him, they stripped the cloak off Him, and they put on Him His [own] garments, and they led Him away to crucify [Him] (Matthew 27:28-31)...

(10) This exact expression, i.e., a pit with no water in it, appears a couple of times in Scripture (Zechariah 9:11; Jeremiah 38:6). The allusion is to the fact that the realm of the dead is void of the presence of God (the sense is only partially applicable to the Lord. It was only Christ's body that was among the dead for a few days, as his spirit was in Paradise immediately -- see Luke 23:43).

(11) Then they led Jesus from Caiaphas to the Fortified Palace. Now it was morning. And they themselves did not enter into the Fortified Palace, so that they should not be defiled, but so that they could eat the Passover. Therefore, Pilate went out to them and said, "What accusation do you* bring against this Man?" They answered and said to him, "If this One were not an evil doer [or, criminal], we would not have handed Him over to you."

(12) Then Satan entered into Judas [*anglicized Greek form of "Judab"*], the one being surnamed Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve. And having gone away, he conferred with the chief priests and the captains [of the temple guard] [about] how he should betray Him to them (Luke 22:3-4).

(13) Christ being sold for pieces of silver is a very famous Messianic prophecy (see Zechariah 11:12; Matthew 26:15).

(14) Reuben going to the pit and not finding Joseph is reminiscent of people visiting the tomb of Jesus Christ only to find it empty.

(15) In two places the Messiah is said to wear a garment covered in blood (Isaiah 63:1-6; Revelation 19:13).

(16) Joseph was handed over to the gentiles and made to serve them (to include being thrown into a dungeon for two years over a false accusation). The Lord was given over to Rome to be killed and after his resurrection became “a light for the nations” (Isaiah 42:6).

One could be cynical and say that perhaps the writers of the New Testament constructed the biography of Jesus to fit that of Joseph. First, there would be little reason for them to do that. Jewish Rabbis weren't expecting the Messiah to come and emulate Joseph. Second of all, the Gospel writings are complicated networks, bound up with the whole early church.

Modern scholarship believes Mark was the first Gospel, with Matthew and Luke both using the material in the subsequent synoptic Gospels.*⁵⁶ Mark was a disciple who was very good friends with Peter (1 Peter 5:13), which is why the Gospel of Mark is probably really the Gospel of Peter, and this is why Luke and Matthew felt bound to use it in their work (for Peter was seen as the chief apostle). Mark also had a friendship with Paul and spent some time with him (Acts 13:5; Colossians 4:10; 2 Timothy 4:11). Thus being a well-travelled believer, he had plenty of opportunity to verify by a variety of sources the information he wrote about.

Luke is similar. He travelled so much with Paul (as is evidenced in the book of Acts that he authored and also in 2 Timothy 4:11, Colossians 4:14, and Philemon 1:24) that he was probably conversant with an enormous amount of the early church, with people who saw the Lord and heard him speak and witnessed his mighty deeds.

Matthew was 1 of the original 12 disciples, although not in the inner circle (i.e., consisting of Peter, James, and John). He obviously knew enough to be sure that the stories of Peter were accurate and trustworthy.

Is it really possible that they all created these Gospels to mimic Joseph and then spread the message that many of them were thrown into prison and killed for? Also, since Peter and Paul probably had a large influence over the Gospels, if they devised a Joseph-motif, why does neither apostle in any of their letters ever mention him as a Christ-type?

Lastly, even if the New Testament was taken away it would be possible to verify the Joseph-like qualities of the Lord Jesus. For example, Pliny the Younger, a Roman ruler who reported to the Emperor Trajan, stated around A.D. 112 that the early Christians were in the habit of singing hymns to Christ as to a god.*⁵⁷ Cornelius Tacitus, one of the greatest historians of ancient Rome, stated while commenting on Christians:

...Christus, from whom the name had its origin, suffered the extreme penalty during the reign of Tiberius at the hands of one of our procurators, Pontius Pilatus...^{*57}

Josephus commenting on Jesus Christ mentions his death by Pilate at the instigation of the religious authorities (Antiquities 18:63-64).

So thus we see that Jesus Christ made claims to divinity, was repudiated by domestic religious authorities, and killed by foreign rulers...

