

The Place of Reason in Defending the Christian Faith

**– with ministry ideas regarding
creation/evolution**

Mark Bergemann

published February 2012 by the

Lutheran Science Institute

4130 Harvest Lane, Racine, Wisconsin 53402-9562

www.LutheranScience.org

to appear in the

LSI Journal

in 2012

The mission of the Lutheran Science Institute is to learn, share and promote the glory of God as revealed in his holy Word and demonstrated in his created world, beginning with the pastors, teachers and laity of the WELS (Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod) and the ELS (Evangelical Lutheran Synod).

Contents

3	Introduction
4	Part 1 – What the Bible Teaches about Reason
4	Reason as Friend and Foe
4	Child-like Faith
4	Understanding Scripture
5	Reason as Judge
6	Reason as Defender
7	Warnings About “Proving” Doctrine
7	Scripture Defends Scripture
8	Use of Reason in Ministry to Christians
8	Use of Reason in Witnessing to Unbelievers
11	Part 2 – Scriptural Examples of Arguments from Reason
15	Part 3 – Skeptics Exposed to the Gospel
16	Changes in a Friend or Spouse
16	Attempts to Prove the Bible Wrong
17	Atheistic Evolutionist ... to the Theist ... to the Christian
19	Part 4 – Ministry Considerations Regarding Creation
20	Evolution Attacks the Gospel
20	Beyond Genesis 1–11
21	Theistic Evolution
22	Bible History
22	Bible Certainty and Changing Science
23	False Claims
24	Straw Men
25	Evolution – Its Effect on Our Thinking
25	Evolution – A Belief that There is No Creator God
25	Scientific Problems For Evolution
26	Invalid Arguments for Creation
26	Discussing Evolution with Unbelievers
27	Appendix – Examples of Creation Arguments by WELS Authors
29	Bibliography

Introduction

“Faith comes from hearing the message, and the message is heard through the word of Christ” (Romans 10:17)¹. Scripture is clear that people come to faith only through the Gospel in Word and Sacrament, and that unbelievers cannot understand spiritual matters.²

As confessional Lutherans we profess: “I believe that by my own reason or strength I cannot believe in Jesus Christ, my Lord, or come to him. But the Holy Spirit has called me through the Gospel, enlightened me with his gifts, and sanctified and preserved me in true faith.”³

What then, is the proper place of reason in defending the Christian faith? What are proper and improper ways to defend the faith? Is there benefit in telling a Christian about the scientific problems with evolution? Is there benefit in telling an unbeliever about the scientific problems with evolution?

This treatise addresses these questions from Scripture (the sole source of all true doctrine), shows supporting quotations from confessional Lutheran authors, looks at biblical examples where Jesus and his apostles used arguments from reason, and considers various ministry applications.

Part 1 – What the Bible Teaches about Reason

Reason as Friend and Foe

Martin Luther described the two faces of human reason with opposing descriptions. He saw reason as a paradox, and rightly so. Reason is a wonderful gift of God and a blessing in understanding Scripture. Reason is also a spiritual enemy that attempts to destroy our faith. Siegbert Becker writes:

¹ All Scripture quotations in this paper are taken from the Holy Bible, New International Version (NIV), © 1973, 1978, 1984 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of Biblica, Inc. All rights reserved worldwide.

² Cf. 1 Corinthians 1:21: “For since in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom did not know him, God was pleased through the foolishness of what was preached to save those who believe.” Cf. also 1 Corinthians 2:14: “The man without the Spirit does not accept the things that come from the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him, and he cannot understand them, because they are spiritually discerned.” Also, cf. Romans 10:17: “Faith comes from hearing the message, and the message is heard through the word of Christ.”

³ Martin Luther, “The Small Catechism,” in *The Book Of Concord – Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, trans. Theodore G. Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), 345. This quotation is part of Luther’s explanation of the 3rd article of the Apostolic Creed.

Reason is a big red murderess, the devil's bride, a damned whore, a blind guide, the enemy of faith, the greatest and most invincible enemy of God. Reason is God's greatest and most important gift to man, of inestimable beauty and excellence, a glorious gift, a most useful servant in theology, something divine. In terms like these Martin Luther gave his estimate of human reason.⁴

Child-like Faith

Jesus said "... unless you change and become like little children, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew 18:1-4). A little child is an excellent example of humble faith. As we grow older, our limited and sin damaged human reason attacks our faith and questions God. Can anyone understand the triune nature of God, or how Jesus can be both fully human and fully God? God asks that we humbly accept such teachings as true.

In its sinful state, human reason even questions the Gospel message that Jesus died to pay the penalty for our rebellion against God. In 1 Corinthians 1:18-25 we read: "The message of the cross is foolishness to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God." In Proverbs 3:5: "Trust in the LORD with all your heart and lean not on your own understanding." In Matthew 11:25: "At that time Jesus said, 'I praise you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because you have hidden these things from the wise and learned, and revealed them to little children.'" We as children of our Heavenly Father pray: "Lord, lead us to be like little children with humble trust in you alone. Amen."

Understanding Scripture

Human reason is used to understand what God tells us in the Bible. Reason enables us to study the Bible and to compare various Scripture passages. Scripture takes this as a given. Reason and language are tools God has chosen through which he gives his truth. But reason does have limits. It cannot lead us to believe spiritual truth.

