If the Creation Account Isn’t True…

Adventist Review By Mark Kellner A recent New York Times op-ed, “The Evangelical Rejection of Reason,”1 would’ve busted a blood-pressure machine had I been connected while reading. According to authors Karl W. Giberson, a “former professor of physics” at Eastern Nazarene College, and Randall J....
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A recent New York Times op-ed, “The Evangelical Rejection of Reason,” I would’ve busted a blood-pressure machine had I been connected while reading.

According to authors Karl W. Giberson, a “former professor of physics” at Eastern Nazarene College, and Randall J. Stephens, an associate professor of history there, affirmation of what many of us consider to be the basics of Christian faith, such as belief in a literal, recent, six-day creation, renders one anti-intellectual, and perhaps even un-Christian.
“Like other evangelicals, we accept the centrality of faith in Jesus Christ and look to the Bible as our sacred book, though we find it hard to recognize our religious tradition in the mainstream evangelical conversation,” they assert. “Evangelicalism at its best seeks a biblically grounded expression of Christianity that is intellectually engaged, humble and forward-looking. In contrast, fundamentalism is literalistic, overconfident, and reactionary.”

Now, some Seventh-day Adventists would strenuously reject any association with “evangelicals.” Many more equally abhor “fundamentalism” as they understand it. However, in attacking core evangelical beliefs such as Creation and the sanctity of marriage, and in asserting, “Christian theology can incorporate Darwin’s insights and flourish in a pluralistic society,” Giberson and Stephens give their blessing to the kind of flaccid faith that likely won’t sustain anyone through anything. They are diminishing, in essence, some of the core beliefs of Adventism.

If the Bible account of Creation isn’t true, as Giberson and Stephens imply in offering to “incorporate” Darwinism in Christian faith, what must logically follow?

If there’s no Creation . . .
. . . where, and how, did sin enter the world?
. . . why do we need a Savior?
. . . from what did God, if He even exists, rest?
. . . why should we rest if, absent Creation, there’s nothing from which God rested?
. . . how can we believe anything else in the Bible?

(Read more)
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32 Responses to “If the Creation Account Isn’t True…”

1. Jon S. Klingbeil December 9, 2011 at 5:02 am

“God never asks us to believe, without giving sufficient evidence upon which to base our faith. His existence, His character, the truthfulness of His Word, are all established by testimony that appeals to our reason; and this testimony is abundant. Yet God has never removed the possibility of doubt. Our faith must rest upon evidence, not demonstration. Those who wish to doubt will have opportunity; while those who really desire to know the truth, will find plenty of evidence on which to rest their faith.” STC p. 105

Remove doubt, remove choice.

(Quote)

Hot debate. What do you think? □ 14 □ 7
2. Faith **December 9, 2011 at 8:31 am**

   **Jon S. Klingbeil**: Remove doubt, remove choice

   Do I misunderstand you? You think we have to have doubt in order to have choice, Jon? I strongly disagree.

   Adam and Eve had choice even before Satan tempted Eve to doubt God’s word. Doubt is a lack of faith in God. As EGW says, God has not removed the possibility of doubt, but that doesn’t mean He wants us to doubt. I think that this statement has been misunderstood. God established the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil in Eden, but that didn’t mean He wanted Adam and Eve to eat from it.

   Jesus told Thomas that those of us who have not seen the physical evidence of His crucifixion that Thomas saw, yet who do not doubt, are blessed.

   I hope you will reconsider the above statement.

   *(Quote)*

   Hot debate. What do you think? 7 8

3. Faith **December 9, 2011 at 8:50 am**

   Regarding the article above, I totally agree with Mr. Kellner that if you remove Creation from the equation, Bible truth collapses.

   There is a reason God began the Bible with the Genesis account. It introduces God to us; it is the foundation of the Plan of Redemption; it reveals the Great Controversy to us and helps us see the difference between right and wrong.

   That is why I am so strongly in favour of this site and what it is trying to do. Our young people should not be taught that creation is an entertaining myth. By doing so, we rob them of the foundation of their belief in God. This issue is vitally important to eternal life for all of us.

