

The Discerner

the voice of... **Religion Analysis Service**

A QUARTERLY EXPOSING
UNBIBLICAL TEACHING & MOVEMENTS

Volume 30, Number 4

October • November • December 2010

Eckankar

Confucianism

Hare Krishna

Freemasons

Jehovah's Witnesses

Humanism

Jainism

Judaism

Neopaganism

MOONIES

Universalism

Wicca

Islam

Exposed!

MORMONS

BAHA'I FAITH

Buddhism

Scientology

Satanism

In This Edition:

Office Notes2
RAS Team

Dear Reader3
by Rev. Laurence J. Sutherland

With This Issue4
by Rev. Laurence J. Sutherland

Bible and Evolution5
by Henry Morris, Ph.D.

Evolution: Fairy Tales for Adults10
by Rev. James P. Beecken & Brian P. Beecken, Ph.D.

Evolution and the Scientific Method21
by Ronald McRoberts, Ph.D.

Judging Angels25
by Roy E. Knuteson, Ph.D.

QUIZ: Future Existence30



*"Hereby know we the spirit of truth
and the spirit of error" 1 John 4:6*

The Discerner

Volume 30, Number 4

October • November • December 2010

Editorial Committee

Rev. Laurence J. Sutherland

Dr. William A. BeVier

Religion Analysis Service Board Members

Dr. Ronald E. McRoberts: President

Ronald B. Anderson: Treasurer

Rev. Laurence J. Sutherland

Editor of "The Discerner"

Rev. Steve Lagoon: Vice President/
Secretary

Rick Dack

Steve DeVore

1313 5th St. SE, Mail Unit 5

Minneapolis, MN 55414-4504

612-331-3342 / 1-800-562-9153

FAX 612-331-3342

Published Quarterly

Price \$10.00 for 4 issues

Foreign subscriptions extra

Religion Analysis Service Board of Reference

Dr. William A. BeVier

Rev. Ron Carlson

Dr. Norman Geisler

Dr. Roy Knuteson



OFFICE NOTES

We wish our subscribers and friends God's richest and best in 2011. May it be true for you what was wished for people with birthdays years ago in Sunday School: "May you find Jesus near, every day of the year!"

Prayer request: Dr. William BeVier, former RAS president and editor of *The Discerner*, has contracted bone cancer. We pray that God's strength, wisdom, and healing grace will attend days of extensive treatments ahead. Likewise we pray for his wife JoAnn, who is also not in the best of health.

Rick Kronk, a Christar missionary in Europe who has written for *The Discerner* several times, has collected his poignant and penetrating observations and analyses of Muslim culture and religion in his new book: "Dreams and Visions: Muslims' Miraculous Journey to Jesus?" To secure a copy of this book, Kronk says: "Go to my blog at <http://nouvelloptique.wordpress.com> and click on the "donate" button which will take you to a PayPal secure page from which you can order a copy. If you do not have a PayPal account, the site accepts credit cards."

RAS TEAM

DEAR READER

Over the years the RAS has submitted numerous articles on the subject evolution. This issue continues to be one of the most difficult problems that both young and older Christians have to deal with in their defense of the Scriptures. This was my situation when I became a believer at 17 years of age. As valedictorian of my public high school class, I wanted to demonstrate that I had not forsaken all reason and academic credulity when I accepted Christ as my Savior. I believed the Genesis account, but my scientific background was limited. Our biological and history textbooks presented the origin of life from the evolutionary perspective. Once, my biology teacher put me on the spot with the question: "What do you think about Darwin, Sutherland?" Frankly I was stumped. I could only answer: "Darwin must be wrong." My spiritual leaders at that time could hardly give me any help either with this crucial question.

Fortunately, I attended a Christian college following high school where this issue was dealt with, though admittedly, quite superficially. My best help came later, however, through a casual encounter with Dr. Henry Morris, who founded the Christian Research Institute, and through the renowned Professor Dr. Dr. Dr. (yes, three earned doctorates) Wilder Smith from England, whose lectures in the 1970s dramatically influenced German university students in Darmstadt, Germany. These two scientists/theologians continue to give believers through their writings courage and support to accept the creation story as described in Genesis.

An anecdotal vignette - one of the students mentioned above in Germany, Eberhard Bertsch, went on to become a professor at the University of Saarbruecken in the Saar region. I remember Professor Bertsch as he lectured to us at one of our conferences. The lecture title had to do with the mathematical impossibility of evolution. He raised his finger to his cheek, almost threateningly, and declared: "Evolution ist voellig unmoeglich, mathematisch unmoeglich!" (Translation: "Evolution is fully impossible, mathematically impossible!")

RAS is pleased to present several articles in this issue to counteract the insidious inroads of Darwinian evolution thought into our educational, psychological, social, ethical, biological, geological, and even biblical thinking and perspectives. The authors are respected scholars in their fields. They know the territory well, and they ably defend the veracity of the Scriptures.

*Wishing you good reading, meditation, and application,
Laurence J. Sutherland*

WITH THIS ISSUE

As indicated earlier, our focus in this edition is the refutation of evolution. We are fortunate to get the support of the Creation Research Institute in our endeavor. Perhaps CRI is the strongest apologetic voice for the literal interpretation of the Genesis account in academic circles anywhere. I have known of the work of Dr. Henry Morris since my college days in Seattle. He was a scholar of great energy and vision, establishing the CRI with its manifold scientific and apologetic undertakings.

It's wonderful to have professors/scholars in our universities that advance the cause of biblical truth. Dr. Brian Beecken, professor of physics at Bethel University in St. Paul, deals with scientific and biblical challenges constantly. His willingness, along with his pastor father, to contribute toward this edition is greeted. The title to his article is indeed provocative, as he labels evolution: "fairy tales". This is obviously satirical and almost taunting - something like players taking off the gloves in a hockey game and going at it. I don't think I need to say any more to encourage the reading and analysis of this article.

Our president of RAS, Dr. Ron McRoberts, has taken time out from his busy lecture tours throughout the world to delineate how true scientific method relates to evolution. Generally truth is not as complex as we think it is. McRoberts makes the complex understandable and plausible; his arguments blast the evolutionary hypothesis and undercut the basic pillars of Darwinism.

A different matter - the judgment of angels by believers is taught in Scripture. Our prolific contributing writer, Dr. Roy Knuteson, debates this theme. What are the components and implications of angelic judgment? He addresses adequately the wide-ranging ramifications of this topic.

Finally, we submit a second quiz on future existence. The future is so prominent in the thought of all religions, cults, and aberrant movements. Please let me know of any score above 80%. Thank you!

Laurence J. Sutherland

BIBLE AND EVOLUTION

by Henry Morris, Ph.D.*

Biology, a word derived from two Greek words, *bios* (“life”) and *logos* (“word”), is “the study of life.” The Bible is the written Word of God, according to its own claims and an abundance of evidence.

The Bible encourages—in fact, commands—the study of biology and all other factual science. The very first divine commandment given to man was: “Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth” (Genesis 1:28).

This “dominion mandate,” as it has been called, is in effect a command to “do science,” for Adam and his descendants could only “subdue” the earth and “have dominion” over all its living creatures by learning their nature and functions. This clearly implies the establishment of a “science” of biology, so that mankind could properly care for and utilize the world’s resources of animal and plant life as created by God.