Paul *reasoned* from the Scriptures, *explaining (demonstrating, opening)* and proving that the Christ had to suffer and rise again:

As his custom was, Paul went into the synagogue, and on three Sabbath days he reasoned with them from the Scriptures, explaining and proving that the Christ had to suffer and rise from the dead. "This Jesus I am proclaiming to you is the Christ," he said (Acts 17:2-3).

On the road to Emmaus Jesus *explained (interpreted, translated)* the Scriptures to his disciples: "Did not the Christ have to suffer these things and then enter his glory?" And beginning with Moses and all the Prophets, he explained to them what was said in all the Scriptures concerning himself (Luke 24:26-27). August Pieper writes:

Now God enters into dealings with rational man also through his reason. ... As an external means for this God has made use of human language, through which men as rational creatures chiefly share their thinking, feeling, and wanting. God could have done it otherwise; but it pleased him to make himself understood by men through human language. God has made just that Word the vehicle of his revelation of his thoughts of salvation. ... Thus God wants to be understood with our reason, with our understanding and soul, intellectually

⁴ Siegbert W. Becker, *The Foolishness of God – The Place of Reason in the Theology of Martin Luther* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1982), 1.

comprehended by us, humanly perceived according to our reason. We are to use our human reason in order to know the gospel of our salvation.⁵ ... Human reason is the external vessel into which God poured his truth clothed in human speech and brings it to our consciousness.⁶

And Lyle Lange concurs: “Reason can be used to study God’s Word, think about it, treasure it, share it with others, and arrange the truths of Scripture in an orderly way to present them to others.”⁷

Reason as Judge

Reason should never be used to sit in judgment over the Scriptures, nor to invent doctrine. Our human reason must submit to the Word of God (the Scriptures) and be an obedient captive to Jesus Christ. As St. Paul states in 2 Corinthians 10:5, “We demolish arguments and every pretension that sets itself up against the knowledge of God, and we take captive every thought to make it obedient to Christ.” August Pieper says:

God’s Word requires absolute imprisonment of the reason as judge of divine secrets under the obedience of Christ. Nowhere in Scripture are we permitted or commanded to sit in judgement on the truth or possibility of a statement of God. We are to hear, learn, receive, believe, adore, and praise what God says, but we are not to test its truth and possibility, because our reason, even in its least principles, is not the measure of God’s reason, and because we lack any measure of the laws of his thinking, since he has not revealed them.⁸

We must not go beyond what Scripture reveals about the hidden and secret things of God. Using reason to explain God’s ways apart from or beyond Scripture easily leads to false teaching. St. Paul asks in Romans 9:20-21:

Who are you, a human being, to talk back to God? Shall what is formed say to the one who formed it, “Why did you make me like this?” Does not the potter have the right to make out of the same lump of clay some pottery for special purposes and some for common use?

And Siegbert Becker expands on St. Paul’s point:

When someone asks why God deals as he does with men, it is really an attempt on the part of reason to tutor God. This questioning springs from a failure to understand and to recognize his sovereign Lordship. If God will have it so, it must be so, and it is right that it should be so. Beyond this assertion we are not to go. God is limited by nothing, and there are no laws to which he must conform, nor rules that he must obey. No one should expect him to regulate his actions by the laws we lay down for him. ... The law, which says that sin must be punished, is not a law that God must obey, but it is a law which God has given. It is a law that expresses the will of God, that tells us what God wants to do and what he will do. God must punish sin only because he cannot be a liar or unjust – in other words, because he

⁵ August Pieper, “Scripture and Reason,” *The Wauwatosa Theology*, trans. James Langebartels (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1997), 1:157.

⁶ A. Pieper, 159.

⁷ Lyle W. Lange, *God So Loved the World – A Study of Christian Doctrine* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2005), 15.

⁸ A. Pieper, 160-161.

is God. We also ought to be on our guard against all attempts to explain the ways of God to men. If the Lord himself has not revealed the explanation or the reason for this action in the Word, we must take off our hats and stand in awe before his majestic excellence. These are his secrets and his incomprehensible judgments. ... If men ask us, for example, why God created Adam in such a way that he could be tempted by the devil and led astray, we can only reply that he is God and that his will has no rules or regulations according to which it must act.⁹

Reason as Defender

Reason is completely inadequate when used to defend the Christian faith. Nowhere does Scripture ascribe such power to reason. To the contrary, God tells us in 1 Corinthians that the words of human wisdom are empty of power, that the unbeliever cannot know God or understand spiritual matters, that the wisdom of this world, human wisdom, finds God and his plan of salvation to be foolishness.

Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the Gospel — not with words of human wisdom, lest the cross of Christ be emptied of its power. For the message of the cross is foolishness to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God. For it is written: “I will destroy the wisdom of the wise; the intelligence of the intelligent I will frustrate.” Where is the wise man? Where is the scholar? Where is the philosopher of this age? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world? For since in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom did not know him, God was pleased through the foolishness of what was preached to save those who believe. Jews demand miraculous signs and Greeks look for wisdom, but we preach Christ crucified: a stumbling block to Jews and foolishness to Gentiles, but to those whom God has called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. For the foolishness of God is wiser than man’s wisdom, and the weakness of God is stronger than man’s strength (1:17-25).

The Apostle emphasizes this same point in the next chapter of the same letter:

My message and my preaching were not with wise and persuasive words, but with a demonstration of the Spirit’s power, so that your faith might not rest on men’s wisdom, but on God’s power. ... The man without the Spirit does not accept the things that come from the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him, and he cannot understand them, because they are spiritually discerned (2:4-5,14).