   I have been greatly saddened to see the posts by those who believe in evolution (including, and especially, the TEs) because of the importance of this issue. It is so sad to see people led astray like this. Their very souls depend on a belief in God, the Bible (in its entirety) and the doctrines established by God for this, the remnant church of the last days.

   Yet they disdain the true believers and boldly proclaim their plans to change our church doctrine to align with their error. I firmly believe that God will step in to stop this plan from succeeding; but I can’t help but wish those involved would abandon all regard for evolution of any kind and come in line with God’s plan. I hate to see any soul lost.

   *(Quote)*

   Hot debate. What do you think? 13 6
4. Holly Pham  December 9, 2011 at 11:12 am

Great article! Regarding the questions asked, liberals and progressives in the SDA Church simply either ignore them or say they are “not salvational.” To them, virtually nothing is salvational.

(Quote)

Hot debate. What do you think? 8 6

5. Abe Yonder  December 9, 2011 at 3:30 pm

Of course any reasonable person knows the creation story is not literal, but fundamentalists are not reasonable, they believe everything the Bible says no matter how absurd.
Also as a part of history, the book of Genesis began with Chapter two verse three, the seven-day creation story was added by the Deuteronomist at Babylon during the fifth century BC (See Harper’s Bible commentary)

(Quote)

Hot debate. What do you think? 8 12

6. Ervin Taylor  December 9, 2011 at 4:14 pm

Mr. Yonder is a new reasonable and rational voice on the Educate Truth(sic) site. It will be very interesting to read how the TBGs (True Believer Group) will respond.

(Quote)

Hot debate. What do you think? 3 14

7. Bill Sorensen  December 9, 2011 at 4:43 pm

Ervin Taylor said….
“Mr. Yonder is a new reasonable and rational voice on the Educate Truth(sic) site. It will be very interesting to read how the TBGs (True Believer Group) will respond.”

Hogwash……

By the way, Faith, Jon may have meant “remove the possibility of doubt and you remove free choice.”

He needs to qualify what he meant.

Bill Sorensen

(Quote)

Hot debate. What do you think? 5 6

8. BobRyan  December 9, 2011 at 4:58 pm

Apparently Erv Taylor finds “yet another place” to differ with the Seventh-day Adventist denomination.
Surprise surprise.
Or was it?
in Christ,
Bob

(Quote)

Hot debate. What do you think? 9 5

9. Sean Pitman December 9, 2011 at 5:04 pm

Mark Kellner is right on the money. Upon what basis does one accept the fantastic claims of the Bible regarding the pre-existence, incarnation, life, death, and resurrection of the God-man Jesus but reject biblical claims regarding the origin of life on this planet?

Erv Taylor, in particular, claims that those who believe all of the empirical claims of the Bible are living in Alice’s Wonderland. I don’t get it. If one is living in part of Wonderland, why make fun of those who live in other parts of Wonderland? who accept all of what the Wonderland Book says about the place?

It is fine to appreciate the ethics of Christianity, but Christianity is more than an appeal to good Christian ethics. Christianity is also a promise of a solid hope in a very real, empirically literal, very bright future with the same Jesus who lived and died and was raised again to save us. If you don’t believe what the Wonderland Book says about other empirical realities, why believe what it says about Jesus and our future with Him?

Sean Pitman
http://www.DetectingDesign.com

(Quote)

Hot debate. What do you think? 11 4

10. Paul Giem December 9, 2011 at 5:13 pm

Abe Yonder (and Erv),

This is interesting. Now the creation account has moved from the Priestly Code to the Deuteronomist literature. Is it that hard to keep your story straight?

For the rest,

Note that the “reasonable and rational voice” basically denies the Mosaic authorship of anything in the Pentateuch. This illustrates one point of the original article. If one goes this route, one finds it very difficult to believe anything else in the Bible, as the method used to discredit the creation account is used to discredit anything else in the history of the Pentateuch, and thereby discredit the knowledge of Jesus and the New Testament writers. That is why, if one wishes to maintain the Bible as having any authority (besides “I like it”), one must find an alternative to the standard Higher Critical method.
Let the discussion begin.