For truly [there] were gathered together against Your Holy Servant Jesus, whom You anointed, both Herod [Antipas] and Pontius Pilate, along with [the] Gentiles and [the] people of Israel, to do as many [things] as Your hand and Your plan predestined to occur (Acts 4:27-28).

By the way, may no one ever get bogged down by the question of who killed Christ. With all seriousness I can say that I killed him, as did every born-again Christian, when our sins were made over to his account.

3. A Holy Reunion

As touched on above, Joseph faithfully served in the home of his new master until the man's wife falsely accused him of rape. The response of his owner was to throw him into a dungeon. While there Joseph met two servants of the king and correctly foretold how they both would be brought out of the pit, one to death and one to life. This again alludes to the fact that the Lord Jesus is the judge of the living and the dead.

These predictions which came true on the third day directly resulted in Pharaoh bringing Joseph up from the dungeon in the third year and making him ruler over all of Egypt...

And Pharaoh said to his servants, "Can we find a man like this, in whom is the Spirit of God [1]?" Then Pharaoh said to Joseph, "Since God has shown you all this, there is none so discerning and wise as you are [2]. You shall be over my house [3], and all my people shall order themselves as you command [*lit. "on/ at your mouth shall all my people kiss"*] [4]. Only as regards the throne will I be greater than you [5]." And Pharaoh said to Joseph, "See, I have set you over all the land of Egypt [6]." Then Pharaoh took his signet ring from his hand and put it on Joseph's hand [7], and clothed him in garments of fine linen and put a gold chain about his neck. And he made him ride in his second chariot. And they called out before him, "Bow the knee [8]!" Thus he set him over all the land of Egypt (Genesis 41:38-43).

- (1) There shall come forth a shoot from the stump of Jesse [*David's father, forefather of Jesus*], and a branch from his roots shall bear fruit. And the Spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him (Isaiah 11:1-2)...

- (2) Yet it was the will of the LORD to crush him; he has put him to grief; when his soul makes an offering for guilt, he shall see his offspring; he shall prolong his days; the will of the LORD shall prosper in his hand. Out of the anguish of his soul he shall see and be satisfied; by his knowledge shall the righteous one, my servant, make many to be accounted righteous, and he shall bear their iniquities (Isaiah 53:10-11).
- (3) And Moses on the one hand as a trusted servant [was] faithful in all his house, for a testimony of those things which would be spoken [later], on the other hand Christ as a Son over His [own] house, whose house we are (Hebrews 3:5-6).
- (4) Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and you perish in the way, for his wrath is quickly kindled. Blessed are all who take refuge in him (Psalm 2:12).
- (5) and (6)
- For "He put all [things] in subjection under His feet." [Psalm 8:6] But when He says that all [things] have been subjected, [it is] evident that [this is] except for the One subjecting all the [things] to Him. Now when all the [things] are subjected to Him, then the Son also Himself will be subjected to the One having subjected all the [things] to Him, so that God shall be the all in all (1 Corinthians 15:27-28).
- (7) [*Jesus said...*] And I am no longer in the world, yet these are in the world, and I am coming to You. Holy Father, keep them in Your name, which You have given to Me, so that they shall be one just as We [are] (John 17:11).
- (8) ...At the Name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of heavenly [ones] and of earthly [ones] and of [ones] under the earth, and every tongue [fig., person] shall confess that Jesus Christ [is] Lord to [the] glory of God [the] Father (Philippians 2:10-11).

Later during a great famine the brothers would venture to Egypt to buy grain from Joseph without knowing who he was. Eventually the family would be reunited after this "Egyptian" lord made his identity known...

So Joseph said to his brothers, "Come near to me, please." And they came near. And he said, "I am your brother, Joseph, whom you sold into Egypt. And now do not be distressed or angry with yourselves because you sold me here, for God sent me before you to preserve life" ...And he kissed all his brothers and wept upon them. After that his brothers talked with him (Genesis 45:4-5, 15).

So it is that Israel will eventually be reconciled to her Messiah...