Richard Balge writes: “We must always remember that repentance and remission of sins are to be proclaimed, not argued. It is not our C. S. Lewis, John W. Montgomery, Francis Schaeffer clever evidences that convict. Only the dynamic of the Happy Message can do that.”¹⁰

Siegbert Becker declares that “The Christian faith is not to be defended by rational argumentation.”¹¹ And Francis Pieper makes the same point:

⁹ Becker, 149-150.

¹⁰ Richard D. Balge, “Preaching Repentance And Remission Of Sins – With Application To Personal Witnessing,” *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 75:2 (April 1978), 106.

¹¹ Becker, 238.

The arguments supplied by the science of apologetics – and there is a great wealth of them – cannot change the human heart, cannot produce an inner acceptance of the Gospel.¹² ... We must always bear in mind that the self-attestation of Scripture as the Word of God is entirely independent of all rational arguments and of all human witness, whether coming from individuals or from the ‘church.’¹³

Warnings About “Proving” Doctrine

Rational arguments should never be used in an attempt to prove any article of faith, such as creation. The power to turn hearts and minds to God and his teachings is found only in the Gospel as found in Word and Sacrament.¹⁴ David Vallesky says:

The evangelist needs to be aware that many, probably most, of the people he encounters will have drunk deeply from the poisoned well of evolutionary thought, since they are likely to be products of an educational system that assumes the theory of evolution to be a fact. ... The solution to this problem, it might appear, would be for the evangelist to prove to a person that evolution is false and the Bible’s teaching about creation is true. There is a difficulty here, however. The doctrine of creation is an article of faith. It is not scientifically verifiable. One can present good, logical arguments against evolution and likewise good, logical arguments for the doctrine of creation as recorded in Genesis 1 and 2. They remain just that, however – logical arguments, but not scientific proof.¹⁵

Scripture Defends Scripture

Scripture is the very Word of God and as such is self-authenticating. Scripture itself is the best defense of Scripture and the best defense of our faith. In 2 Timothy 3:15-16 we read: “and how from infancy you have known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make you wise for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is God-breathed and is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness.” While in the desert, Jesus used Scripture three times in his apologetic with Satan: “It is written.” (Matthew 4:1-11 and Luke 4:1-13). Siegbert Becker writes:

The best defense of Scripture is Scripture itself. When man asks for proof of the truth of Christian doctrines, we are simply to quote the Bible passages which teach these doctrines.

¹² Francis Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics* trans. H. W. Romoser *et al.* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950), 1:65.

¹³ F. Pieper, 1:312.

¹⁴ Cf. 1 Corinthians 1:21: “For since in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom did not know him, God was pleased through the foolishness of what was preached to save those who believe.” Cf. also 1 Corinthians 2:14: “The man without the Spirit does not accept the things that come from the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him, and he cannot understand them, because they are spiritually discerned.” Cf. also Romans 10:17: “Faith comes from hearing the message, and the message is heard through the word of Christ.”

¹⁵ David J. Vallesky, *We Believe-Therefore We Speak, The Theology and Practice of Evangelism* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1995), 40. Vallesky uses the word “fact” with the common definition of “a known truth,” and not with the scientific definition of “a possible or likely explanation of observed phenomena.”

If men do not accept the doctrines of the Christian faith on the authority of the Bible, we are not even to desire their assent on other grounds. The Christian faith is not to be defended by rational argumentation.¹⁶

Use of Reason in Ministry to Christians

God has chosen to strengthen and grow our faith only through the Gospel in Word and sacrament. However, Scripture does show that arguments from reason can help believers better understand spiritual truths. In places like 1 Corinthians chapters 9 and 15, Paul uses arguments from reason when addressing believers. (See “Part 2 – Scriptural Examples of Arguments from Reason.”) Reason can also be used to help believers see the logical inconsistencies that are often apparent in unbelief. Francis Pieper writes:

Such rational arguments serve to show how frivolous are the judgments of unbelief against the divinity of Scripture. These arguments may be used to good advantage also in the case of Christians who are afflicted with doubts as to the divine character of Scripture. These doubts arise from the unbelieving flesh of the Christians, and through these rational arguments the flesh of the Christians is outwardly checked and subdued.¹⁷

Siegbert Becker speaks about Martin Luther’s use of reason:

While Luther believed it was ridiculous and downright blasphemous to presume to defend Scripture with rational argumentation, yet he also believed it was perfectly proper to point out the logical weakness in the attacks made on Scripture whenever the opportunity to do so presented itself.¹⁸

Armin Schuetze writes:

Let’s sum up how we [Christians] can equip ourselves in our struggle against this subtle danger [of evolution]. ... We will train ourselves to distinguish between scientific *facts* and mere *possible explanations* of observed phenomena. ... We will not permit ourselves to become blind to the inconsistencies in evolutionism, to its contradictions of some scientific laws, to its broad conclusions often based on a minimal of evidence.¹⁹

Use of Reason in Witnessing to Unbelievers

The power to turn hearts and minds to God and his teaching is solely in the Gospel as found in Word and Sacraments.²⁰ The Gospel message provides the only medicine for

¹⁶ Becker, 238.

¹⁷ F. Pieper, 311.

¹⁸ Becker, 176.

¹⁹ Armin Schuetze, “The Dangers of Evolution and How to Meet Them,” *Truth Unchanging – Is Evolutionism The Answer?*, ed. Werner H. Franzmann (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1967), 83. Italics are in the original source.