Paul Giem

PS. Note the poisoning of the well. Abe claims, “any reasonable person knows the creation story is not literal, but fundamentalists are not reasonable, they believe everything the Bible says no matter how absurd.” That is an interesting definition of the word “reasonable”, or else an interesting claim. Is Abe willing to back this up, or is this just another unsupported claim?

(Quote)

Hot debate. What do you think? 13 4

11. Kingsley Whitsett December 9, 2011 at 5:45 pm

It’s refreshing to read from Mark Kellner’s article that there are Adventist believers who haven’t strayed from a “thus saith the Lord!” If we can casually throw out the veracity of the creation story, as has been mentioned some do, then we can pick and choose whatever we want concerning other Bible truths. Thus, the final authority in matters of truth becomes not what the Bible teaches, but what best suits me to believe. Since God hasn’t called me to be His prophet, I choose to believe His inspired prophets, those “holy men of God” who “spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”

Kingsley Whitsett

(Quote)

Hot debate. What do you think? 11 4

12. Sean Pitman December 9, 2011 at 5:49 pm

The Documentary Hypothesis

@Abe Yonder:

Also as a part of history, the book of Genesis began with Chapter two verse three, the seven-day creation story was added by the Deuteronomist at Babylon during the fifth century BC (See Harper’s Bible commentary)
Unfortunately, Yonder’s argument is based on the well-known, still popular, and yet fundamentally flawed “Documentary Hypothesis” of Biblical critics. “The documentary hypothesis (sometimes called the Wellhausen hypothesis), holds that the Pentateuch (the Torah, or the Five Books of Moses) was derived from originally independent, parallel and complete narratives [labeled J, D, E, and P], which were subsequently combined into the current form by a series of redactors (editors).” These editors supposedly compiled these independent accounts into one work some 500 years BC during the time of the Babylonian captivity.

Consider that the documentary hypothesis has been challenged, since it was first proposed in the late 1800s, quite effectively, by numerous Biblical scholars. Consider, for example, the arguments of Rendsburg (1986) where he demonstrates the linguistic unity and artistry of the composer of all of Genesis. For example, the “J” and “E” sections share a large number of theme-words and linking words, puns, etc.

It becomes simply incredulous that J wrote 12.1-4a, 12:6-9 about the start of Abraham’s spiritual odyssey and that E wrote 22:1-19 about the climax of his spiritual odyssey, and that these two authors living approximately 100 years apart and in different parts of ancient Israel time and again chose the same lexical terms. Surely this is too improbable, especially when such examples can be and have been multiplied over and over. Admittedly, a corresponding word here or there could be coincidental, but the cumulative nature of the evidence tips the scales heavily against the usual division of Genesis into JEP…

The evidence presented here points to the following conclusion: there is much more uniformity and much less fragmentation in the book of Genesis than generally assumed. The standard division of Genesis into J, E, and P strands should be discarded. This method of source criticism is a method of an earlier age, predominantly of the 19th century. If new approaches to the text, such as literary criticism of the type advanced here, deem the Documentary Hypothesis unreasonable and invalid, then source critics will have to rethink earlier conclusions and start anew.
It seems then like “the Documentary Hypothesis and the arguments that support it have been effectively demolished by scholars from many different theological perspectives and areas of expertise. Even so, the ghost of Wellhausen hovers over Old Testament studies and symposiums like a thick fog, adding nothing of substance but effectively obscuring vision. Although actually incompatible with form-critical and archaeology-based studies, the Documentary Hypothesis has managed to remain the mainstay of critical orthodoxy.”

For a further review of the fundamental problems with the Documentary Hypothesis here is an interesting introduction: Link

As an interesting aside, note that ‘the documentary hypothesis was originally based on the supposition that the events in the Torah preceded the invention of writing, or at least its use among the Hebrews. This is because Julius Wellhausen lived in the nineteenth-century, but nineteenth-century notions about ancient literacy have been completely refuted by archaeological evidence. The documentarians have not updated the documentary hypothesis to take this into account, so we still find them assigning very late dates to their hypothetical sources of the Torah…. Archaeology has shown that writing was common during the time in which the events of the Torah were to have taken place.’ – Kenneth Collins, The Torah in Modern Scholarship

