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If there is no God, as the atheist claims, then how did life originate? Did it sponta- neously generate? Many concede that there’s just too much scientific evidence against abiogenesis for it to be palatable (see Miller, 2012). But if life did not cre- ate itself, it had to come from somewhere, and the atheist “cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door” (Lewontin, 1997, p. 31). So, where is the left Outer space? That is precisely what many in the evolutionary community are hoping for. Of course, this seeming solution is merely a mirage. Simply pushing the problem of abiogenesis off to another place in the Universe does not solve the problem. It is a tactic to forestall the inevitable, hoping that, since there is so much we do not know about the Universe, abiogenesis may be possible elsewhere. But in reality, the problem remains. There is no scientific evidence to substantiate the idea that the laws of the Universe would allow the formation of life from non-life. We must still await the development of a legitimate answer from the atheist: from whence came life?

SPACE FOSSILS?

Regardless of this attempt to divert attention from the problem of abiogenes- isis, there is a growing interest in the prospect that life could have originated from space. Recently, a NASA scientist, Richard Hoover, of the Marshall Space Flight Center in Alabama, authored an article in the Journal of Cosmology in which he cites evidence from microfossils—fossilized extraterrestrials—in a meteorite that hit France in the 1890s (Hoover, 2011). Michael Leminick, science writer for Time, said, “[M]aybe life first arose in outer space and came to earth fully formed. It’s an astonishing idea, not completely crazy” (Leminick, 2011). Skepticism abounds in the scientific community concerning Hoover’s dis- coveries, since claims of proof of extra- terrestrial life have always proven to be bogue (e.g., Taylor, 1997; Nagy, et al., 1963). Biologist, P.Z. Myers, of the University of Minnesota Morris, said regarding Hoover’s discovery, “This work is garbage. I am surprised anyone is grant- ing it any credibility at all…. I’m looking forward to the publication next year [in the journal of Cosmology—JM], of the discovery of an extraterrestrial rabit in a meteor” (as quoted in Leminick). Chief scientist in the science division at NASA, Paul Hertz, even said that Hoover’s article was rejected from publish- ment in a more established, peer- reviewed journal. Concerning Hoover’s article, he said, “While we value the free exchange of ideas, data, and information as part of scientific and technical inquiry, NASA cannot stand behind or support a claim unless it has been peer-reviewed or thoroughly examined by other qualified experts” (as quoted in “Alien Life in Meteorites: Remarkable Achievement or Garbage?” 2011).

ORGANIC MOLECULES FROM SPACE

This stance by NASA casts serious doubt on the validity of Hoover’s claims, and yet he is not alone in his theory about life originating from outer space, in spite of the lack of evidence to support it. So, the hope remains alive. Astronomers have recently found organic materials in meteorites (e.g., Nakamura-Messenger, et al., 2006), which some believe could be proof of previously undiscovered organisms in outer space and that “may have seeded the early Earth with the building blocks of life” (Jefes, 2006). Mike Zolensky, a NASA cosmic mineralogist, said, “If we suspect, this type of meteorite has been falling onto Earth throughout its entire history, then the Earth was seeded with these organic globules at the same time life was forming here” (as quoted in Jefes). Sun Kwok, the Dean of Science and Chair Professor of Physics at the University of Hong Kong, said, “If this is the case, life on Earth may have had an easier time getting started as these organic compounds can serve as the basic ingredients for life” (as quoted in Chow, 2001). Organic materials are generally defined as decayed materials which contain carbon (like life forms on Earth), presumably because the materials were once living. These materials, in turn, give rise to organic materials. Organic materials from space reaching Earth in no way means that the primary problem for atheists has been solved. The question of whether organic materials in a junkyard does not in any way imply that the blocks will be capable of arrang- ing themselves into a complex machine that will then come to life, start walking, and reproduce. But before the organic materials can be converted to life, a significant factor must be considered. Scientists who make the discovery, said, “While it may be too soon to determine whether these organic compounds played a role in kick-starting the development of life on Earth, it certainly is a possibility” (Chow, emp. added). One can speculate, conjecture, and engage in baseless hope all he wants, but the truth remains: organic materials do not do thing to help the evolutionist move from the scientific impossibility of jumping from non-life to life in nature.