²⁰ Cf. 1 Corinthians 1:21: “Since in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom did not know him, God was pleased through the foolishness of what was preached to save those who believe.” Cf. also 1 Corinthians 2:14: “The man without the Spirit does not accept the things that come from the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him, and he cannot understand them, because they are spiritually discerned.” Cf.

a soul who, through the law, sees its own lost condition. Arguments from reason do not in any way increase the effectiveness of the Gospel in bringing souls to faith.

Even so, Jesus repeatedly used arguments from reason to silence unbelieving religious leaders who sought to trap him with questions. Peter and Paul preceded their Gospel message with arguments from reason. (See “Part 2 –Scriptural Examples of Arguments from Reason.”)

Rational arguments in and of themselves are worthless in witnessing to unbelievers, but are of worth if they provide a point of contact with the unbeliever, giving opportunity to share the Gospel message. Reason may be useful in silencing certain objections to the validity of Scripture, but reason and non-biblical evidence at best provide a short introduction or a point of contact. Presentation of Law and Gospel should not be delayed. According to Adolf Hoenecke:

As reason serves as an instrument for appropriating the truths to be believed, so it can serve further in a helpful manner with its ability in refuting errors and proving doctrines. ... One great service that reason can render in the area of refutation is that it can make the irrationality and untenability of the opposing claim evident. We see the Lord himself using reasonable arguments in refuting his adversaries (Luke 11:17-18).²¹

Siegbert Becker agrees:

The Christian faith is not to be defended by rational argumentation. But again, this does not mean that we are not to employ reason in the struggle with enemies of the faith. Every argument of reason can be overthrown with an argument from reason. We may use reason to show the unbeliever the untenableness of his position and the unwarranted nature of his conclusions.²²

David Vallesky holds the same opinion:

If one approaches the doctrine of inspiration before one brings the message of sin and grace, he can only do so on the basis of rational arguments, e.g., the extraordinary preservation of the biblical manuscripts, the remarkable fulfillment of prophesy, the striking effects the Scriptures have had on people over the ages, the way archeology continues to confirm the historical details of the Scriptures. Such rational arguments do have their place, especially if the person to whom one is speaking objects to hearing anything from the Bible because he has heard that the Bible has been changed so much over the years, that it has all kinds of errors and contradictory interpretations. The presentation of some rational arguments for the Bible’s trustworthiness may result in the person being willing to give its message a hearing. In the final analysis, though, inspiration can never be proved to an unbeliever. It is an article of faith.²³

also Romans 10:17: “Faith comes from hearing the message, and the message is heard through the word of Christ.”

²¹ Adolf Hoenecke, *Evangelical Lutheran Dogmatics*, trans. James Langebartels and Heinrich Vogel (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2009), 1:270-271.

²² Becker, 176.

²³ Vallesky, 31-32.

Richard Balge says that rational argumentation have their place, but that Law and Gospel are to be used differently: “There may be a place for apologetic in removing misconceptions and barriers to the faith. But we must always remember that repentance and remission of sins are to be proclaimed, not argued.”²⁴ Francis Pieper shares Balge’s sentiment:

Besides the Christian certainty (*fides divina*) of the divinity of Scripture, which is produced by the self-attestation of Scripture, there is also a purely human conviction (*fides humana*, or “scientific certainty”) of the divine authority of Scripture, which is based on arguments of reason. ... The arguments that call forth only a human faith (*fidem humanam*) would be underestimated if we declared them to be utterly worthless. Also Christ and his Apostles used them on occasion. [Here Pieper’s footnote comments on Matt. 22:29; 1 Cor. 15:34; Acts 2:15; Acts 17:28.] Such rational arguments serve to show how frivolous are the judgments of unbelief against the divinity of Scripture. ... Arguments of reason, historical arguments, etc., can be of service in the conversion of a person by inducing those outside the church to read or hear the Word of God itself and so come to faith in the Word by operation of the Holy Ghost through the Word. ... We must always bear in mind that the self-attestation of Scripture as the Word of God is entirely independent of all rational arguments and of all human witness, whether coming from individuals or from the ‘church.’²⁵

Michael Borgwardt also sees a legitimate apologetic purpose for using human reason to establish “points of contact” with one’s audience:

To show that Christianity is not unreasonable but rather beyond reason, we may well use reason itself as a point of contact without denying that the Spirit working through the means of grace is alone effective in producing faith and proving the truth of the gospel. Apologetics is not, in itself, an inappropriate use of reason. ... To some, it might seem ironic that the same apostle who insisted that “Faith comes from hearing the message, and the message is heard through the word of Christ” (Romans 10:17), did not hesitate to appeal to such non-biblical sources as history, nature, or the cultural experiences of his hearers in his attempts to establish points of contact with his audiences.²⁶

Roland Cap Ehlke warns us not to err either by depending on reasonable argumentation in order to convert the unbeliever, nor by rejecting all use of reasonable argumentation out of hand:

Apologetics – the defense of the Christian faith – is a difficult subject to treat. Most writers on the topic fall into one of two errors. Some apologists seem to think they can argue and reason people into Christianity. The Bible however, states that a saving faith in Jesus Christ is a supernatural gift from God the Holy Spirit. “No one can say, ‘Jesus is Lord,’ except by the Holy Spirit” (1 Corinthians 12:3). This gift comes as the Spirit uses the Bible to bring people to know and believe in Jesus. On the other hand, many Christians feel that any appeal to historical evidences and logical arguments is improper. They look at it as a denial

²⁴ Balge, 106.