As evidence of this, consider that the Ebla Tablets, written some 2200 years BC, prove that writing, even alphabetic-type writing, was in existence well before Moses. Some of the statements about creation found on these tablets also seem to parallel the Biblical creation narrative, suggesting that the Genesis creation story, or something very similar to it, was known well before the “Deuteronomists” or even Moses came on the scene. These tablets also speak of a flood story like that of the flood story in the Bible. The Ebla Tablets also mention the names Abraham and Isaac, suggesting that such names were known during this time. They also tell of two sinful cities, Sodom and Gomorrah, and mention all five of the cities of the valley in the same order mentioned in the Bible. This is in the face of “higher critics” who had claimed that Sodom, Gomorrah, Ur and other Canaan cities of the Bible never did exist. However, the Ebla Tablets showed the Bible was correct and that the critics were wrong. And the list goes on and on. The Bible is by far the most accurate history book known to modern man.

Sean Pitman
http://www.DetectingDesign.com

(Quote)

Hot debate. What do you think? 12 5

13. Ron D Henderson December 9, 2011 at 9:25 pm

Well done this time Sean Pitman! You are right there. I read the Adventist Review and sent a response. Here is some of what I wrote, folks, “Even if no one believes any more, Mark has to stand firm and true. The message of Revelation 14 challenges this atheistic teaching head on…” I forget all, but this was the gist of it. We have nothing to fear in our belief in God’s Word, in its account of the world’s origins. To what else can we turn? To turn anywhere else is to abandon the faith given to us by our
forefathers the apostles and that would be folly in its fullest sense.

(Quote)

Hot debate. What do you think? 11 4

14. Charles December 9, 2011 at 11:30 pm

Ervin Taylor: Mr. Yonder is a new reasonable and rational voice on the Educate Truth(sic) site. It will be very interesting to read how the TBGs (True Believer Group) will respond.

So the “enemy” continues to sow tares in with the wheat…

These are not the voices of Adventism. Not even close. But prophecy is being fulfilled, remarkably.

(Quote)

Hot debate. What do you think? 11 4

15. Jon S. Klingbeil December 10, 2011 at 5:36 am

@ Faith, if God removed all doubt from our thinking there would be no reason to doubt anything. There would be no argument here. There would be no disagreements. This web site would not exist. No one would say evolution is the way we came into existence. If the possibility of doubt were removed, we would be robots whose one job is to obey what the master controller says. Kinda like an inanimate object. But God did not do this. He gave us the freedom of choice. I can choose to believe Him or I can choose to believe Him not. I can even choose something or someone else’s idea and theology if I wish. This is why this website is in existence, because I can choose. If doubt were removed, so would my choice. Remove doubt [Gods part], remove choice [our part]. Now we have the choice to like or dislike this statement, to love or hate it. Its our choice. Place your judgement into the green or red box. Kinda daft really.

(Quote)

Hot debate. What do you think? 8 2

16. Bill Sorensen December 10, 2011 at 6:07 am

Jon said…..

” If the possibility of doubt were removed, we would be robots whose one job is to obey what the master controller says. Kinda like an inanimate object.”

This is true, Jon. But that does not make doubt itself a necessity for freedom. The possibility of doubt is not doubt itself.

So, just like sin is possible, does not make it necessary to defend human choice. We need not doubt and
we need not sin even if the possibility is a reality.

I assume this is what you mean, even if you stated it slightly different.

Bill Sorensen

(Quote)

Like or Dislike: 6 3


I have told this episode to many of my students over the years.

Back in the early 1980s while at The University of North Carolina at Charlotte, one of my colleagues and I were having a discussion in my office about creation versus evolution. We really got into it and were going back and forth. It became obvious that I wasn’t going to change her mind and that she wasn’t going to change mine.

While talking, a thought struck me, and I said to her, “You know, Sue, if you’re right and I’m wrong, and there is no God and no creation, at least I have tried to behave myself and be a good citizen, and have lived a good life. If the creation account isn’t true, I will have nothing to lose! But, if I’m right and you’re wrong, and there is a God who created, who gave us the plan of salvation, and the Bible as a guide of life, and you reject Him, then you will have everything to lose! I would rather be safe than sorry!!”