A second problem is that terrestrial contamination of living bacterial material, scientists must consider in any studies involving extraterrestrial materials pass- ing through the Earth’s atmosphere and reaching the Earth. A “bubble-shape.” is a commonplace with scientific speculation, where life originating from outer space has been found in this meteorite from Mars, “We may be too soon to determine whether space could have been delivered organic com- pounds to life on Earth remains an open question” (“Astronomers Discover…,” 2011, emp. added). Toward the end of their article on the discovery, ScienceDaily.com noted that Kwok and colleague, Yong Zhang, also of the University of Hong Kong, the scientists who made the discovery, said, “Our work has shown that stars have no problem making complex organic compounds under near-vacuum condi- tions. Theoretically, this is impossible, but observationally we can see it happen” (as quoted in “Astronomers Discover…” ). Kwok further explained, “It is quite possible that the organic material in meteorites are remnants of star dust in the solar nebula. The star dust [was] ejected by nearby planetary nebula[s] and survived the journey across the galaxy” (as quoted in Chow, emp. added).

Space.com explains, “[s]uch chemical complexity was thought to arise only from living organisms, but the results of the new study show that these organic compounds can be created in space even when no life forms are present. In fact, such complex organic could be produced naturally by stars, and at an extremely rapid pace (Chow, emp. added).”

ScienceDaily adds, “Most interestingly, this organic star dust is similar in structure to complex organic compounds found in meteorites (“Astronomers Discover…” , emp. added). In response to his co-discovery, Kwok said, “Nature is much more clever than we had imagined” (as quoted in Chow). So, these organic materials that are apparently found “everywhere in our own galaxy and in other galaxies” (Chow), which coat meteorites that collide with Earth, are not proof of life in outer space at all, since stars form from non-living entities—can give rise to organic materials.

FLAWED EVOLUTIONARY DATING TECHNIQUES

Instead of continuing to trust blindly in the assumption of abiogenesis, which has thrust naturalistic scientists into
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space to try to find hope for their failed theory. While it is distressing to note that recent findings have validated a more reasonable view, this new discovery adds more weight to the dangers inherent in organic dating techniques, like radiocarbon dating, since such techniques rely on the fundamental assumption that organic materials are produced through the decay of bio-materials (i.e., materials which were once living). If, as this latest discovery suggests, organic materials can come about through other processes, caution should be taken in relying heavily on modern dating techniques for dating anything thought to be very old. The Creation model contends that such dating techniques are useless when used to date extremely old materials (i.e., materials older than a few hundred years), because those techniques assume a constant (slow) rate of decay and no contamination from outside sources. This latest discovery supports that contention.

Another fascinating and telling implication from this discovery regards the formation of coal and petroleum, which are thought to be produced naturally by organics under seemingly unfavorable conditions (i.e., the specific principles necessary to sustaining life). The rapid production of organic materials by stars is evidence that viewing geological phenomena through the lens of catastrophism is a much more reasonable approach than uniformitarianism at interpreting geological processes.

CONCLUSION

Bottom line: atheistic evaluation is not a plausible model for interpreting scientific data. No plausible scientific method has been developed to substantiate the idea that the Universe is extremely old. Uniformitarian principles fall short in their attempt to date the Earth, unlike catastrophism—a model which is supported by the Bible. Life does not come from non-life in nature. Organic compounds from outer space cannot solve the problem since the problem of abiogenesis remains. The search for the existence of aliens in order to explain the origin of life is unnecessary, since there is abundant evidence which supports the truth that there is a God who created the heavens, the Earth, and everything in them in six days (Exodus 2011). Trust the Bible. It’s always right.
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In light of President Obama’s recent endorse -ment of homosexual marriage, Apologetics Press would simply like to remind Christians and America at large that what God says to any subject, on any and every evil, including the sin of homosexuality, is the only thing that ultimately matters (John 12:48). God, not man (Jeremiah 10:23), determines what is right and what is wrong.