²⁵ F. Pieper, 309-312.

²⁶ Michael J. Borgwardt, “The Apostle Paul As Apologist,” *Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary On-line Essay File* (November 16, 1993) <http://www.wlsessays.net/node/209> (accessed January 19, 2012).

of God's ability to convert. Yet, as Mr. Quist shows, the Bible itself makes frequent use of such appeals.²⁷

Part 2 – Scriptural Examples of Arguments from Reason

Jesus and his Apostles used reason and extra-biblical sources in their apologetic. In Lystra, the Apostle Paul addresses unbelievers who are unfamiliar with the Bible. Valleskey describes Paul's audience as "untutored pagans."²⁸ As an introduction, or point of contact, Paul appeals to their natural knowledge of god, first by talking about God our creator, and then by talking about God our preserver.²⁹ Paul's testimony was cut short by Jews from nearby cities who turned the crowd against Paul. Valleskey comments: "What we have here, then, is an approach to evangelism, preevangelism, if you will, which would have led, if the occasion had permitted, into the greater things the one true God had done for the Lystrans and all people."³⁰ Paul addressed the crowd at Lystra:

"Men, why are you doing this? We too are only men, human like you. We are bringing you good news, telling you to turn from these worthless things to the living God, who made heaven and earth and sea and everything in them. In the past, he let all nations go their own way. Yet he has not left himself without testimony: He has shown kindness by giving you rain from heaven and crops in their seasons; he provides you with plenty of food and fills your hearts with joy" (Acts 14:15-17).

Before the Athenian Areopagus, the Apostle Paul is again addressing unbelievers who are unfamiliar with the Bible. Just as in Lystra, Paul uses an introduction or point of contact. Paul appeals to the Athenians' natural knowledge of god, first by referring to their statue to the unknown god, and then by quoting from two Greek poets³¹:

Paul then stood up in the meeting of the Areopagus and said: "Men of Athens! I see that in every way you are very religious. For as I walked around and looked carefully at your objects of worship, I even found an altar with this inscription: TO AN UNKNOWN GOD. Now what you worship as something unknown I am going to proclaim to you. ... 'For in him we live and move and have our being.' As some of your own poets have said, 'We are his offspring' (Acts 17:22-23,28).

²⁷ Roland Cap Ehlke, in his preface to Allen Quist's *The Marks of the Nail: A Survey of the Evidence for Christianity* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1985), v.

²⁸ David J. Valleskey, *A Portrait of Paul – Making Disciples of All Nations* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2002), 75.

²⁹ Valleskey, 76.

³⁰ Valleskey, 76.

³¹ "The first quotation in verse 28 acknowledges that life is from God. It may be from the *Cretica* of the poet Epimenides (about 600 B.C.). The second quotation says essentially the same thing and appears twice in ancient Greek literature. The poet Aratus (315–240 B.C.) from Paul's homeland, Cilicia, wrote it in his *Phaenomena*. His contemporary Cleanthes (331–233 B.C.) included it in his *Hymn to Zeus*." Richard D. Balge, *Acts*, The People's Bible, 2nd ed. (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2001), 194.

When accused of being in alliance with Satan (as opposed to driving out demons by the power of God), Jesus used an argument from reason. Jesus used the apologetic technique of showing that if his critic's position were true, it would lead to a ridiculous situation. Unbelief is, in general, a logically inconsistent position.³² Most Pharisees were unbelievers, and therefore needed to hear Law and Gospel, yet under the circumstances Jesus chose to make an argument from reason. The Pharisees were very familiar with Scripture and believed it to be God's Word, but they rejected Jesus and God's plan of salvation:

But when the Pharisees heard this, they said, "It is only by Beelzebub, the prince of demons, that this fellow drives out demons." Jesus knew their thoughts and said to them, "Every kingdom divided against itself will be ruined, and every city or household divided against itself will not stand. If Satan drives out Satan, he is divided against himself. How then can his kingdom stand? And if I drive out demons by Beelzebub, by whom do your people drive them out? So then, they will be your judges. But if I drive out demons by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God has come upon you. Or again, how can anyone enter a strong man's house and carry off his possessions unless he first ties up the strong man? Then he can rob his house" (Matthew 12:24-29; parallel in Luke 11:14-26).

Jesus used reason to turn the tables on his unbelieving critics. If the chief priests and elders answered Jesus correctly, then they would be speaking against their own position, and if they answered in another way, they would turn the people against them.

Jesus entered the temple courts, and, while he was teaching, the chief priests and the elders of the people came to him. "By what authority are you doing these things?" they asked. "And who gave you this authority?" Jesus replied, "I will also ask you one question. If you answer me, I will tell you by what authority I am doing these things. John's baptism — where did it come from? Was it from heaven, or from men?" They discussed it among themselves and said, "If we say, 'From heaven,' he will ask, 'Then why didn't you believe him?' But if we say, 'From men' — we are afraid of the people, for they all hold that John was a prophet." So they answered Jesus, "We don't know." Then he said, "Neither will I tell you by what authority I am doing these things" (Matthew 21:23-27).