O to see the sight, next to Christ's Coming in the clouds, the most joyful! Our elder brethren the Jews and Christ fall upon one another's necks and kiss each other! They have been long asunder; they will be

kind to one another when they meet. O day! O longed-for and lovely day-dawn! O sweet Jesus, let me see that sight which will be as life from the dead, thee and thy ancient people in mutual embraces (Samuel Rutherford, writing in 1633).^{*58}

So we see that Genesis foretells everything of major significance that was to transpire throughout the pages of the Bible. Darwin is unable to account for the present, nevermind the ancient past or distant future...

Set forth your case, says the LORD; bring your proofs, says the King of Jacob. Let them bring them, and tell us what is to happen. Tell us the former things, what they are, that we may consider them, that we may know their outcome; or declare to us the things to come. Tell us what is to come hereafter, that we may know that you are gods; do good, or do harm, that we may be dismayed and terrified. Behold, you are nothing, and your work is less than nothing; an abomination is he who chooses you (Isaiah 41:21-24).

4. Revisiting Abraham...

Before ending the section on prophecy, it is interesting to note that the first Jewish father was called out of the same area where the Tower of Babel boasted of its greatness shortly before. The believing remnant to come will also be called forth out of a new Babylon, an entity mentioned throughout the book of Revelation, a monstrous one-world system set to conquer the globe through the enforcement of the "mark of the beast" (see Revelation 13). Think for a moment how wonderful such a prophecy is.

John penned his vision about 1900 years ago. How could anyone have known that a worldwide conquest in a short amount of time would ever become a possibility before advanced transportation systems and weaponry? How did he know that the world would be able to exist as a cashless society? That is to say, how did he know before the advent of computers that through a mark on the hand or forehead people would be able to conduct business transactions? How did he know that one day the whole world would be able to witness local events in real time (see Revelation 11)? John's prophecies make perfect sense to us, but they were all complete nonsense before the emergence of our modern culture.

IV. Conclusion

A. Until Shiloh Comes

One of the main arguments against the creationist view has nothing to do with science or the validity of Genesis; it always comes in the form of a question: “If God is all powerful and loves us, then why did such and such happen?” In these times when the destructions via “natural disasters” are going to increase more and more, this question will become very central to the discussion of God’s existence.

The answer is remarkably simple: God is powerful and loving, but he is also very angry at sin and must judge it (in a general sense for the time being; i.e., recipients of bad are not necessarily the greatest of sinners, it's just that we all deserve judgment -- see Luke 13:1-5). This is the Biblical picture of God, and it is also what we see in nature. He is the God of altruism and beauty, yet also the creator of volcanoes and earthquakes, deformities and disease:

I form light and create darkness, I make well-being and create calamity, I am the LORD, who does all these things (Isaiah 45:7).

We are going to hell for our sins if we do not repent and trust in the sacrifice of Jesus Christ for our forgiveness. What would God be like if he didn’t afflict us now? What if you lived 120 years of the sweetest bliss and then died and went to the Lake of Fire? Would you not call God a false prophet? Would you not wonder why he didn’t rather make life a misery so at least there would have been knowledge of his awesome wrath? God must bring the worst afflictions upon us, for the sum total of these things don’t even begin to portray the full force of the anger set to eternally consume the unrepentant.

Like the wise man Daniel, a very good believer who was taken captive by an enemy army, we shouldn’t blame God for our calamity; we should blame ourselves instead...

...We have sinned and done wrong and acted wickedly and rebelled, turning aside from your commandments and rules...To us, O LORD, belongs open shame, to our kings, to our princes, and to our fathers, because we have sinned against you (Daniel 9:5, 8).

And we should be grateful that God sent his Son to endure everlasting justice on our behalf. Of course, the scoffers who scoff at creation also mock at the idea of redemption. How could one person atone for the sins of the world? Simple. Just as the High Priest went into the Tabernacle/Temple to bring forgiveness to the people of Israel concerning the ceremonial Law of Moses, so does the eternal High Priest appear in heaven to apply atonement for those who put their trust in him.

The book of Genesis starts with a very interesting Messianic prophecy (3:15), a beginning of the full Gospel revelation; it also ends with one...

The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the obedience of the peoples be (49:10; *Revised Version*).