There is thus no conflict at all between the Bible and biological science. But “evolutionary biology” is another matter. It is a philosophy, not science, an attempt to explain the origin and developmental history of all forms of life on a strictly naturalistic basis, without the intervention of special creation.

The Bible is opposed to evolutionary biology in that sense. Ten times in its opening chapter it stresses that the various created forms of life were to reproduce only “after their kinds” (see Genesis 1:11, 12, 21, 24, 25). This restriction does not preclude “variation,” of course, since no two individuals of the same kind are ever exactly alike. Such “horizontal” recombinations, within the created kinds, are proper subjects of scientific study and so do not conflict with the Bible.

There are many fully credentialed professional biologists who are Christian creationists who have no problem with this biblical stipulation. The Institute for Creation Research, for example, has such professionals in the life sciences on its own staff, and there are hundreds more in other creationist organizations.

However, it is sadly true that *most* biologists and other life scientists are thoroughly committed to evolutionism. This is especially true

of the biological “establishment.” One poll of the members of the National Academy of Sciences found that, although commitment to atheism was predominant among the leading scientists in all fields, biologists were more so than others.

Biologists had the lowest rate of belief (5.5% in God, 7.1% in immortality), with physicists and astronomers slightly higher (7.5% in God, 7.5% in immortality).¹

In fact, probably most of this small minority who *do* believe in God are theistic evolutionists, not creationists.

However, it should be emphasized that this overwhelming commitment to evolutionism is not because of the scientific evidence, but rather because of antipathy to biblical Christianity. Even Charles Darwin became an evolutionist and agnostic because of his rejection of the biblical doctrine of divine punishment.²

Scientific evidence for biological evolution is very weak, at best. In all recorded history, there is no example of real evolution having occurred. The tremendous complexity of even the simplest forms of life is seemingly impossible to explain by evolution. Yet, they believe it anyway. The genetic code which governs the reproduction process in all creatures is extremely complex, clearly implying intelligent design. Yet, it is attributed to natural selection. Note the following statement:

The genetic code is the product of early natural selection, not simply random, say scientists in Britain. Their analysis has shown it to be the best of more than a billion possible codes... Roughly 10^{20} genetic codes are possible, but the one nature actually uses was adopted as the standard more than 3.5 billion years ago.³

However, instead of coming to the obvious conclusion that an intelligent agent was responsible, it is simply assumed that it happened naturally.

...it is extremely unlikely that such an efficient code arose by chance—natural selection must have played a role.⁴

Natural selection thus takes the place of God, not only in the origin of species, but even in the origin of the remarkable code which governs life, so they say.

1 Larson, E. J. and L. Witham, 1998. Leading Scientists Still Reject God. *Nature*. 394 (6691): 313.

2 Darwin, C. 1978. *Autobiography*. Reprinted in *The Voyage of Charles Darwin*. C. Rawlings, ed. BBC. See A Scientist's Thoughts on Religion, *New Scientist* (vol. 158, April 18, 1998), 15.

3 Knight, J. 1998. Top Translator. *New Scientist*. 158: 15.

4 *Ibid.*

However, a number of evolutionary biologists have recognized the absurdity of relying on natural selection alone to accomplish such marvelous feats. Two very prominent evolutionists said it this way:

Major questions posed by zoologists cannot be answered from inside the neo-Darwinian straitjacket. Such questions include, for example: “How do new structures arise in evolution?” “Why, given so much environmental change, is stasis so prevalent in evolution as seen in the fossil record?” “How did one group of organisms or set of molecules evolve from another?”⁵

These are the same unanswered questions that creationists have been posing to evolutionists for years. The obvious *true* answer is that of biblical creation.

This answer is not acceptable to evolutionists, of course, so they invent “just-so stories” or mysterious “order-out-of-chaos” scenarios.

Fanciful abstractions have been invented by the neo-Darwinists, many of whom are scientists who, beginning as engineers, physicists, and mathematicians, found biology “easy.”⁶

The coauthors of the book cited above, while vigorously opposing the neo-Darwinian concept of gradual evolution by random mutation and natural selection, are not endorsing the “punctuated equilibrium” hypothesis of Gould and others, and certainly not creationism. Rather, they think the answers lie in *Gaia*, the ancient pagan idea that the earth is a giant organism itself—Mother Earth, as it were.

Richard Dawkins is the best-known neo-Darwinist in England, with Edward O. Wilson (of Harvard) probably filling that role in America. A reviewer of one of Wilson’s books noted that he “alludes in several passages to the problem of complexity as the greatest challenge facing all science.”⁷

His co-Darwinian, Dawkins, thinks it can all be solved somehow in terms of computer simulations and his “blind watchmaker.” However, in trying to explain the human brain by natural selection, Wilson seems to have come to an impasse.

Evolution of the brain occurred over the three million years between our simian ancestors and the advent of *Homo sapiens* about a million years ago. The strangest feature of the process

5 Margulis, L. and D. Sagan. 1997. *Slanted Truths: Essays on Gaia, Symbiosis, and Evolution*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 100.

6 *Ibid.*, 270.

7 Gillispie, C. C. 1998. E. O. Wilson’s *Consilience*: A Noble Unifying Vision, Grandly Expressed, Review of *Consilience: the Unity of Knowledge* by Edward O. Wilson (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1998), 322 pp. In *American Scientist*. 86: 282.

is that the capacity of the brain should far exceed the needs of mere survival. A further curiosity is that, once the brain was fully formed, the enormous differentiation of cultures occupied mere millennia, while only the twinkling of an evolutionary eye separates us from the earliest records of any civilization.⁸

Of course, none of this is strange or curious if one is willing to accept the biblical record of the origin of the human brain and the origin of civilization.

Instead of such a simple solution as primeval divine creation, however, evolutionary biologists argue violently among themselves about the relative merits of neo-Darwinism, punctuated equilibrium, and *Gaia* in explaining man. Stephen Jay Gould of Harvard (advocate of punctuationism) had a widely publicized debate with evolutionary anthropologist/linguist Steven Pinker. The comments by science writer Brookes are fascinating and relevant.

Gould is an inevitable by-product of an age-old controversy which most scientists now acknowledge to be simplistic and well past its sell-by-date. It has no apparent function other than intellectual one-upmanship. It is precisely because there is so little evidence for either of their views that they can get away with so much speculation and disagreement.⁹

This particular debate was about evolutionary psychology, but the same comments could apply to evolutionary biology. Neither side can offer any observational evidence.

The punctuationists find their main evidence in the ubiquitous evolutionary gaps in the fossil record. In spite of these gaps, the fossil record is usually presented as evidence that evolution has occurred in the past, even though we cannot see it in either the field or lab in the present.

But the fossils don't really provide any solid evolutionary evidence either, whether for gradualism or punctuationism.

Fossil discoveries can muddle our attempts to construct simple evolutionary trees—fossils from key periods are often not intermediates, but rather hodgepodes of defining features of many different groups... Generally, it seems that major groups are not assembled in a simple linear or progressive manner—new features are often “cut and pasted”—on different groups at different times.¹⁰

8 Ibid, 281.

9 Brookes, M. 1998. May the Best Man Win. *New Scientist*. 158: 51.

10 Shubin, N. 1998. Vertebrate Palaeontology: Evolutionary Cut and Paste. *Nature*. 394 (6688): 12.

Not only are there no transitional series of fossils among the billions of known fossils in the rocks, but also there are no unequivocal evolutionary sequences.