When some unbelieving Pharisees tried to trap him, Jesus answered with an argument from reason:

Then the Pharisees went out and laid plans to trap him in his words. They sent their disciples to him along with the Herodians. "Teacher," they said, "we know you are a man of integrity and that you teach the way of God in accordance with the truth. You aren't swayed by men, because you pay no attention to who they are. Tell us then, what is your opinion? Is it right to pay taxes to Caesar or not?" But Jesus, knowing their evil intent, said, "You hypocrites, why are you trying to trap me? Show me the coin used for paying the tax." They brought him a *denarius*, and he asked them, "Whose portrait is this? And whose inscription?" "Caesar's," they replied. Then he said to them, "Give to Caesar what is Caesar's, and

³² Psalm 14:1: "The fool says in his heart, 'There is no God.'" Unbelief, in general, is a logically inconsistent position. One example is relativism. Those who reject a law giver (God) believe that each individual or society decides what is right and what is wrong for themselves. Relativism in all its forms is a self-inconsistent position. If a relativist were to follow his beliefs consistently, he would be a sociopath, yet that is considered wrong by most relativists. By definition, a relativist cannot complain about evil, injustice, unfairness, or about others doing something that is not right. Most relativists still complain about these things because they hold a self-refuting and self-inconsistent position — relativism. Cf. Francis J. Beckwith and Gregory Loukl, *Relativism: Feet Firmly Planted Mid-Air* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998).

to God what is God's." When they heard this, they were amazed. So they left him and went away (Matthew 22:15-22).

He saw through their duplicity and said to them, "Show me a *denarius*. Whose portrait and inscription are on it?" "Caesar's," they replied. He said to them, "Then give to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's." They were unable to trap him in what he had said there in public. And astonished by his answer, they became silent (Luke 20:23-26).

In Matthew and Mark, Jesus uses an argument from reason with the Sadducees, who believed that only the five books of Moses are God's Word. The Sadducees were unbelievers who did not even accept that there is life after death. Jesus reasoned with them from the book of Genesis – an authoritative source which they could all accept: "About the resurrection of the dead – have you not read what God said to you, 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'? He is not the God of the dead but of the living" (Matthew 22:31-32; cf. also Mark 12:26-27).

Against the unbelieving Pharisees, Jesus used reasonable argumentation to prove that it is not a violation of the Third Commandment to perform miracles of healing on the Sabbath:

The Lord answered him, "You hypocrites! Doesn't each of you on the Sabbath untie his ox or donkey from the stall and lead it out to give it water? Then should not this woman, a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan has kept bound for eighteen long years, be set free on the Sabbath day from what bound her?" (Luke 13:15-16).

Again Jesus uses a logical argument to tell unbelieving Pharisees why it is lawful to heal on the Sabbath:

Going on from that place, he went into their synagogue, and a man with a shriveled hand was there. Looking for a reason to accuse Jesus, they asked him, "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath?" He said to them, "If any of you has a sheep and it falls into a pit on the Sabbath, will you not take hold of it and lift it out? How much more valuable is a man than a sheep! Therefore it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath." Then he said to the man, "Stretch out your hand." So he stretched it out and it was completely restored, just as sound as the other (Matthew 12:9-14).

Jesus used a series of three logical arguments to make the point that we should trust God to provide our earthly necessities. First, since God has given us the greater gift of life and a body, he will also give the lesser gifts of food and clothes. Second, God feeds the birds, and we are more valuable than birds, so God will feed us too. Third, God clothes the flowers and grass, so he will clothe us too.

Therefore I tell you, do not worry about your life, what you will eat or drink; or about your body, what you will wear. Is not life more important than food, and the body more important than clothes? Look at the birds of the air; they do not sow or reap or store away in barns, and yet your heavenly Father feeds them. Are you not much more valuable than they? Who of you by worrying can add a single hour to his life? And why do you worry about clothes? See how the lilies of the field grow. They do not labor or spin. Yet I tell you that not even Solomon in all his splendor was dressed like one of these. If that is how God clothes the grass of the field, which is here today and tomorrow is thrown into the fire, will he not much more clothe you, O you of little faith? (Matthew 6: 25-30).

After his triumphal entry into Jerusalem, Jesus was the target of those who would trap him with words. Through Matthew 21 and 22 we read how Jesus often used reason to force his critics to defend their logically inconsistent positions. They could not defend their

position, so they stopped using questions in an attempt to trap Jesus. We read in Matthew 22:46: “No one could say a word in reply, and from that day on no one dared to ask him any more questions.” We read similar statements in Mark 12:34 and in Luke 20:40.

The Apostle Paul used reason when addressing the Christians in Corinth. Paul made the logical case that if there is no resurrection, then why should he endanger himself by preaching the Gospel? If there is no resurrection, then why not spend your days enjoying the good life? Paul quotes the Greek poet Menander: “Bad company corrupts good character.”³³ Paul finally reasons that we shouldn’t live like the heathen who do not know God. We know God, and our lives should reflect that.

And as for us, why do we endanger ourselves every hour? I die every day — I mean that, brothers — just as surely as I glory over you in Christ Jesus our Lord. If I fought wild beasts in Ephesus for merely human reasons, what have I gained? If the dead are not raised, “Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die.” Do not be misled: “Bad company corrupts good character.” Come back to your senses as you ought, and stop sinning; for there are some who are ignorant of God — I say this to your shame (1 Corinthians 15:30-34).

On Pentecost the disciples “were filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other tongues as the Spirit enabled them.” Scoffers made fun of them and said, “They have had too much wine.” So Peter began with an argument from reason as a lead-in to the Gospel message that followed.

Then Peter stood up with the Eleven, raised his voice and addressed the crowd: “Fellow Jews and all of you who live in Jerusalem, let me explain this to you; listen carefully to what I say. These men are not drunk, as you suppose. It’s only nine in the morning! (Acts 2:14-15).