Here we see that the Messiah was to come from the line of Judah (David's future tribe) and that the crown of the kingdom would belong to him forever. It is the descriptive name "Shiloh" though that is the most intriguing aspect. This town was where the Tabernacle was located upon the Israelites entering the land of Canaan, yet it was destroyed and the religious capital would be moved to Jerusalem with the construction of the Temple. Similarly the Lord who "tabernacled among us" (John 1:14) died, arose, ascended, and shall return in greater glory to reign over the peoples, having "come from [the] seed of David according to [the] flesh...having been designated Son of God with power according to [the] Spirit of holiness, by [the] resurrection from [the] dead" (Romans 1:3-4):

"In that day I will raise up the booth of David that is fallen and repair its breaches, and raise up its ruins and rebuild it as in the days of old, that they may possess the remnant of Edom and all the nations who are called by my name," declares the LORD who does this (Amos 9:11-12).

Ah yes, but this would require faith in his resurrection, a point that the new atheists like to contemn. Yet there were many witnesses to this wonderful event, and their testimony shouldn't be quickly discarded; some of it makes for a very interesting witness...

B. Remarks on the Resurrection

The Lord Jesus Christ performed many healings and other acts of kindness in front of thousands, but many of his special disclosures were reserved for his inner circle. On the morning of the resurrection everything changed; the gates of restraint as to his heavenly majesty were thrown open, and all of his disciples were welcome to come and bask in his divine glory.

The first to arrive at the empty tomb was a large group of women; it's interesting to note that every synoptic Gospel lists a different woman in particular (John just focuses on Mary Magdalene)...

Now after [the] Sabbaths, at the dawning into [the] first [day between the] Sabbaths [fig., the first day of the week; i.e., early Sunday morning], Mary the Magdalene and **the other Mary** went [or, came] to see the grave (Matthew 28:1).

And the Sabbath having past, Mary the Magdalene and Mary [the mother] of James and **Salome** bought spices, so that having come they should anoint Him (Mark 16:1).

Now it was Mary the Magdalene and **Joanna** and Mary [the mother] of James and the rest with them, who were telling these [things] to the apostles (Luke 24:10).

These women were probably mentioned specifically because they were the individual witnesses whom Matthew, Mark, and Luke consulted. And what did they see? “The other Mary” reported a mighty angel sitting on the tomb-stone. Salome saw one young man sitting inside the tomb, while two men appeared to Joanna.

Now if you read the four accounts of the resurrection given in the Gospels it is possible to piece together exactly the comings and goings of the women and the other disciples on that morning; possible, yet complex.

If the resurrection was a fraud, why would the disciples come up with such a complicated account? Why would they give the glory of the discovery to a large pack of women instead of to themselves? Why throw in this very odd triple-angelic disclosure? If they had made this event up would not their accounts read: “We all knew he was going to be raised, so we stayed awake around the clock waiting for him. When he arose he saw us and said how impressed he was over our extraordinary faithfulness and told us to go and ask the people to build us big mansions and bow at our feet.”

C. A Personal Word to Richard Dawkins

First of all let me apologize for making you my proverbial punching-bag throughout this book. I didn’t mention you over and over again because I have some morbid grudge. It’s simply that you are the world’s most famous evolutionist and atheist (or sixth-level agnostic), and that in itself makes your work the standard to argue against.

Besides, there’s much about you that I admire. You are smarter and more educated than I’ll ever be, and you have a terrific ability to write and teach clearly. Also, even though some of your beliefs put forth a really dangerous message to society, I can be thankful that you have courage enough to teach materialism for what it truly is, to take it to its logical conclusion, and not, as the many, cower under some sort of “mother Gaia” theosophy to avoid uncomfortable results.

I know that most people who accept Darwinian evolution have no idea what they believe or why they believe it, and are like the myriads of Christians who have never even bothered to read the Bible. These are the people I referred to in my introduction as the false art professionals. But you clearly know what you’re talking about, so how can I have the audacity to question you?