This poses a “chicken and egg” problem for paleontologists: If independent evolution of key characters is common, how is phylogeny to be recognized?¹¹

The real bottom line of the entire question of biological origins is that the biblical record fits all the real scientific facts, and evolution does not.

References

Adapted from Dr. Morris' article “The Bible and/or Biology” in the June 1999 edition of *Acts & Facts*.

* Dr. Morris (1918-2006) was Founder of the Institute for Creation Research.

Cite this article: Morris, H. 2010. Biology and the Bible. *Acts & Facts*. 39 (11): 4-5.

Morris, H. 2010. Biology and the Bible. *Acts & Facts*. 39 (11): 4-5. Copyright © 2010 Institute for Creation Research, www.icr.org. Used by permission.

¹¹ Ibid, 13.

EVOLUTION: FAIRY TALES FOR ADULTS

by Rev. James P. Beecken & Dr. Brian P. Beecken

In 1984 Louis Bounoure, the former director of the Strasbourg Zoological Museum and later the Director of the French Natural Center for Scientific Research, wrote: “Evolutionism is a fairy tale for grown-ups. This theory has helped nothing in the progression of science. It is useless.”¹ James Perloff concluded his *Survey of Evolutionary Theory* with these words: “The princess kissed the frog, and he turned into a handsome prince. We call that a fairy tale. Evolution says (if you add a few million years) frogs turn into princes, and we call that science.”²

Is evolution really a fairy tale for grown-ups? Certainly evolution consists of many fantastic stories. Let us examine a few and see how well they fit the fairy tale format.

Fairy Tale #1: The Origin of the Universe—the Big Bang

Once upon a time, a long, long time ago, perhaps 10–20 billions of years ago, there was nothing—no time, no space, no matter, no energy—just nothingness. Then one incredible day this nothingness became a single, tiny infinitely hot spot—a spot much smaller than the period at the end of this sentence. Then this tiny spot that came from nothing exploded outward into hydrogen and helium, eventually producing all the matter in the entire universe. Gradually these outward racing atoms began circling one another, producing gas clouds which then pushed together into stars forming 100 billion galaxies, each with 100 billion stars. That is a lot of gas, matter, and energy, but believe it or not, it all came from nothing. At least that is what Edward P. Tyron, a professor of physics at the City University of New York, and other evolutionists believe. He writes: “In 1973, I proposed that our universe had been created spontaneously from nothing as a result of established principles of physics. This proposal struck people as preposterous, enchanting or both.”³ You know what? It does sound like a fairy tale. Dr. Jason Lisle, a Christian astronomer says: “This story of origins is entirely fiction... an attempt to explain how the universe could have been created without God... Quite a few secular astronomers are beginning to abandon the big bang... The big bang simply is not a good explanation of how the universe began.”

1 Louis Bounoure, “Le Monde et la Vie,” October, 1983. Quoted in *The Advocate*, March 8, 1984.

2 James Perloff, *Tornado in a Junkyard*, 1999, p. 274.

3 Edward P. Tyron, “What Made the World,” *New Scientist*, May 1984, p. 84.

Sir Fred Hoyle, the famous British mathematician and astronomer, writes: “I have little hesitation in saying that a sickly pall now hangs over the big-bang theory. When a pattern of facts becomes set against a theory, experience shows that the theory very rarely recovers.”⁴

We believe what the Bible says is a better explanation: “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” We have never seen nothing makes something, but every day we observe people with intelligence making all kinds of things. Belief in a God who is all-knowing, all-wise, and all powerful—who created everything—seems far more reasonable. Someone may ask: “Where did God come from?” We have a choice. Either nothing made everything, including matter and intelligence, or an intelligent God made everything including matter and living things with intelligence. Is it possible to believe that nothing times nobody equals everything? The Biblical explanation makes far more sense.

Fairy Tale #2: The Origin of Life

Once upon a time, a long, long time ago, 4–6 billion years ago, life evolved out of inanimate matter. This event occurred despite the fact that Spallanzani (1780) and Louis Pasteur (1860) proved that spontaneous generation is an impossibility and that life comes only from life (i.e., biogenesis). Our earth, which was a molten mass of very hot rock, over a period of millions and millions of years gradually cooled off. Eventually, some of the rock dissolved and formed a chemical soup. Then one day, according to Charles Darwin: “In some warm little pond, with all sorts of ammonia and phosphorous salts, light, heat, electricity etc... [or, was it as others suggest, out of a mud hole or sloshing sea water, a volcanic rim, warm wet dirt, an electrified mud puddle, or something else?] a protein compound was chemically formed ready to undergo still more complex changes” until the first life form came into existence.”⁵

Vance Ferrell has observed: “One minute after it dies, an animal still has all its chemicals, proteins, fatty acids, enzymes, DNA codes and all the rest. But it no longer has life. Scientists cannot produce life. Why then should they expect rocks and sea water to have that ability?”⁶ In other words, if we cannot bring a dead animal or person back to life when the exact components that make up the living animal or person are present, how can anyone believe life began by accident when the components for life did not exist?

4 Fred Hoyle, “The Big Bang under Attack,” *Science Digest*, May 1984, p. 84.

5 Charles Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, 1887, p. 202.

6 Vance Ferrell, “The Evolution Handbook,” 2001, p. 222.

The famous Stanley Miller experiment in 1953 did not even come close. In fact, afterward he stated that his own experiment (with limited results that were far from anything living) could not possibly have been done by chance outside of a modern laboratory.⁷ And his coworker, Harold Urey, made this statement: “All of us who study the origin of life find that the more we look into it, the more we feel it is too complex to have evolved anywhere. We all believe as an article of faith that life evolved from dead matter on this planet. It is just that its complexity is so great, it is hard for us to imagine that it did.”⁸ The atheist, Richard Dawkins, in his book *The Blind Watchmaker* says: “There is enough information capacity in a single human cell to store the Encyclopedia Britannica, all 30 volumes of it, three or four times over.” According to Werner Gitt, the amount of information processed in our bodies during the course of one day is “one million times greater than all the knowledge stored in all the libraries in the world.”⁹ Walter Brown says: “The genetic information contained in each cell is roughly equivalent to a library of 4,000 volumes.”¹⁰ Where did all this information come from?

Francis Crick, co-discoverer of the DNA molecule and a Nobel Prize winner, has written: “An honest man, armed with all the knowledge available to us now, could only state that in some sense, the origin of life appears at the moment to be almost a miracle.”¹¹ No wonder that he went on to propose that life may have arisen somewhere else, out in space, and come here either on a meteor or a spaceship.

Sir Fred Hoyle determined that the probability that a single protein could originate in a primitive environment, given 4–6 billion years in which to do it, is one chance in $10^{40,000}$. That is one chance in 1 with 40,000 zeros after it. Jerry Bergman sums it up this way: “Since thousands of complex protein molecules are required to build a single cell, probability moves outside the realm of possibility.” Hoyle also declared that the probability of an evolutionary origin of life anywhere in the universe in 20 billion years is equal to the possibility that a tornado sweeping through a junkyard would assemble a Boeing 747.¹² Sir Fred Hoyle, formerly an atheist, eventually declared that life had to be created and that therefore there must be a God.