Over the years I have often thought of my answer as a possible cop-out, but what else is there? “He that cometh to God must believe that He is….” He that cometh to Darwin must believe that he is. Make and take the best choice.

If the creation account isn’t true…, we Adventists will have nothing more to lose than the atheists and the compromisers will, except perhaps being ridiculed, embarrassed, losing our jobs (I was expelled!), etc.

But…, if the creation account IS true, then expect “wailing and gnashing of teeth” when Jesus comes. Who in their right mind would not want to be safe, instead of sorry?

(Quote)

Like or Dislike: 2 7

18. BobRyan December 10, 2011 at 6:48 pm

Richard D. Brown: While talking, a thought struck me, and I said to her, “You know, Sue, if you’re right and I’m wrong, and there is no God and no creation, at least I have tried to behave myself and be a good citizen, and have lived a good life. If the creation account isn’t true, I will have nothing to lose! But, if I’m right and you’re wrong, and there is a God who created, who gave us the plan of salvation, and the Bible as a guide of life, and you reject Him, then you
will have everything to lose! I would rather be safe than sorry!!

An atheist thread over on a club Adventist board recently made fun of the Gospel arguing that it is a solution without a problem because in the atheist mindset – there is no lake of fire… no heaven to lose, no hell to avoid, no sin, no need of salvation.

So I suppose this is appropriate.

he atheist stands at the Great White Throne in Rev 20 and writes in his diary.

Dear Diary -

1. Just found out that God is real and really did create the world in 7 days — oops!

2. Just found out that God made laws for the entire universe and the penalty for rebellion was said to be the 2nd death…. oops!

3. Just found out that Adam and Eve were created sinless – chose to rebel against God’s Law and so mankind was doomed to the 2nd death since they were the only two people on the planet…oops!

4. Just found out that Jesus Christ really was the Son of God and came to save mankind…. oops!

dear diary – I now realize that if the beginning concepts were all true even though I doubted and disbelieved them – there is the strongest likelihood that the end of the Bible is all true as well…. big OOPS!

The liberal Christians of the world consider it “mean spirited” to “believe the Bible warnings” given to lost mankind and even worse to “tell mankind about them”.

in Christ,

Bob

(Quote)

Like or Dislike: 📈 3 📈 5

19. Faith December 10, 2011 at 8:05 pm

Perhaps, Jon, we are just dealing with semantics here. We both believe that God has given us the power of choice. But to assign doubt to God’s part is going too far, in my opinion.

Doubt is unbelief. If we doubt God we do not believe in Him. If we do not believe in Him we cannot accept His salvation. Doubt is what Satan insinuated in the angel population in Heaven, which cost a
third of the angels their eternal lives. Any way you look at it, when it is directed against God, doubt is a bad thing.

I don’t see doubt as a God-given gift. As I said before doubt is not a good thing, and God is the giver of every good and perfect gift. Why would He plant doubt into our hearts? He knows the results of that—discord and eventually war—which brought about the expulsion of Satan and his following band of angels.

It doesn’t make sense that God would put that negative trait into our lives; nothing good could come of it. I imagine He knew that Satan would provide the doubt. Certainly God doesn’t remove all doubt from our minds,(that is what Ellen said, btw; she said He didn’t remove doubt—she doesn’t say it originates with Him) He just made us capable of choosing between right or wrong.

You said: “If the possibility of doubt were removed, we would be robots whose one job is to obey what the master controller says. Kinda like an inanimate object.”

To an extent you are correct; yet, think: what will it be like when God comes to take His children home to heaven? Will there be any doubt in existence in any of our minds? I don’t think so. And I don’t think we will be like robots either. We will have made our choice and have no more doubts. That doesn’t mean we will not be free agents, but we will just know better.

So you see, Jon, while I can’t agree with your idea that God gave us doubt, I do agree that we all have the power of choice.

And, personally, I would be glad if this whole controversy was over and there was no need of this website or any other because then we would have made our decisions and be of one accord. I look forward to that day.