In my introduction I also talked about *a priori* beliefs, and herein is your problem. You are the product of your own sort of natural selection. Just as the shaping power of predators, sexual selection, or genetic drift unto

improved fuel procurement/consumption might affect a species, so you have a hatred of God, and it has been your guiding force mechanism unto the warping of your perception. I hope sincerely you'll read a literal copy of the Bible without enmity, or even just Daniel, Zechariah, and Revelation in these end times. I know God can do all things, even enlighten and enliven one of the greatest, though mistaken, minds of our day.

D. Complexities in Investigating

Any physical theory is always provisional, in the sense that it is only a hypothesis: you can never prove it. No matter how many times the results of experiments agree with some theory, you can never be sure that the next time the result will not contradict the theory. On the other hand, you can disprove a theory by finding even a single observation that disagrees with the predictions of the theory. As philosopher of science Karl Popper has emphasized, a good theory is characterized by the fact that it makes a number of predictions that could in principle be disproved or falsified by observation. Each time new experiments are observed to agree with the predictions the theory survives, and our confidence in it is increased; but if ever a new observation is found to disagree, we have to abandon or modify the theory. At least that is what is supposed to happen, but you can always question the competence of the person who carried out the observation (Hawking).^{*59}

This is the scientific method. I know that if the Bible and the theory of evolution are weighed on these scales the good Book will triumph while Darwin will sink into the abyss. Yet there must be an understanding that there are complexities in debating world views that go beyond a lab experiment. This is simply because passions are much higher and the participants more numerous. Let's discuss two of these.

First of all there's a difference between core proof and periphery proof. For example, a lot of atheists/evolutionists discount books by creationists and even entire ministries simply because some trifling mistake is discovered. An atheist rejected a Christian one time mainly because he said there were dinosaurs that were bigger than blue whales and the reader thought for sure that he was wrong; is this really sensible? Should the great question of eternal life versus eternal damnation hang in the balance of such a trivial fact? This is very common. Find some little mistake, crack some little joke, and excuse oneself of all conviction.

Next, a lot of evidence is subject to different interpretations, so seekers must exercise caution. For example, there are cases where some scientist thinks he or she has found an "unintelligent design," such as the blind spot in the eye due to backwards retinas, etc. The recurrent laryngeal nerve seems to wrap around an artery and head back up to its proper destination for no reason. There is a reason however; actually, many reasons, as the

nerve connects to the esophagus, mucous membranes, and windpipe muscles along the way back. Evolutionists could retort, "Yes, but that's just natural selection making the best of a bad situation;" on and on the bickering could go.

As for the eye, creatures that have retinas that are not "backwards" see more poorly than the likes of us. An evolutionist could then say, "Yes, but these are simpler organisms." Ah, correct; so when did this retina revolution take place in the evolutionary timescale? How come simpler organisms (invertebrates) have retinas facing one direction and complex organisms (vertebrates) have the opposite (with a few exceptions as always)? Why would natural selection elicit such a bizarre and enormously complex change?

You get the idea. The lesson is that in weighing the evidence one has to decide exactly what is evidence and what isn't. Popper says the fulfilment of a pre-stated prediction is a good kind, and I believe that's why the Bible is filled with prophecy from beginning to end.

E. Final Remarks

In conclusion, I hope this book made you think about the folly this world reports as fact, and also that there's a case for the belief in the inspiration of the Holy Bible. When it's all said and done the human being is very small, very shallow, very puny, easily deceived, and perpetually sinful. Even the book of Genesis says as much about the people of God themselves. Abraham lied about being married to Sarah, Noah and Lot became drunk, Jacob thought his pseudo-science was creating marked livestock instead of the power of God; on and on, and this is just the first book!

We should not blindly follow people for answers to the difficult questions; not even scientists or religious leaders. An online dictionary describes a bas-relief as a "sculpture in low relief, in which the forms project slightly from the background but no part is completely detached from it."⁶⁰ It is true that none of us are too far removed from the dirt from which we were made. We must examine all things for ourselves scientifically, and base our faith on the conclusions.