Fairy Tale #3: The Incredible Walking Fish

Back in October, 1976, the U.S. National Storytelling Festival was

7 Ferrell, p. 233.

8 Harold C. Urey, quoted in Christian Science Monitor, Jan 4, 1962, p. 4.

9 Werner Gitt, *In the Beginning there was Information*, 2005, p 108.

10 Walter Brown, *In the Beginning*, 2008, p. 3.

11 Francis Crick, *Life Itself, Its Origin in Nature*, 1981, p. 88.

12 Fred Hoyle, *Evolution from Space*, 1981, p. 28.

held in Jonesboro, Tennessee. One tall tale went like this: “A boy while fishing one day caught a catfish, but he threw it back in. The next day he caught it again. This time he kept it out of the water for a little longer, and then he threw it back in. And so it continued all summer long—the fish staying out of the water for longer and longer periods of time, until it became accustomed to living on land. At the end of the summer, as the boy was walking to school, the fish jumped up out of the water and began following the boy like a dog. All went well until they started to cross an old bridge with a plank missing. Alas, the poor fish fell through the hole and into the water below and quickly drowned.” That is an interesting tale, but evolution also has a story about a walking fish.

Once upon a time, a long, long time ago a fish came up out of the water, slithered ashore and began walking. He found it so exhilarating that over a period of millions of years and after a tremendous number of design changes (i.e., random mutations) he gradually changed himself into a land animal complete with legs instead of fins, skin instead of scales, and lungs instead of gills with which to breathe the air. And so it was that amphibians, reptiles, birds, mammals, and finally human beings resulted.

In 1980 and 1981, Luther Sunderland recorded, with their permission, interviews with three of the most important paleontologists in the world who were in charge of at least half of the fossil collections on the planet covering every basic fossil discovery of the past 150 years. He asked them about that fish that came up out of the water and began to walk on land and if they knew of any transitional species. The answer was a strained silence and an embarrassed side-stepping of the issue. Although this is a basic teaching of evolutionary theory, none of these experts could name a single transitional species or missing link.¹³

Paleontologist Jennifer Clark, University of Cambridge, writes: “We thought we’d pinned down the origin of limbed tetrapods. We have to rethink the whole thing.”¹⁴ Paleontologist Per Ahlberg of Uppsala University, Sweden, adds: “These results force us to reconsider our whole picture of the transition from fish to land animals.”¹⁵

Fairy Tale #4: The Amazing Spot that became an Eye

Once upon a time, a long, long time ago there was a spot. It could have been a freckle or a mole or a wart. No matter, the important

¹³ S. D. Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma*, p. 89.

¹⁴ ScienceNOW, 6 January 2010, <http://news.sciencemag.org/sciencenow/2010/01/06-02.html>, Accessed 12/12/10

¹⁵ ScienceDaily, 8 January 2010, <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2010/01/100107114420.htm>, Accessed 12/12/10

thing is that the spot was sensitive to light, and it just happened to be on the head and not on an arm or a leg. After millions of years and a miraculous number of design changes (i.e., random mutations) this sensitive spot slowly changed into an eyeball complete with a retina, a cornea, an optic nerve capable of sending a thousand million impulses per second to the brain, a lens, pixels, rods and cones, and iris, tear ducts, focusing muscles and an eyelid to protect it all.

No wonder Darwin wrote: “The eye to this day gives me a cold shudder... To suppose that the eye with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by natural selection seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree.”¹⁶ Says Robert Jastrow: “The eye appears to have been designed; no designer of telescopes could have done better.”¹⁷ John Stevens writes: “Keeping in mind that there are 10 million or more nerve cells interacting with each other in complex ways it would take a minimum of 100 years of Cray [supercomputer] time to simulate what takes place in your eye many times every second.”¹⁸ As you might imagine an eye with any one of its many parts missing would not have worked—so it would be hard for natural selection to select it. There is an alternative explanation. The Bible says: “Ears that hear and eyes that see—the Lord has made them both.”¹⁹

Fairy Tale #5: The Remarkable Story of the Dinosaurs

Once upon a time, a long, long time ago, 65–135 million years ago, the earth was ruled by about 500 different types of dinosaurs. Some were as small as chickens. Others were as tall as a five story building. No one knows for sure where they came from or how they got here, but we do know that suddenly, about 65 million years ago, they all disappeared. Why? No one knows for sure. Many think that the earth was hit by a large meteor or an asteroid. Others suggest that they were killed by volcanoes, climate change, disease, brittle egg shells, or their eggs being eaten by other animals.

Now, it is true that the word *dinosaur* is not found in the Bible. But that is easily explained by the fact that the King James Version was translated in 1611 whereas the word dinosaur, which means *terrible lizard*, wasn't coined until the 19th century. Of course, the Bible does mention dragons and in Job 40:15–18 there is a description of “Behemoth” which perfectly fits Apatosaurus. And in the next chapter

¹⁶ Darwin, *Origin of the Species*, p. 175.

¹⁷ Jastrow, *The Enchanted Loom: Mind in the universe*, p. 98.

¹⁸ John K. Stevens, “Reverse Engineering the Brain,” *Byte*, April 1985, p. 287.

¹⁹ Proverbs 20:12, NIV.

we find a description of a huge, fierce sea monster named “Leviathan” which sounds a lot like a Plesiosaur. Also, many cultures have stories or legends about dragons and dragon slayers. Tens of thousands of pictographs, cave drawings, and pieces of pottery picturing dinosaurs have been found in many places around the world. Why? The simplest and most obvious explanation for these descriptions of dinosaurs is that people lived with them and saw them. Could it be that most dinosaurs were buried in sediment and then fossilized as a result of Noah’s flood, that young (i.e., small) dinosaurs were on the ark and that their descendants gradually died out as a result of the climate changes following the flood?

A recent discovery has sent shock waves through the scientific community. In the mid-1990’s Mary Schweitzer was studying thin sections of T-Rex bones under a microscope at Montana State University. Then, as she describes it: “The lab filled with murmurs of amazement, for I had focused on something inside the vessels that none of us had ever noticed before: tiny round objects, translucent red with a dark center. Then a colleague took one look at them and shouted: ‘You’ve got red blood cells. You’ve got red blood cells!’” Dr. Schweitzer responds: “I looked at this and I looked at this and I thought, this can’t be. Red blood cells don’t preserve. It was exactly like looking at a slice of modern bone. But, of course, I couldn’t believe it. I said to the lab technician: ‘The bones are, after all 65 million years old. How could blood cells survive that long?’”²⁰ Then in 2005 she discovered that some soft tissue remained and that it was still elastic. One researcher wrote: “The flexible and elastic structures are very similar to what one would get from a fresh bone. It is so flexible and resilient that when stretched it would return to its original shape.” Dr. Schweitzer said: “I am quite aware that according to conventional wisdom and models of fossilization, these structures are not supposed to be there, but there they are. I was pretty shocked.”²¹ On CBS News’ “60 Minutes” reporter Leslie Stahl interviewed Dr. Schweitzer. At one point Schweitzer showed Stahl soft tissue from a Tyrannosaurus. Stahl commented: “It looks like the soft tissue she would have expected to find if it had been modern bone. This was impossible. This bone was over 68 million years old.”²²

So how could a fossilized bone, after more than 65 million years still have intact organic structures? Surely the soft tissue would have completely degraded by now. Connective tissue degrades over time, such that DNA should not survive at all, even if the creature only

20 Mary Schweitzer, “Soft Tissue Vessels and Cellular Preservation in Tyrannosaurus?” *Science*, Vol. 307, March 2005, p. 1952.