In the ninth chapter of 1 Corinthians, Paul addresses believers by using a series of rhetorical questions, logical arguments, and illustrations from daily life. He uses these to defend his apostleship, talk about Christian freedom, and warn against falling away from faith. Paul asks nineteen questions in this single chapter. First, Paul defends his right to a salary. He begins these seven verses with four rhetorical questions demanding a positive response. He ends with four rhetorical questions demanding a negative response. He uses illustrations from the daily life of a soldier, gardener, and shepherd:

Am I not free? Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord? Are you not the result of my work in the Lord? Even though I may not be an apostle to others, surely I am to you! For you are the seal of my apostleship in the Lord. This is my defense to those who sit in judgment on me. Don’t we have the right to food and drink? Don’t we have the right to take a believing wife along with us, as do the other apostles and the Lord’s brothers and Cephas? Or is it only I and Barnabas who lack the right to not work for a living? Who serves as a soldier at his own expense? Who plants a vineyard and does not eat its grapes? Who tends a flock and does not drink the milk? (1-7).

Paul continues by quoting a Scripture passage about the proper treatment of animals and applies its general principle to the current topic. He also mentions how the Old Testament Levites received food from worshipers’ gifts and sacrifices:

³³ Carleton A. Toppe, *1 Corinthians*, The People's Bible, 2nd ed. (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2002), 151.

Do I say this merely on human authority? Doesn't the Law say the same thing? For it is written in the Law of Moses: "Do not muzzle an ox while it is treading out the grain." Is it about oxen that God is concerned? Surely he says this for us, doesn't he? Yes, this was written for us, because whoever plows and threshes should be able to do so in the hope of sharing in the harvest. If we have sown spiritual seed among you, is it too much if we reap a material harvest from you? If others have this right of support from you, shouldn't we have it all the more? But we did not use this right. On the contrary, we put up with anything rather than hinder the gospel of Christ. Don't you know that those who serve in the temple get their food from the temple, and that those who serve at the altar share in what is offered on the altar? In the same way, the Lord has commanded that those who preach the gospel should receive their living from the gospel (8-14).

St. Paul then explains why he does not make use of some of his rights and freedoms, and further expounds on his ministry methods:

But I have not used any of these rights. And I am not writing this in the hope that you will do such things for me, for I would rather die than allow anyone to deprive me of this boast. For when I preach the gospel, I cannot boast, since I am compelled to preach. Woe to me if I do not preach the gospel! If I preach voluntarily, I have a reward; if not voluntarily, I am simply discharging the trust committed to me. What then is my reward? Just this: that in preaching the Gospel I may offer it free of charge, and so not make full use of my rights as a preacher of the Gospel. Though I am free and belong to no one, I have made myself a slave to everyone, to win as many as possible. To the Jews I became like a Jew, to win the Jews. To those under the Law I became like one under the Law (though I myself am not under the Law), so as to win those under the Law. To those not having the Law I became like one not having the Law (though I am not free from God's Law but am under Christ's Law), so as to win those not having the Law. To the weak I became weak, to win the weak. I have become all things to all people so that by all possible means I might save some. I do all this for the sake of the Gospel, that I may share in its blessings (15-23).

Finally, Paul exhorts his readers to follow his example and be faithful unto death. Paul uses several examples from athletics to make his point:

Do you not know that in a race all the runners run, but only one gets the prize? Run in such a way as to get the prize. Everyone who competes in the games goes into strict training. They do it to get a crown that will not last, but we do it to get a crown that will last forever. Therefore I do not run like someone running aimlessly; I do not fight like a boxer beating the air. No, I strike a blow to my body and make it my slave so that after I have preached to others, I myself will not be disqualified for the prize (24-27).

Part 3 – Skeptics Exposed to the Gospel

Sometimes we as witnesses can make use of a "point of contact" to lead into a Law and Gospel message. In the previous section, "Part 2 – Scriptural Examples of Arguments from Reason," we saw how Paul did this in Lystra (Acts 14) and in Athens (Acts 17).

Our sinful human nature does not want us to listen to the Gospel. Unbelievers are often like King Felix, who cut short Paul's witness, "That's enough for now! You may leave. When I find it convenient, I will send for you" (Acts 24:25).

God uses all sorts of circumstances in getting unbelievers to listen to the Good News about Jesus. Our "point of contact" in witnessing is just one example. Following are other

examples of how God brings unbelievers to listen to the Gospel message. These examples are of atheists, agnostics, and other non-Christians who were skeptical about the Christian faith, but for various reasons were exposed to the Gospel message. Some started reading Scripture for the very purpose of proving Christianity false.