(Quote)

Like or Dislike: 🕯 2 🕯 3

20. Charles December 10, 2011 at 8:31 pm

Richard D. Brown: I have told this episode to many of my students over the years. Back in the early 1980s while at The University of North Carolina at Charlotte, one of my colleagues and I were having a discussion in my office about creation versus evolution. We really got into it and were going back and forth. It became obvious that I wasn’t going to change her mind and that she wasn’t going to change mine. While talking, a thought struck me, and I said to her, “You know, Sue, if you’re right and I’m wrong, and there is no God and no creation, at least I have tried to behave myself and be a good citizen, and have lived a good life. If the creation account isn’t true, I will have nothing to lose! But, if I’m right and you’re wrong, and there is a God who created, who gave us the plan of salvation, and the Bible as a guide of life, and you reject Him, then you will have everything to lose! I would rather be safe than sorry!!” Over the years I have often thought of my answer as a possible cop-out, but what else is there? “He that cometh to God must believe that He is…” He that cometh to
Darwin must believe that he is. Make and take the best choice. If the creation account isn’t true…, we Adventists will have nothing more to lose than the atheists and the compromisers will, except perhaps being ridiculed, embarrassed, losing our jobs (I was expelled!), etc. But…, if the creation account IS true, then expect “wailing and gnashing of teeth” when Jesus comes. Who in their right mind would not want to be safe, instead of sorry?

David Asscherick spoke in at least one of his presentations about “Pascal’s Wager” – “a suggestion posed by the French philosopher, mathematician, and physicist Blaise Pascal that even if the existence of God could not be determined through reason, a rational person should wager as though God exists, because one living life accordingly has everything to gain, and nothing to lose.”

Well, it seems that there is a certain amount of reasonable logic to such a proposition.Personally however, I see no need for such thinking.

“Science” pretends to have the answers backed up by proof(s). The reality is that science does not prove anything about what has caused the existence of our world today. “Science” is incapable of proving it. If it could determine so much as what gives life, then maybe it could replicate it and demonstrate how life began. It cannot and so it makes hypothesis, suppositions, and theories about a world that IS, but would NOT BE, without the existence of LIFE. LIFE is the beginning of our world as it is today.

To explain LIFE requires acknowledgement of a power beyond anything that mankind (or science) can comprehend. Recognizing such an entity (Creator) thus implies that He would provide his intelligent creation with knowledge of how we came to be, why, and what is in the future. Thus the Bible. The Bible explains all of that in a compelling way to me, as well as the reasons why others of humanity seek a rationality in denial.

I am not participating here to convince anyone who otherwise wishes to believe there is no Creator to Whom they will be accountable. I know that is futile. As Ben Franklin said, “A man convinced against his will, is of the same opinion still.”

The message that is important is that great simple statement that is the very foundation for the existence of the SDA Church: “Fear God and give glory to Him… and WORSHIP HIM that Made Heaven and Earth…”

That is the mission of our beloved movement in THESE FINAL DAYS. Notions of evolutionary ideas and teaching, strike at the heart of the Creator message… It is just that simple. An enemy is doing these things.

(Quote)

Hot debate. What do you think? 🗳️ 9 🗳️ 2


@ Faith. God did not give us doubt as you have suggested. Nor have I suggested it. He allows room for the possibility of it. Re-read the quote. Better yet, go pick up the book Steps to Christ and read the
whole chapter on “What to Do With Doubt.” Statements taken in context can be understood more easily.

(Quote)

Like or Dislike: 7 0

22. Bill Sorensen December 11, 2011 at 3:15 pm

We go on and on. The final conclusion is this. Those who believe the bible is the final authority will always make science fit the bible.

Those who hold science above the word will always make the bible fit science.

You can not resolve this conflict. You can only identify it and accept the conclusion.

Do you think you will convince the “Dr. Taylor’s” of this world who hold science above the word of God?

Not unless you can convince them the final locus of authority is the bible. In that case, you must “prove” the validity of the bible before you can “prove” anything by the bible.

So, perhaps at this point, we are “beating a dead horse.” Just a thought.

Bill Sorensen

(Quote)

Like or Dislike: 7 0

23. ken December 11, 2011 at 3:55 pm

Re Bill’s Quote

“The final conclusion is this. Those who believe the bible is the final authority will always make science fit the bible.”