21 E. Boswell, Montana State University News Service, Vol. 94, March 24, 2005.

22 “60 Minutes” on CBS Nov. 15, 2005.

lived 50,000 years ago.²³ Actually, freshness of fossils that are in rock that is supposed to be millions of year old is not unusual as one might think. Recently, according to a BBC News report,²⁴ Dr. Phil Wilby of the British Geological Survey cracked open a 150 million year old rock and found a fossilized squid inside. Amazingly, the squid's ink sac was still fresh enough that the excavators could draw pictures with the ink. As Wilby said: "It is difficult to imagine how you can have something as soft and sloppy as an ink sac inside a rock that is 150 million years old." Yes, it is difficult. Question: How can organic structures millions of years old survive and be fresh? Answer: Perhaps these structures and the rocks they are found in are not even close to being millions of years old.

Fairy Tale #6: The Adventurous Dinosaur that became a Bird

Once upon a time, a long, long time ago there was a running dinosaur, a theropod, or, perhaps it was a crocodile-like reptile as others believe, that decided she would like to fly. Initially she lived in trees and leapt from limb to limb and glided from perch to perch. Gradually, over many, many years she streamlined her body, changed her solid bones into hollow bones, developed a Y-shaped breast bone, grew powerful chest muscles for flight and special lungs that are completely different from those of a reptile, changed her front legs into wings, and, last but not least, began to grow feathers that were perfectly adapted for flight. At first she began gliding down from her perch on the tree catching bugs on her way down. But eventually she learned to really fly and became a real bird.

Richard Dawkins, an evolutionist and author of *The God Delusion*, glibly states: "Feathers are modified reptilian scales." But scales are folds in the skin whereas feathers are complex structures with barbules and hooks. Feathers originate in a totally different way than follicles inside the skin like hair, and they are made from a radically different type of protein than skin. In addition, creationists wonder: "Of what use would a half-wing or a partial-feather be?" Structures like these would get in the way and be a handicap, thereby causing natural selection to eliminate such organisms.

Fairy Tale #7: The Wonderful, Wonderful Egg

Once upon a time, a long, long time ago, in a land far, far away, a mother dinosaur laid a wonderful egg and when that egg hatched, guess what happened? Out came a little baby bird, the first baby bird in the world. "And the baby grew up... with feathers... the first

23 V. Morell, "Dino DNA: The Hunt and the Hype," *Science*, 261(5118), 1993, p. 160–162.

24 Story 2009/08/19 BBC NEWS: http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/uk_news/england/wiltshire/8208838.stm

beautiful bird that ever sang in the tree tops... of long, long ago.” This fanciful little story was first published in 1958 and immediately was recommended by the American Association for the Advancement of Science as worthwhile science for children. Two NEA affiliates, the American Council on Education and the Association for Childhood Education, gave it their highest recommendation.

This children’s story was probably based on the work of evolutionist, Richard Goldschmidt. After 30 years of applying x-rays and chemicals to fruit flies, he found no evidence that mutations could produce evolution. So in 1940 he wrote his book *The Material Basis of Evolution*, in which he announced his new concept of mega-evolution: One new life form suddenly emerges out of a different one. He called it “Hopeful Monsters.” For example, one day a fish laid some eggs and some of them turned into a frog, or a snake laid an egg and a bird hatched from it. You know what? That sounds like a fairy tale to us.

Fairy Tale #9: How the Giraffe got its Long Neck

Rudyard Kipling once wrote a fanciful story for children about how the elephant got its long nose. It goes like this. Once upon a time, a long, long time ago a baby elephant strayed away from its mother and wandered down to the bank of a shiny river. There he spotted a bump sticking up out of the water. The baby elephant went closer and leaned over to get a better look. Suddenly the bump, it was actually a crocodile, jumped up and grabbed the nose of that poor little elephant. Then the elephant child sat back on his little haunches and pulled, and pulled, and pulled, and his nose began to stretch. And the crocodile floundered toward the bank, making the water all creamy with great sweeps of his tail, and he pulled and pulled, and pulled. And that is how the elephant got its long nose.

Now let us consider an evolutionary story, originally written by Charles Darwin himself. In his *Origin of the Species*, Darwin wrote: “So... the individuals which were the highest browsers, and were able during dearths to reach even an inch or two above the others, will often have been preserved... By this process long continued... combined no doubt in a most important manner with the inherited effects of increased use of parts, it seems to me almost certain that any ordinary hoofed quadruped might be converted into a giraffe.”²⁵

Does anyone see a problem here? The female giraffe on average is twenty-four inches shorter than the male and must surely have starved to death along with her children and all the other animals while only the males survived. Another question: How did the giraffe

25 Darwin, *Origin of the Species*, 1859, p. 202.

get its amazing heart (40 lbs.) and complicated circulatory system that enables it to pump blood up to its 20-foot-high brain? How did it develop the ability to immediately reduce the immense pressure that would develop in the brain when it leans over to get a drink of water? We do not find it surprising that after over a century of the most extensive exploration for fossils, the world's museums cannot display a single fossil that would connect the giraffe with any other creature with medium-sized necks or legs.²⁶

Fairy Tale #10:

The Awesome Cow (or was it a Bear?) that became a Whale

As you know, whales and dolphins are actually mammals, not fish. They live their whole life in water. But evolutionists believe that they evolved from land animals. Darwin thought that since they are air-breathing, warm-blooded, and milk-giving they must have developed from land animals in ancient times. The evolutionary story goes as follows:

Once upon a time, a long, long time ago in a place far, far away, a fish got out of the water, began walking, and then changed itself into a land animal complete with legs and skin and lungs. Still later, about 70 million years ago, one of its remote ancestors, a mammal, stepped back into the water and eventually became a whale.

Charles Darwin thought it was a bear that ventured back into the water, although many today believe it was a cow. Darwin wrote: "In North America the black bear was seen by Hearne swimming for hours with widely open mouth, thus catching like whales, insects in the water. Even in so extreme a case as this, if the supply of insects were constant... I can see no difficulty in a race of bears being reduced by natural selection, more and more aquatic in their structure and habits, with larger and larger mouths, till a creature was produced as monstrous as a whale."²⁷

The evolutionist, Milner, believes it was not a bear that went swimming one day and changed into a whale. He believes it was a cow.²⁸ Regardless, consider some of the changes this transformation would have required. The neck would have disappeared. The front legs became broad, flat, paddle-like shaped organs. The tail developed flukes—horizontal tail fins. The nostrils moved upwards and backwards until today they are blow-holes located on the top of the head. The lung capacity had to increase enormously to permit long dives—as deep as three-quarters of a mile, yet the whale has no need

²⁶ Luther Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma*, pp. 83–4.

²⁷ Darwin, *Origin of the Species*, 1859 and 1984 editions, p. 184.

²⁸ Milnar, *Encyclopedia of Evolution*, 1990, p. 463.

of a decompression chamber to prevent dying of the bends on the way back up. Eyes had to change until they could see under water; diet had to change from grass to plankton and fish. The skin had to lose its hair and sweat glands and gain fatty blubber. Meanwhile a sonar and navigational capacity was being developed which is superior to the most sophisticated systems in our most modern submarines.