Have you ever read *The Origin of Species*? Have you ever read a literal copy of the Bible*(see the appendix for an extra word of advice)? Then how can you be sure that you do not have a counterfeit faith? Have you given eternity the attention that it deserves? I trust that you have, and if not, please, do not delay. Read, search, seek; find the truth, and may the Lord Jesus, the living stone (1 Peter 2:4), the perfect image of God (Hebrews 1:3), reveal himself to you in all his fulness.

Before closing altogether, think about two final points.

1. If evolutionary theory caused people to have to live extremely moral lives, would it be so popular?
2. Would you be willing to bet a month's wages on a one in a trillion bet? Yet you are wagering your eternal soul over a theory where the odds are much worse?

If you did discern the Lord, then be sure, again, to accept Him. Say to yourself, "All that Christ is to any, He shall be to me. Does He save sinners? He shall save me. Does He change men's hearts? He shall change mine. Is He all in all to those that trust Him? He shall be all in all to me." I have heard persons say that they do not know how to take Christ. What says the apostle? "The Word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart." If you have something in your mouth that you desire to eat, what is the best thing to do? Will you not swallow it? That is exactly what faith does. Christ's word of grace is very near you, it is on your tongue; let it go down into your inmost soul. Say to your Saviour, "I know I am not fit to receive Thee, O Jesus, but since Thou dost graciously come to me as bread comes to the hungry, I thankfully receive Thee, rejoicing to feed upon Thee! Since Thou dost come to me as the fruit of the vine to a thirsty man, Lord, I take Thee, willingly, and I thank Thee that this reception is all that Thou dost require of me. Has not Thy Spirit so put it -- 'As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name?'" -- C.H. Spurgeon

Appendix

The Bible is a big book that spans quite a large time period, so there needs to be an understanding of how to divide it properly. It begins with the account of origins in Genesis and then from Exodus to Acts the dominant theme is the nation of Israel. From Acts to Jude the dominant theme is the New Testament church. It concludes with the book of Revelation, which describes the Lord physically returning to restore creation to its original pristine glory.

There are four types of laws presented in the Scripture against two major backdrops (Israel and the church) and three minor backdrops (Eden [Genesis 1-3], the Messianic Age [Ezekiel 40-48], and Heaven [Revelation 21-22]). We'll leave the lesser backdrops out of the discussion; ideally you can double-check my propositions about the majors while reviewing the minors at a later time.

The first type is the civil law. This is the secular system of how to run a group justly. In the Old Testament this is presented in the form a national law. In the New Testament it appears in an ecclesiastical form, that is, how to run a church.

The second type of law is the ceremonial. This is instruction concerning the administration of symbolic religious sacraments. In the Old Testament it was animal sacrifice and circumcision. In the New Testament it is carried out by the Lord's Supper and baptism.

The third type of law is the eternal moral law. While civil and ceremonial laws change from dispensation to dispensation, the moral law never changes. The laws that are given in the Old Testament that also appear in the New are therefore a part of the unchangeable code: you shall not murder, commit adultery, steal, etc.

The fourth type of law really isn't a law but a provision. We all break the moral law and therefore deserve condemnation. Yet we can be forgiven of all things through faith in the atoning life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus Christ, Israel's Messiah, Job's Redeemer, the Serpent's Crusher, the One True God.

So it is important for the modern believer to understand where he or she fits in. We are convicted of sin through the moral law, saved through the great provision, and then we should strive to follow the moral, civic, and ceremonial laws of today (*the civic and ceremonial laws of yesterday are also very edifying to reflect on of course*). The full account of these precepts is found in the letters to the churches, the Epistles, the books ranging from Romans to Jude. This is the bedrock doctrine for every Christian, the lens through which we should see the rest of the Word and the world.