Credit to Bill for calling it like he sees it. When it comes to creation science I think he is right.

The problem of course is for everyone else who views science as an objective tool of inquiry without a faith or non faith bias. Once science becomes a tool of faith or non faith it becomes subjective to the faith or non faith in in question. Science should rise above bias to be an objective tool for all of humanity. It should not matter one iota if one believes or does not believe in God when doing science. Let the results demonstrate what they may.

Your agnostic friend
Ken

(Quote)

Like or Dislike: 3 0
24. Charles December 11, 2011 at 4:16 pm

**Bill Sorensen**: We go on and on. The final conclusion is this. Those who believe the bible is the final authority will always make science fit the bible. Those who hold science above the word will always make the bible fit science. You can not resolve this conflict. You can only identify it and accept the conclusion. Do you think you will convince the “Dr. Taylor’s” of this world who hold science above the word of God? Not unless you can convince them the final locus of authority is the bible. In that case, you must “prove” the validity of the bible before you can “prove” anything by the bible. So, perhaps at this point, we are “beating a dead horse.” Just a thought. Bill Sorensen

Well said, Bill. There are an abundance of those who do not accept the validity of scripture over science. AND, they have that right. But not to come into the SDA church and sow tares of such teaching within our ranks – and especially upon our children. The true SDA faith takes Scripture as ultimate and final authority and “science” must be subject to it. AND, there are plenty of brilliant scientists who see no conflict there.

(Quote)

Like or Dislike: 4 1

25. ken December 11, 2011 at 4:44 pm

Bill’s Quote

“The final conclusion is this. Those who believe the bible is the final authority will always make science fit the bible.”

Charles Quote

“The true SDA faith takes Scripture as ultimate and final authority and “science” must be subject to it.”

Drs Pitman and Kime

Do you agree or disagree with Bill and Charles’s statements?

Your agnostic friend

Ken

(Quote)

Like or Dislike: 3 1

26. BobRyan December 11, 2011 at 4:45 pm

**Bill Sorensen**: We go on and on. The final conclusion is this. Those who
believe the bible is the final authority will always make science fit the bible.

Those who hold to blind-faith evolutionism will always find a way to bend-science to fit the doctrines of evolutionism.

This is the lament of their fellow atheist evolutionist Collin Patterson.

Thus Creationism and Evolutionism are in fact two competing religions.

However ID is “just science” and since it allows observations in nature that are not compatible with atheist doctrines about “there being no god” – many of the devotees to evolutionism will object to the actual science of I.D.

Yet in Romans 1 — God says that “they are without excuse” when they do that.

Romans 1 is not a problem for agnostics and atheists who already ignore the Bible entirely.

But it poses a bit of a snag for believers in Theistic Evolutionism operating from inside the Christian church.

in Christ,

Bob

(Quote)

Like or Dislike: 2 4

27. Charles December 11, 2011 at 5:45 pm

BobRyan> Thus Creationism and Evolutionism are in fact two competing religions.

That is the truth of it. The religions of Christ and of the anti-christ.

(Quote)

Like or Dislike: 2 3

28. Bill Sorensen December 11, 2011 at 7:51 pm

Well, I think we can see that you can not posit final authority in both. It is one or the other.

Science will never endorse a miracle. And biblical miracles transcend science.

Isn’t that obvious?

In which case, you can not “prove” one by the other.
The bible claims its own authority by way of prophecy. And just because the bible points to nature as the product of God’s doing, you can’t “prove” that by nature itself.

“The heavens declare the glory of God” only to those who believe the bible. The bible gives us a “first cause” while nature gives us none.

Science has no testimony for a “first cause”. And scientists don’t agree on the various possibilities they speculate about.

If I were of that ilk, I would simply say nature has always existed and has no “first cause”. But if this is true, then science is no longer science.

In the end, it should be more than obvious, you can not harmonize evolution with the biblical declarations. They are mutually exclusive.

And if so, trying to prove the biblical explanation by way of nature is an exercise in futility.