If you think that all this is remarkable, there is still more. If the cow (or bear) wanted a drink of fresh water, somehow it had to swallow salt water and desalinate it in its digestive system. Alas, millions of cows must have died in agony as their fresh water stomachs and bodies absorbed all that salt before their desalination systems fully evolved.

The late E.J. Slijper wrote: “We do not possess a single fossil of the transitional forms between the aforementioned land animals and the whales.” Is this fact really more surprising than the story? Thankfully, the story can be tested. Simply drop a cow into the ocean and observe what happens.

Epilogue

It is not unusual for us to hear people express astonishment when we state that we believe the Bible is God’s word. They usually respond with incredulity, saying certainly we must realize that not everything the Bible says can possibly be true. And from a human standpoint we would have to agree. Certainly there are things in the Bible that are difficult to understand and sometimes even to believe, but we are willing to say that an all powerful God can do things that defy human explanation. However, what would happen if people were to think as critically about evolution as they do about the Bible? After considering carefully some of these “fairy tales for grown-ups,” we wonder why people are not more incredulous about the beliefs of evolutionists.

Sometimes it is said, “All intelligent educated people believe in evolution.” Not true! Thousands of practicing scientists have rejected evolution. One of them is Dr. Jonathan Sarfati, a chemist who authored *Refuting Evolution*. He is also a former New Zealand national chess champion known for his ability to play, while blindfolded, 12 sighted challengers simultaneously. Do you know what he calls evolution? He calls it “the greatest hoax on earth.” Soren Loutrup, a well-known Swedish scientist and an evolutionist has said: “I believe that one day the Darwinian myth will be ranked the greatest deceit in the history of science.”²⁹ D. M. S. Watson, an

29 Soren Loutrup, *Darwinism: The Refutation of a Myth*, Croomhelm, New York, 1987, p. 422.

evolutionist, candidly admitted evolution is a “theory universally accepted, not because it can be proven by logically coherent evidence to be true, but because the only alternative, special creation, is clearly incredible.”³⁰ Julian Huxley, a leading proponent of evolution, once was asked on a TV program why evolution was so readily accepted. He replied: “The reason we accepted Darwinism even without proof is because we didn’t want God to interfere with our sexual mores.”

Richard Dawkins and other atheists deliberately give the impression that no credible scientist opposes evolution. Not only is this not true, but such assertions effectively prevent examination of the fairy tales of evolution. Therefore, some people, in the name of science, believe in evolution with its goo to you, molecule to man, particles to people, and slime to crime. They say: “After all, given enough time anything can happen—even the impossible.” Perhaps they do not want to consider a very reasonable alternative: a God to whom we are all accountable.

About the Authors

Rev. James P. Beecken received his Bachelor of Divinity from Eden Theological Seminary and has served as a pastor for over forty years. His son, Dr. Brian P. Beecken, received his Ph.D. in Physics from the University of Minnesota. He has worked for NASA, The Air Force Research Laboratory, and Texas Instruments. Currently, he is a Professor and Chair of the Physics Department at Bethel University. The authors gratefully acknowledge Vance Ferrell for freely providing source material for this article in *The Evolution Handbook*. Additional information is available at <http://evolutionfacts.com/Handbook>.

³⁰ D. M. S. Watson in *Nature*, quoted by Duane Gish in *Evolution: The Fossils Say No*, 1973, p. 24.

EVOLUTION AND THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD

A MATHEMATICAL SCIENTIST CONSIDERS EVOLUTION IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD

by Ronald E. McRoberts, Ph.D.

Mario Bunge (1987), a prominent 20th century philosopher of science, asserts that science has a unique goal and a unique method that serve to distinguish it from non-science. The goal is to describe and explain patterns of observable natural facts. With respect to method, Bunge further asserts that “the scientific method is a mark of science, ...no scientific method, no science.” In characterizing the scientific method, Hans Reichenbach (1938) emphasized the distinction between the context of *Discovery* and the context of *Justification*. The starting point for Discovery is an acknowledged problem or gap in the current state of knowledge, and the ending point is one or more hypotheses proposed to fill the gap. The starting point for Justification is the set of hypotheses, and the ending point is a valid scientific inference. An important distinction between Discovery and Justification is that whereas Justification has a well-accepted logic, Discovery is a creative enterprise for which there are no rules or formal logic. Such is decidedly not the case for Justification; the ending point of Justification is a valid scientific inference, and the logic of inference is formal and rigorous.

To achieve their goal, scientists accumulate data in the form of observations and measurements that are as error-free as possible, organize these data into discernible patterns, and then formulate explanatory hypotheses as to the causal agents that produced the patterns. About the only constraint on hypotheses is that they must be testable, meaning that they must be sensitive to empirical data. Sensitivity means that if a hypothesis is valid, there must exist corroborating evidence, and if it is invalid, there must exist falsifying evidence. A crucial point is that explanatory hypotheses generally cannot be proven, but rather only corroborated; however, they can be falsified or proven false. The most popular approach to testing hypotheses in the context of Justification is characterized as *hypothetico-deduction*, and entails derivation of predictions from hypotheses. If comparisons of the predictions to empirical evidence are positive, then the hypothesis is said to be corroborated.

Now, on to evolution. Richard Dawkins has been a prominent opponent of the Christian worldview as evidenced by his authorship of “The God Delusion.” He has also been a strong proponent of evolution and the author of multiple books on this topic intended for general audiences including the recent “The greatest show on earth: the evidence for evolution.” Dawkins and Darwin before him are among natural observers who, over the millennia, have noted patterns of similarities and differences among classes of living creatures and have sought to explain them. Darwin proposed natural selection as a hypothesis to explain variations between isolated subpopulations of finches in the Galapagos Islands. In this context, natural selection may be defined as the process by which attributes become more or less common in a population as the result of consistent pressures upon the survival or reproduction of the population members. In the context of Discovery, there is nothing wrong with natural selection as a hypothesis; the difficulties arise in the context of Justification.

In the context of Justification, natural selection is well-corroborated as an explanation for many of the differences in subpopulations of the same species. One natural example is the change in the predominant color of a species of moth that resides on the boles of trees near London, England. Centuries ago, before widespread coal-induced pollution, the predominant moth color was light to resemble tree bark color as a means of camouflage from bird predators. As pollution blanketed London, the predominant color became much darker, because light colored moths were much more visible against the background of dark tree bark, suffered much greater mortality, leaving only darker moths to reproduce. As pollution decreased in the 20th century, the predominant color shifted back to lighter shades. In this case, the pressure to which natural selection was responding was bird predation. The variations observed in different breeds of dogs and cattle reflect the same concept. In these cases, the pressure is human-induced and the selection is much less natural, but the concept is the same. The crucial observation for both examples is that the moths were all of the same species, regardless of their color, and different breeds of dogs and cattle are still all of the same species, regardless of their different sizes, colors, and dispositions.