God demands that “love be genuine,” as we “[a]bhor what is evil” and “hold fast to what is good” (Romans 12:9, emp. added). Regarding the ungodly who suppress the truth, Paul wrote:

Claiming to be wise, they became fools... Therefore God gave them up to the passions of their hearts to impurity, to the dishonor -ing of their bodies among themselves... God gave them up to dishonorable passions. For what they exchanged natural relations for those that are contrary to nature; and the men likewise gave up natural relations with women and were consumed with passion for one another, men committing shameless acts with men and receiving in them -selves the due penalty for their error. And since they did not see fit to acknowledge God, God gave them up to a debauchery with their own passions, what ought not to be done. They were filled with all manner of unrighteousness, evil (Romans 1:22-26,24-26, ESV, emp. added).

Woe to those who call evil good and good evil” (Isaiah 5:20).

Eric Lyons
Children are naturally inquisitive. They want to know how birds fly, why grass is green, what makes snow cold, and a host of other things. While many of their questions deal with trivial matters, children often ask some of the most profound, important questions in the world. One such question is, “How do we know God is real?” It is the responsibility of every Christian adult to be prepared to respond to that question with a clear and simple answer that will instill confidence and faith in the young inquisitor. Written on a 3rd-6th grade level, How do You Know God is Real? explores simple reasons why we can know that God exists. It will satisfy children’s curiosity and equip them to be able to defend their personal belief in God.
In Forged, Ehrman discusses the subject of pseudepigraphy—the writing of books under false names—in the first few centuries of the early church. Although he has addressed the issue in previous books, this is his most extended discussion of the topic. According to Ehrman, there were two different types of pseudepigraphical books included in the New Testament. First, some books were supposedly published anonymously but later had authors’ names attached to them, such as the Gospels (although this could not have been possible, since the early church was virtually unanimous on the authorship). If they had been published anonymously, there would be no end to the debate. Second, some were forged in the names of other authors, usually biblical figures of considerable significance. This practice abounded in the early centuries of the church. Examples include the Gospel of Peter (in the Gospel of Thomas), as well as numerous other gospels, apocalypses, and epistles. The second category is where Ehrman places six of Paul’s epistles.

Determining the authorship of any particular work is an oft-debated topic among scholars, given the fact that an author’s language may be influenced by a number of factors. While some scholars were incredibly skeptical of the Pauline authorship of several of the apostles’ letters, other scholars have undertaken some level of self-correction. Concerning Ehrman’s assertions that the majority of scholars deny the Pauline authorship of nearly half of Paul’s epistles, professor of New Testament for Doctoral level study at Wycliffe College, and author of several books on New Testament authorship, Bart Ehrman has long been critical of Ehrman’s refusal to interact with scholars with whom he disagrees. This is especially true in the case of scholarly treatments of what Ehrman believes they went about practicing their craft. Forged includes a discussion of the production of ancient documents, but Witherington notes that Ehrman seems to have given little thought to the role and duties of scribes in the ancient world. In other words, Ehrman does not spend time with texts, but not with how they were produced or by whom.

He explains: I need to say from the outset and on first glance that there appears to be a rather large lacuna in the argument of this book, namely the failure to do some basic work in the realm of ancient scribal practices and the roles of scribes in producing ancient documents. For example, see my discussion elsewhere in this book with the landmark study of Karel van der Toorn, Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible, in which it is demonstrated at length that scribes played a huge role in collecting, editing, and producing ancient documents, and that it was indeed a regular practice to name scribes as contributing to the tradition, or the first or a major contributor to the tradition (2011, italics in orig.).