Bill Sorensen
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29. Wesley Kime December 11, 2011 at 9:51 pm

@ken: That God, through the bible, among so many other things and ways, including what I myself see and sense and have experienced, is my core, crux, and premise, I affirm polsolutely and unapologetically. Again. Likewise certainly, unapologetically, and resoundingly, that objective observation of the natural universe, the at-bottom definition of science, already fits and is already subject.
Your reaffirming friend,

W
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30. Ken December 11, 2011 at 11:21 pm

Dear Wes

“The ultimate authority must always rest with the individual’s own reason and critical analysis.”

- the Dalai Lama

Your agnostic friend
Ken
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31. Faith December 11, 2011 at 11:44 pm

**Jon S. Klingbeil**: Remove doubt, remove choice

**Jon S. Klingbeil**: Remove doubt [Gods part], remove choice [our part].

Sorry if I misunderstood you, John, but the above quotations kind of threw me. It came across to me that you thought God gave us the doubt—that it was a requirement. That was why I inquired if I was misunderstanding you in the first place.

Glad to know we both agree. God bless.
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32. Jon S. Klingbeil December 12, 2011 at 2:41 am

Faith, I am glad we agree too. 😊
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A recent New York Times op-ed, “The Evangelical Rejection of Reason,”⁠¹ would’ve busted a blood-pressure machine had I been connected while reading.

According to authors Karl W. Giberson, a “former professor of physics” at Eastern Nazarene College, and Randall J. Stephens, an associate professor of history there, affirmation of what many of us consider to be the basics of Christian faith, such as belief in a literal, recent, six-day creation, renders one anti-intellectual, and perhaps even un-Christian.

“Like other evangelicals, we accept the centrality of faith in Jesus Christ and look to the Bible as our sacred book, though we find it hard to recognize our religious tradition in the mainstream evangelical conversation,” they assert. “Evangelicalism at its best seeks a biblically grounded expression of Christianity that is intellectually engaged, humble and forward-looking. In contrast, fundamentalism is literalistic, overconfident, and reactionary.”

Now, some Seventh-day Adventists would strenuously reject any association with “evangelicals.” Many more equally abhor “fundamentalism” as they understand it. However, in attacking core evangelical beliefs such as Creation and the sanctity of marriage, and in asserting, “Christian theology can incorporate Darwin’s insights and flourish in a pluralistic society,”⁠² they assert.

Giberson and Stephens give their blessing to the kind of flaccid faith that likely won’t sustain anyone through anything. They are diminishing, in essence, some of the core beliefs of Adventism.

If the Bible account of Creation isn’t true, as Giberson and Stephens imply in offering to “incorporate” Darwinism in Christian faith, what must logically follow?

If there’s no Creation . . .
. . . where, and how, did sin enter the world?
. . . why do we need a Savior?
. . . from what did God, if He even exists, rest?
. . . why should we rest if, absent Creation, there’s nothing from which God rested?
. . . how can we believe anything else in the Bible?

One of the more popular fallacies being floated these days is that the Creation account found in Genesis is an allegory, a “celebration,” much in the way the ancient Hebrews took seven days to mark the inauguration of a temple.

Nonsense. Either the Creation account is true, or we can all sleep in next Saturday morning. As one speaker recently put it: “If God did not create man in His own image . . . how can we truly believe that He can re-create us for a new heaven and a new earth?”

In the intellectual redoubts in which deconstructionism masquerades as “inclusiveness,” we are seeing the fruits of such exposition: good Christian youths leaving the institutions at which they arrived full of faith suffused with doubt, and drifting away from the church. The only surprise is that we expect anything different from those who seem to hold conformity to the world’s standards above allegiance to the Lord of hosts.

And yet it is those of us who try to uphold the Bible as the ultimate standard who are derided, whether it’s in the pages of the New York Times or through media closer to many of our homes. It’s odd, isn’t it, that the much-vaunted “tolerance” of some has so little room for defenders of “the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints” (Jude 3, NKJV).⁶

I make no apologies for believing the Bible. I do not regret taking God at His Word. And I have to believe, and pray, I am not alone among Adventists in these views.

---

² Ibid.
⁶ Ibid.
Mark A. Kellner is news editor of the Adventist Review. This article was published December 8, 2011.