Citations

- 1) "The artful codgers: Pensioners who conned British museums with £10m forgeries." London Evening Standard (www.standard.co.uk). Web. 16 November 2007.
- 2) Lennox, John. God's Undertaker. Oxford: Lion Book, 2011. (Kindle Edition)
- 3) "Global Survey of Evangelical Protestant Leaders." The Pew Forum On Religion & Public Life (www.pewforum.org). Web. 22 June 2011.
- 4) Patterson, Roger. "Origin of the Solar System." Evolution Exposed (www.answersingenesis.org). Web. 30 December 2010.
- 5) Thomas, Brian. "Solar System Secrets Solved." Institute for Creation Research (www.icr.org). Web. 4 February 2009.
- 6) "The Universe is Finely Tuned for Life." Answers in Genesis (www.answersingenesis.org). Web. (Downloaded) July 2011.
- 7) Hawking, Stephen. A Brief History of Time. London: Bantam (Transworld), 1988. (Pg. 125)
- 8) Dembski, William, and Sean McDowell. Understanding Intelligent Design. Eugene, Oregon: Harvest House Publishers, 2008. (Pg. 155)
- 9) Comfort, Ray. Nothing Created Everything. Los Angeles: WorldNetDaily, 2009. (Pg. 25)
- 10) Aristotle. The History of Animals (Book V) (classics.mit.edu). Web. (Downloaded) July 2011. (Part 1)
- 11) www.richarddawkins.net/quotes/42. (Downloaded) July 2011.
- 12) Van De Weghe, Rob. Prepared to Answer. Port Hadlock, Washington: Windmill Ministries, 2007. (Pg. 38)
- 13) Bergman, Jerry. "Jerry R. Bergman." In Six Days. Ed. John F. Aston. Green Forest, Arkansas: Master Books, 2000. (Pgs. 26-28)
- 14) Darwin, Charles. On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life. PDF Version. (Chapter 6)
- 15) Darwin, Charles. On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life. PDF Version. (Chapter 4)
- 16) Dawkins, Richard. The Greatest Show on Earth. New York: Free Press, 2009. (Pg. 156)
- 17) Dembski, William, and Sean McDowell. Understanding Intelligent Design. Eugene, Oregon: Harvest House Publishers, 2008. (Pgs. 110-111)
- 18) Lennox, John. God's Undertaker. Oxford: Lion Book, 2011. (Kindle Edition)
- 19) Stove, David. Darwinian Fairytales. New York: Encounter Books, 1995. (Kindle Edition)
- 20) Dawkins, Richard. The Selfish Gene. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006. (From chapter 2)
- 21) Darwin, Charles. On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life. PDF Version. (Chapter 7)
- 22) Einstein, Albert. "Remarks on Bertrand Russell's Theory of Knowledge." The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell, Vol. V. Ed. Paul Arthur Schilpp. Tudor Publishers, 1944.
- 23) Oller, John. W. "Einstein's Gulf: Can Evolution Cross It?" Impact (#327). September 2000.
- 24) Ankerberg, John, and John Weldon. "Can Occult Practices Lead to Psychiatric Illness and Related Problems?" Ankerberg Theological Research Institute (www.ankerberg.com). Web. 2005.
- 25) Michaelson, Johanna. The Beautiful Side of Evil. Eugene, Oregon: Harvest House Publishers, 1982. (Pgs. 75-76)