As always, Ehrman presents his findings as the “result of a scholarly” implying that real scholarship—whatever or whatever that might be—is agree with him. In reality, numerous scholars dis-agree with—not to mention the fact that the majority of his conclusions are in serious conflict with the views of other scholars. He consistently claims that his view is that of the majority, although they don’t have to hear anything that he says. A typical example of this is proven himself no exception. In an interview on the “Kirkus Reviews” Web site, Ehrman says: The only people who take offense so far as I can tell off-the-wall views like this kind of historical scholarship is blasphemy. My response to such people is that they need to look not only at the results of Ehrman’s scholarship (as he has presented in my book) but also at the evidence that makes these results convincing to scholars of all sorts of persuasions. Christians and non-Christian alike. The evidence that supports my claims in Forged is extremely compelling to most people who examine it (Pike, 2011, emp. in orig).
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Determining the authorship of any particular work is an oft-debated topic among scholars, given the fact that an author’s language may be influenced by a number of factors. While some scholars were incredibly skeptical of the Pauline authorship of several of the apostles’ letters, other scholars have undertaken some level of self-correction. Concerning Ehrman’s assertions that the majority of scholars deny the Pauline authorship of nearly half of Paul’s epistles, professor of New Testament for Doctoral level study at Wycliffe College, and author of several books on New Testament authorship, Bart Ehrman has long been critical of Ehrman’s refusal to interact with scholars with whom he disagrees. This is especially true in the case of scholarly treatments of what Ehrman believes they went about practicing their craft. Forged includes a discussion of the production of ancient documents, but Witherington notes that Ehrman seems to have given little thought to the role and duties of scribes in the ancient world. In other words, Ehrman does not spend time with texts, but not with how they were produced or by whom.

He explains: I need to say from the outset and on first glance that there appears to be a rather large lacuna in the argument of this book, namely the failure to do some basic work in the realm of ancient scribal practices and the roles of scribes in producing ancient documents. For example, see my discussion elsewhere in this book with the landmark study of Karel van der Toorn, Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible, in which it is demonstrated at length that scribes played a huge role in collecting, editing, and producing ancient documents, and that it was indeed a regular practice to name scribes as contributing to the tradition, or the first or a major contributor to the tradition (2011, italics in orig.).

As always, Ehrman presents his findings as the “result of a scholarly” implying that real scholarship—whatever or whatever that might be—is agree with him. In reality, numerous scholars dis-agree with—not to mention the fact that the majority of his conclusions are in serious conflict with the views of other scholars. He consistently claims that his view is that of the majority, although they don’t have to hear anything that he says. A typical example of this is proven himself no exception. In an interview on the “Kirkus Reviews” Web site, Ehrman says: The only people who take offense so far as I can tell off-the-wall views like this kind of historical scholarship is blasphemy. My response to such people is that they need to look not only at the results of Ehrman’s scholarship (as he has presented in my book) but also at the evidence that makes these results convincing to scholars of all sorts of persuasions. Christians and non-Christian alike. The evidence that supports my claims in Forged is extremely compelling to most people who examine it (Pike, 2011, emp. in orig).
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As always, Ehrman presents his findings as the “result of a scholarly” implying that real scholarship—whatever or whatever that might be—is agree with him. In reality, numerous scholars dis-agree with—not to mention the fact that the majority of his conclusions are in serious conflict with the views of other scholars. He consistently claims that his view is that of the majority, although they don’t have to hear anything that he says. A typical example of this is proven himself no exception. In an interview on the “Kirkus Reviews” Web site, Ehrman says: The only people who take offense so far as I can tell off-the-wall views like this kind of historical scholarship is blasphemy. My response to such people is that they need to look not only at the results of Ehrman’s scholarship (as he has presented in my book) but also at the evidence that makes these results convincing to scholars of all sorts of persuasions. Christians and non-Christian alike. The evidence that supports my claims in Forged is extremely compelling to most people who examine it (Pike, 2011, emp. in orig).
Christian scholars are dishonest, if not duplicitous, and have engineered a conspiracy to keep the populace from learning the truth. Conspiracy theories like this have no place in any serious discussion of these issues.