The essence of Dawkins recent book is an argument to extend natural selection as a hypothesis for explaining differences within a species to a hypothesis for explaining differences between species. The argument is that random mutations within a population of the same species make some individuals more fit with respect to a particular trait. In the face of natural selection, these more fit individuals experience greater survival, produce more offspring, and become more populous in the population. Different mutations make some other individuals more fit with respect to different traits, and eventually these multiple subpopulations that are more fit with respect to different traits diverge from their common ancestral population and form multiple different species. Thus, no self-respecting evolutionist claims today that humans descend from a different current species of primates but rather that multiple current species descend from a common ancestral species. This attempt at extending the role of natural selection as an explanatory hypothesis for differences within species to an explanatory hypothesis for differences among species invokes no inherent problems within the context of Discovery where there are few constraints. The problems arise in the context of Justification where the rules of logic are rigorous and formal. Although admittedly, evolution scientists have derived predictions from their hypothesis that are consistent with natural observations and from the perspective of hypothetico-deduction constitute corroborating evidence. However, this evidence is mostly indirect and secondary, and, of course, corroboration is not proof. In fact, Dawkins presents no direct evidence that random mutations within a species have actually produced a different species. Thus, much of the rigor expected in the context of Justification is lacking.

However, before uniformly condemning scientists, science, or the scientific method, Christians should exercise considerable caution. In fact, the scientific method works exceptionally well, and few of us can claim not having benefitted from advances that can be directly attributed to its application. Think of heart pacemakers, antibiotics, and kidney dialysis; think of the electronics and satellite technology that have produced cell phones and the Internet; think of the advances made in weather forecasting, particularly since the Armistice Day blizzard

of 1940 when there was none; and some of The Discerner's readers can remember cranking handles to start their cars. The list goes on.

Christians must accept that problems associated with evolution do not derive necessary or exclusively from scientists, the scientific method, or science. Rather, the basic problem is that unbelieving scientists recognize only the scientific method as a means of proposing and testing hypotheses as explanations for patterns of natural facts. Christians, however, recognize a second source of knowledge in the form of the revealed Word of God. Herein lies the crux of the solution to the evolution problem: evangelize an evolution scientist!

REFERENCES

- Bunge, M. (1967). *Scientific research I*. Springer-Verlag. New York.
- Dawkins, R. (2009). *The greatest show on earth*. Free Press. New York.
- Dawkins, R. (2006). *The God delusion..* Houghton Mifflin. Boston.
- Reichenbach, H. (1938). *Experience and prediction*. University of Chicago Press. Chicago.

JUDGING ANGELS

by Roy E. Knuteson, Ph.D.

In Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthian believers he asks a very provocative and startling question: "*Do you not know that we will judge angels?*" (1 Corinthians 6:3). Apparently they did not know this, nor do many Christians today. In order to properly interpret and understand this revelation, it is necessary to raise a series of theological questions that beg for answers:

1. Who are these angels that require judgment from Christians?
2. When does this judgment take place?
3. On what basis will these angels be judged?
4. What will be the results of this judgment?
5. What is the application of this truth for today?

Scripturally, angels can initially be divided into two general categories, either as "counterfeit angels" or, as "biblical angels."

COUNTERFEIT ANGELS

The Mormon Angel Moroni

Joseph Smith, the founder of Mormonism, claimed that "two personages" appeared to him in 1820, revealing that all the churches were corrupted and their creeds were an abomination to God. Therefore, it would be his calling to restore true Christianity. In retelling this spiritual encounter later, the story changes. The "two personages" were first identified as "angels." In later versions these same spirit-beings were identified as God the Father and his Son! Mormon leaders claim that this, the first of a series of visions, is the foundational basis for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. Everything, they will admit, hinges on the veracity of Smith's testimony.

Three years later in 1823, Smith claimed to have had a second vision in which a solitary angel, who identified himself as "Moroni," revealed to him the existence of some golden plates. Smith stated that he saw them "in a vision." Moroni allegedly arranged for a series of four return visits, one year apart, with a promise that he would actually

show Smith the mysterious golden plates. Sure enough, in 1827 Smith claimed that Moroni showed him the plates, which had been buried in a hill called “Cumorah” in New York State. With the plates in hand and with the aid of a “seer stone” which he called the “Urim and Thummim,” Smith asserted that he was enabled to translate the (phony) “Reformed Egyptian” language into Elizabethan English! In 1830 Smith’s “translation” was published as *The Book of Mormon*.

What shall we make of these claims? Do we have the right to judge the angel of Mormonism? Absolutely! Jesus said: *“Do not judge according to appearances, but judge with righteous judgment”* (John 7:24 NASB). There is a place for critical evaluation when dealing with the cults of Christendom. Only two angels are identified in the Bible (Gabriel and Michael). Neither of them is associated with such bizarre claims that Smith makes regarding the golden plates which allegedly reveal that the Indians of North and South America were really displaced Israelites! We can conclude, therefore, that Moroni was either the figment of Smith’s fertile imagination, or more probably, that Moroni was an evil angel or a demon, since Satan masquerades as an *“angel of light”* (2 Corinthians 11:14). Certainly Satan’s associates can do the same.

The Muslim Angel Gabriel

The belief in the existence of angels is fundamental to Islamic teaching, and especially in reference to the origin of the Koran, the Islamic Bible. At the age of 40 Muhammad had his first vision. At first he was unsure of the source of these visions, whether they were divine or demonic. His wife Khadijah encouraged him to accept them as coming from Allah, which he did. Once, while asleep, the angel Gabriel reportedly appeared again and commanded him to *“Recite.”* Not knowing what to say, he asked again, and Gabriel said: *“Recite in the name of the Lord who created man from blood coagulated, recite thy Lord is a wondrous kind, who by the pen has taught mankind things they know not (being blind).”*

After this divine commission, Muhammad continued to receive “messages” or “revelations” until his death in 632 A.D. One such message revealed that every Muslim has two recording angels — one records all the good deeds and the other evil deeds. At the final judgment every man will be resurrected and the books of the recording angels will be opened. Allah will then judge everyman’s deeds and admit some to paradise where they will recline on couches and drink wine handed to them by the maidens of paradise, of whom each man may marry as many as he pleases. All others will be consigned to the flames of hell.

Gabriel is considered to be the messenger of Allah and the Koran is the *magnum opus* of his ministry through Muhammad. The result is a book about four-fifths the length of the New Testament and is divided into 114 chapters. A portion of the Koran was written by the prophet and the rest was based on his oral teachings which were written from the memory of his disciples years after his death. Yet all of it is believed to be the divinely revealed word of Allah and is the only rule for faith and duty for people everywhere.

What shall we conclude regarding the prominent role that the angel Gabriel plays in Islamic theology? First, the Gabriel of the Koran is not the same spirit-being of the Bible. Identical names do not mean identical personages. Obviously, Muhammad knew the name of the biblical Gabriel and therefore applied it to the counterfeit angel for a more ready acceptance by his disciples. Secondly, the content of the Muslim angel's revelation stands in sharp contrast to the revelations of the Bible and cannot be reconciled or harmonized with the Bible.

For example: Muslims do not believe that Jesus was crucified, or that He arose from the dead. Therefore, He cannot be the "Son of God." They believe that Jesus was a sinless prophet who has been superseded by Muhammad. These are major theological errors and can certainly be classified as "things taught by demons" (1 Timothy 4:1). Therefore, we judge the Muslim angel Gabriel to be a counterfeit angel—one of many who need exposure and rejection. Ephesians 5:11 admonishes us to "*have nothing to do with the fruitless deeds of darkness, but rather expose them.*" That is the scriptural basis for judging these evil angels now.