- 26) Eccles, John. Evolution of the Brain: Creation of the Self. New York: Routledge, 1989. (Pg. 176)
- 27) Popper, Karl, and John C. Eccles. The Self and Its Brain: An Argument for Interactionism. London: Routledge, 2003. (Pg. 38)
- 28) Stove, David. Darwinian Fairytales. New York: Encounter Books, 1995. (Kindle Edition)
- 29) Morris, John. "Don't the Fossils Prove Evolution?" Institute for Creation Research (www.icr.org). Web. (Downloaded) July 2011.
- 30) Darwin, Charles. On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life. PDF Version. (Chapter 9)
- 31) Dawkins, Richard. The Selfish Gene. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006. (Pg. 1)
- 32) Yoxen, Edward. The Gene Business. London: Free Association Books, 1986. (Pg. 30)
- 33) Dawkins, Richard, and John Lennox. The God Delusion Debate. Fixed Point Foundation, 2007. MP3 Audio. (Approx. min. 49)
- 34) Anderson, Reevel. "Scotland tops world cocaine use." BBC News (www.bbc.co.uk). Web. 24 June 2011
- 35) "England worst in Western Europe for obesity and teenage pregnancy." The Telegraph (www.telegraph.co.uk). Web. 2 July 2011
- 36) Dawkins, Richard. River Out of Eden. New York: Basic Books, 1995. (Pgs. 96, 133)
- 37) Darwin, Charles. The Descent of Man (literature.org). Web. (Downloaded) June 2011. (Chapters 6 and 7)
- 38) "Christian Views on Slavery." Wikipedia. Web. (Downloaded) June 2011.
- 39) Weikart, Richard. "The Dehumanizing Impact of Modern Thought: Darwin, Marx, Nietzsche, and their Followers." The Discovery Institute (www.discovery.org). Web. 18 July 2008.
- 40) Stove, David. Darwinian Fairytales. New York: Encounter Books, 1995. (Kindle Edition)
- 41) Darwin, Charles. On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life. PDF Version. (Chapter I)
- 42) Darwin, Charles. The Descent of Man (literature.org). Web. (Downloaded) July 2011. (Chapter 5)
- 43) Tetlow, Jim. 101 Scientific Facts and Foreknowledge. Eternal Productions, 2005.
- 44) Morris, Henry. "The Confusion of Tongues." Web. (Downloaded) June 2011. <http://ldolphin.org/babel.html>
- 45) Hodge, Bodie. "Why Don't We Find Human & Dinosaur Fossils Together?" The New Answers Book (Volume 1). Ed. Ken Ham. Green Forest, Arkansas: Masterbooks, 2006. (From chapter 13)
- 46) "Biblical Archaeology: Ancient Civilization." Allaboutarchaeology.org. Web. (Downloaded) June 2011.
- 47) Morris, Henry. Scientific Creationism. Green Forest, Arkansas: Masterbooks, 1985. (Pg. 98)
- 48) British Museum. The Babylonian Legends of the Creation and the Fight Between Bel and the Dragon. Kindle Edition. (Introductory Material)
- 49) Tetlow, Jim. 101 Scientific Facts and Foreknowledge. Eternal Productions, 2005.
- 50) "Ebla." New World Encyclopedia (www.newworldencyclopedia.org). Web. 25 August 2008.
- 51) Hoerth, Alfred J. Archaeology and the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 1998. (Pg. 90)
- 52) Boyd, Robert. Boyd's Handbook of Practical Apologetics. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1997. (Pg. 147)

- 53) Wood, Bryant G. "The Mari Archive." Associates for Biblical Research (www.biblearchaeology.org). Web. 6 February 2006.
- 54) Boyd, Robert. Boyd's Handbook of Practical Apologetics. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1997. (Pg. 146)
- 55) Sailhamer, John H. Biblical Archaeology. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1998. (Pg. 40)
- 56) Morris, Leon. Luke. Nottingham, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988. (Pg. 62)
- 57) Van De Weghe, Rob. Prepared to Answer. Port Hadlock, Washington: Windmill Ministries, 2007. (Pgs. 165-167)
- 58) Finto, Don. God's Promise and the Future of Israel. Ventura, California: Regal Books, 2006. (Pg. 221)
- 59) Hawking, Stephen. A Brief History of Time. London: Bantam (Transworld), 1988. (Pg. 10)
- 60) www.thefreedictionary.com/bas-relief. (Downloaded) July 2011.

Because we take God to be the author of the "book of nature" as well as the divine author of the book of Scripture, we believe the proper interpretation of the Flood story will not be in conflict with what we have discovered in the natural world. The Bible in ancient context. The Bible is a record of encounters between Almighty God and ordinary humans that lived thousands of years ago. Another clue about how to interpret the Flood story comes from its place in the book of Genesis and specifically in the "primeval narratives" of Genesis 1-11. Biblical scholars almost universally see these chapters as having a different purpose than the rest of the book of Genesis. The primeval narratives cover a huge swath of cosmic history and are highly figurative in their language. Why should we study Genesis? How can we study Genesis? How do the Fathers of the Church approach the text? To prepare for this lesson I returned to my class notes and thesis research from St. Tikhon's Seminary, including the copious notes given us by Bp. Seraphim, Genesis, Creation and Early Man, which I believe is the best book available on this topic. Lots of people like to talk about Genesis and talk about creation and evolution but it soon becomes obvious that they are just giving their opinions, and they don't really know what they're talking about. But Fr. Seraphim did the work.