The Critics Aren’t Always Correct

On-line reviews of Ehrman’s work seem to fall into one of two main categories: (1) New Testament scholars who have critiqued Ehrman’s work and point out that his blogs and articles address ways in which Ehrman’s work makes grand claims supported by surprisingly little evidence, shows almost no interaction with other viewpoints, and, perhaps most importantly, continues to trot out the same tired arguments even though they have been answered by New Testament scholars in sources ranging from published books to articles and blogs on the Internet. One of the strong points of Ehrman’s work is that he is a fine storyteller. For a respected academic, it is too bad that he has sullied his own reputation by offering materials that look less like truth and more like tall tales.
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As a final word, I would like to thank all who have contributed to this discussion. Your insights and arguments have been invaluable in helping me to arrive at the conclusions that I have reached. I hope that this has been a constructive and respectful exchange, and I welcome any further comments or questions that you may have.

Marriage Defined

Dave Miller, Ph.D.

What constitutes the standard of good morals? Is it not Christian- ity? There certainly is none other. Say that cannot be appealed to and what would be good morals? The day of moral virtue in which we live would, in an instant, if that standard were abolished, lapse into the dark and murky night of pagan immorality (City Council of Charleston, 1879, emp. added).

Practitioners of unscriptural doctrine, homosexuality, and other sin- ner behaviors are slowly but surely eroding and dissolving the moral foundations of American civilization—what the Court called “the sure foundation of all that is stable and noble in our civilization.” Will America awaken from this spiritual stupor? Will Christians rise up and react in time? The time has come for those who still maintain these truths to re- cognize that we are in a full-scale, unmis- takable war—a culture war—a spiritual war of seismic proportions against the governmental authorities and cultural forces that now are openly hostile toward God, Christ, and the Bible. May we take heart and commit ourselves to this criti- cal struggle, as we consider the words of God through Paul:

Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might. Put on the whole armor of God, that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we do not wrestle against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this age, against spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places. Therefore take up the whole armor of God, that you may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand firm (Ephesians 6:10-13, emp. added).
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New Book for Young People on God’s Existence

The assault on the integrity of the Scriptures in the last half century demands a proactive approach by Christians in an effort to protect and rescue the minds of our youth as they are regularly subjected to challenges to their faith. Hence, 10 years ago, Apologetics Press released a monumental volume that was designed to answer a very critical question often posed by young people: “How do we know the Bible is from God?”

But further, what child—growing up in a home where God is revered and His Word is respected—has not also asked the question: “Mom (or dad), how do you know God exists?” It’s an equally valid question that deserves an equally valid answer. But what should be a parent’s (or teacher’s) response? If we really believe what the Bible says—that each Christian must “be ready to give a defense to everyone who asks you a reason for the hope that is in you…” (1 Peter 3:15)—then we should be able to sit down with a child and provide an answer that is based solidly on the available evidence. It will not do to say simply, “Well, dear, we just ‘know’ in our heart that God exists,” or “Well, we’ve always been taught, and we’ve always believed, that God is real.” Those are not adequate answers for a young, inquiring mind. We must do better. Every single child who asks the question deserves better!

With that realization in mind, we are extremely pleased to announce the release of the sequel to How do You Know the Bible is from God?—a book that was written to help parents and teachers “do better,” and to give each and every child the answer he or she deserves to such a vitally important question. Written on a 3rd-6th grade level, How do You Know God is Real? explores simple reasons why we can know that God exists. It will satisfy children’s curiosity and equip them to be able to defend their personal belief in God.

In its 13 chapters covering 68 pages, How do You Know God is Real? examines such topics as “the first cause,” “our unique Universe,” “amazing animals,” “design in the human body,” “evil, pain, and suffering,” and much more. The last chapter of the book brings the reader to the all-important consideration: “What does God mean to me?” In addition, the book is filled with gorgeous photographs, illustrative diagrams, youngster-oriented clip-art, and intriguing images. Children will be thrilled with the undeniable proof that God is real.

Priced far below market value, why not order several copies to give to a child, grandchild, nephew, niece, or neighborhood friend? Call us toll free at (800) 234-8558 to order with a credit card, order off our Web site (www.ApologeticsPress.org), or order by mail. A child will thank you—both now, and in the years to come.

Dave Miller