BIBLICAL ANGELS

The Existence of Angels

According to the Bible the world of angels was created in eternity past by the Lord Jesus: "*For by him all things were created: things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones, or powers, or authorities, all things were created by him and for him*" (Colossians 1:16). Angels are spirit-beings of the highest order under Christ and are subject to Him (Matthew 26:53). Their numbers are beyond human comprehension and computation (Psalm 68:17, Daniel 7:10, Hebrews 12:22, Revelation 5:11). The 273 references to angels in the Bible provides the only source of truthful information regarding these amazing creatures, who, apart from supernatural appearances, are not normally permitted to come into the sphere of human experience. Hence they are usually unseen.

The Classification of Angels

Angels are also classified as being “holy” (Jude 14), or “evil” (Ephesians 6:12), and this raises a very natural question: Which of these two categories is Paul referring to—holy angels or evil angels? It will be observed that nothing in the words or context provides a clue to our understanding. The fact that Paul does not further define these angels would lead us to normally conclude that he is speaking of holy angels. The judgment referred to then would be based upon the individual angel’s faithfulness in service to believers as “guardians” (Psalm 91:11-12 and as “ministering spirits” (Hebrews 1:14), and they would be rewarded accordingly.

There was a time when there were only holy angels. In the dateless past, Satan, once called “Lucifer, the Morning Star” revolted against God (Isaiah 14:12-14). He forsook his exalted position and title to become the “prince of this world system” (John 12:31). In his rebellion, he led literally billions of the heavenly host astray (Revelation 12:4) and these rebels are called “the devil’s angels” in Matthew 25:41. It is obvious that Satan and all of his angels were created as free moral beings with the ability to choose right from wrong, just as humans can (see also L.S. Chafer, “Systematic Theology,” Vol.2, P.8). These angels held their destiny within the power of their own choice. Once their decision was made to rebel against God, the consequence was irrevocable. It sealed their doom forever (Matthew 25:41).

The Works of Evil Angels

A vast majority of Satan’s angels are demons who duplicate the evil works of their leader by their attempts to counterfeit and destroy God’s work (2 Thessalonians 2:9-10). These wicked angels know that their days are numbered and that divine judgment awaits them in the Lake of Fire (Revelation 8:29, Luke 8:31). In the meantime, the Devil and his cohorts are busy deceiving the nations (Revelation 20:8); blinding the minds of unbelievers (2 Corinthians 4:4); snatching the word of God from the hearts of people (Matthew 13:19); inspiring all lies and false doctrine (John 8:44); and are the originators of all unbiblical religions (1 Corinthians 10:19-21).

The Future for Evil Angels

There is another sub-group from within the angelic world *“that did not keep their positions of authority, but abandoned their own home, — these God has kept in darkness, bound with everlasting chains of judgment on that great day”* (Jude 6). Peter adds: *“For God*

did not spare angels when they sinned, but sent them to hell” (Grk: “Tartarus”—the prison house for demons), “*putting them in gloomy dungeons to be held for judgment*” (2 Peter 2:4).

In Genesis 6 and according to Old Testament terminology, these bound angels are the “sons of God” who did not keep their “positions of authority.” They cohabited with the “daughters of men,” which resulted in a race of giants (the “Nephilim” of Genesis 6:4-6). This illicit relationship was a basic cause for the world-wide flood of Noah’s day.

This is the only interpretation that satisfies the Greek Text of Jude 6-7, which links the sins of Sodom and Gomorrah “in the same way” with the immorality of these fallen angels. According to the Word of God, we know that Satan and his angels will be denied access to the heavenly realm in the middle of the coming Great Tribulation (Revelation 12:7-12). They will be confined to the Abyss during the millennial reign of Christ (Revelation 21:3, 7-8) and later released for a short time (Revelation 21:3). Finally, the Devil and all of his cohorts will be tormented forever in the Lake of Fire at the final judgment (Matthew 25:4, Revelation 20:10).

The role that believers will play in reference to the future judgment of angels is not clearly defined in Scripture. We would wish for more information regarding this fascinating subject. Paul’s point in citing the future judgments of angels is to challenge Christians everywhere that since they will have the responsibility to pass judgment on angels, they certainly are competent to “*judge trivial cases and the things of this life*” (1 Corinthians 6:3) Christians are therefore forbidden to go to court against another believer and that before unbelievers. This is a case where prophesied events have a direct bearing on temporal events now.

One thing we can be assured of—whenever this judgment of angels takes place, we believers will be prepared to participate in it as guided by the Lord, since whatever He commands, He also provides the wherewithal to do whatever He commands. There are some very interesting surprises that await the believer, one of which includes the judgment of angels.

All Scriptures are from the New International Version unless otherwise noted.

QUIZ:

FUTURE EXISTENCE

1. The destiny for non-believers according to the Jehovah's Witnesses and the Seventh Day Adventists is:
 - a. Eventual salvation through "second chance"
 - b. Conscious, eternal body torment
 - c. Everlasting sorrow and regret
 - d. Annihilation of being

2. Roman Catholics term the Intermediate State (between Heaven and Hell) as:
 - a. Investigative Judgment
 - b. Purgatory
 - c. Gehenna
 - d. Beatification

3. Germanic tribes envisioned a future:
 - a. Valhalla
 - b. Paradise regained
 - c. Land of Hope and Glory
 - d. Land of Sky Blue Waters

4. Muslim martyrs expect a future:
 - a. Harem with virgins
 - b. Celestial and terrestrial bliss
 - c. Land of milk and honey
 - d. Beulah Land

5. Buddhists anticipate a future cosmic bliss called:
 - a. Sea of Tranquility
 - b. Elysian Fields
 - c. Cloud Nine
 - d. Nirvana

6. Jesus told the story of Dives (rich man) and Lazarus in:
 - a. John 14
 - b. Matthew 24
 - c. Luke 16
 - d. Mark 5

7. The New Jerusalem in Revelation 21 is:
 ___ a. Hexagonal
 ___ b. Cubical
 ___ c. Rectangular
 ___ d. Conical
8. What biblical object typifies Heaven?
 ___ a. Mount Zion
 ___ b. Goshen
 ___ c. Noah's Ark
 ___ d. Plain of Megiddo
9. The best word to describe the raising of Lazarus is:
 ___ a. Transfiguration
 ___ b. Glorification
 ___ c. Resuscitation
 ___ d. Resurrection
10. Communication between the living and the dead is called:
 ___ a. Nepotism
 ___ b. Necromancy
 ___ c. Mesmerism
 ___ d. Supplication

Answers:

1. (d); 2. (b); 3. (a); 4. (a); 5. (a); 6. (d); 7. (c); 8. (b); 9. (a); 10. (b)

Personal Notes on the Articles:

Please feel free to email us at info@ras.org if you have any questions or comments.

SUBSCRIBERS

If your mailing label reads December 2010 and is Vol. 30, No. 4, your subscription expires with this issue. Please renew your subscription soon. Renewals cost \$10.00 per year in the U.S. Foreign subscriptions cost extra to cover the additional postage.

Come visit Religion Analysis Service on the World Wide Web!
 Our URL is: <http://www.ras.org> • Our e-mail address is: info@ras.org

RELIGION ANALYSIS SERVICE, INC.
1313 5th St. SE, Mail Unit 5
Minneapolis, MN 55414-4504

Address Service Requested

=====
Important – If your mailing label
reads December 2010, your subscrip-
tion has expired with this issue.
Please renew now!
=====

Non Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
Paid
Minneapolis, MN
Permit No. 795