Changes in a Friend or Spouse

Some unbelievers see desirable changes in their friend or spouse, after that friend or spouse becomes a Christian. Some of these unbelievers start reading the Bible, possibly for the first time, and they come to faith too. Lee Strobel, an alumnus of Yale Law School and award-winning journalist, became a Christian under such circumstances. He writes:

For much of my life I was a skeptic. In fact, I considered myself an atheist. Leslie stunned me in the autumn of 1979 by announcing that she had become a Christian. ... I was pleasantly surprised – even fascinated – by the fundamental changes in her character, her integrity, and her personal confidence. ... I launched an all-out investigation into the facts surrounding the case for Christianity. ... I picked apart the Bible verse by verse.³⁴

Attempts to Prove the Bible Wrong

Some critics investigate the Bible to prove it wrong, are exposed to the gospel message, and become Christians. Some of the more famous examples:

1. Two men agreed to independently prove the Bible false. British Lord George Lyttelton decided to prove that Saul was never converted.³⁵ Lawyer Gilbert West decided to prove that Jesus did not rise from the dead.³⁶ During their investigations, each became a Christian, and each later defended the faith through their writings.
2. Josh McDowell was challenged to examine the Bible's claims about Jesus. McDowell writes: "I thought most Christians were walking idiots. ... Finally I accepted their challenge, but I did it out of pride, to refute them. ... The background of my first two books was my setting out to refute Christianity. When I couldn't, I ended up becoming a Christian."³⁷

³⁴ Lee Strobel, *The Case For Christ – A Journalist's Personal Investigation of the Evidence for Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998), 13-14.

³⁵ Lord George Lyttelton, introduction to *The Conversion of St. Paul* (New York and Boston: American Tract Society, 1900), 9. <http://archive.org/stream/conversionofstpaullytt#page/n7/mode/2up> (accessed January 19, 2012).

³⁶ Gilbert West and Lord George Lyttelton, *A Defence of the Christian Revelation, on two very important points: as contained in one treatise, entitled, Observations on the history and evidences of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and Observations on the Conversion and Apostleship of St. Paul* (London: voluntary subscription, 1748). <http://www.archive.org/details/defenceofchristioowest> (accessed January 19, 2012).

³⁷ Josh McDowell, volume 1 of *Evidence That Demands a Verdict: Historical Evidences for the Christian Faith*, rev. ed. (San Bernardino: Here's Life Publishers, 1988), 364-365.

Atheistic Evolutionist ... to Theist ... to Christian³⁸

Some atheists and agnostics come to the conclusion that evolution is impossible without a creator. They became theists, believing that some unknown god is our creator. Some of these theists then look for the creator, sometimes studying Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and other faiths. They read a Bible or listen to a Christian talk about Jesus our Redeemer, and some become Christians. Dr. Jerry Bergman writes:

Many critics of the creation worldview conclude that creationists accept this worldview because they accepted Christianity first (and in many cases this is correct). Many people, though, accepted Christianity because they rejected evolutionism and accepted creationism first. Only then were they able to accept Christianity (and many of those who have rejected Darwinism have not yet accepted Christianity). Rejection of evolutionism may be the first step, and then accepting a creation worldview is the second step. Then Christianity becomes a third step.³⁹

Dr. Richard Lumsden was “One staunch Darwinian who converted first to creation, then to Christ.”⁴⁰ Coppedge writes:

Dr. Richard Lumsden was professor of parasitology and cell biology at Tulane University. He served as dean of the graduate school and published hundreds of scientific papers. He trained 30 Ph.D.s. Thoroughly versed in biological sciences, both in knowledge and lab technique, including electron microscopy, he won the highest world award in the field of parasitology. All through his career, he believed Darwinian evolution was an established fact of science, and he took great glee in ridiculing Christian beliefs.

One day, he heard that Louisiana had passed a law requiring equal time for creation with evolution, and he was flabbergasted – how stupid, he thought, and how evil! He used the opportunity to launch into a tirade against creationism in class and to give his students his best eloquence in support of Darwinism. Little did he know he had a formidable opponent in class that day – no, not a silver-tongued orator to engage him in a battle of wits; that would have been too easy. This time it was a gentle, polite, young female student.

This student went up to him after class and cheerfully exclaimed, “Great lecture, Doc! Say, I wonder if I could make an appointment with you; I have some questions about what you said and just want to get my facts straight.” Dr. Lumsden, flattered with this student’s positive approach, agreed on a time they could meet in his office. On the appointed day, the student thanked him for his time and started in.

³⁸ This section quotes several Reformed Christians. Their Reformed theology shows in their writings, including “decision theology” and the non-biblical view that Christian faith can be strengthened by scientific evidence for creation. A few phrases like “able to accept Christianity” are in their words quoted here. Nonetheless, these quotes are valuable, as they show how these people went from atheism to theism. After that, they heard the Gospel message and became believers in Christ.

³⁹ Jerry Bergman, “Cultlike Characteristics of Atheism,” *Persuaded by the Evidence: True Stories of Faith, Science, & the Power of a Creator*, ed. Doug Sharp and Jerry Bergman (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2008), 46-47. The phrase “accepting a creation worldview is the second step” is here used to mean coming to the conclusion that evolution is impossible without a creator. Such a person has not come to saving faith in Jesus, although he may do so in the future – the “third step.”

⁴⁰ David F. Coppedge, “Mocker Turned Apologist,” in *Persuaded by the Evidence: True Stories of Faith, Science, & the Power of a Creator*, ed. Doug Sharp and Jerry Bergman (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2008), 211.

She did not argue with anything he had said about evolution in class, but just began asking a series of questions: “How did life arise? Isn’t DNA too information-complex to form by natural law and chance? Why are there gaps in the fossil record between all major kinds of animals? What are the many missing links between apes and man?” She didn’t act judgmental or provocative; she just wanted to know. Lumsden, unabashed, gave the standard evolutionary answers to her questions. But something about this interchange began making him very uneasy. He was prepared for a fight, not for a gentle, honest set of questions. As he listened to himself spouting the typical evolutionary responses, he thought to himself, “This does not make any sense. What I know about biology is contrary to what I’m saying.” When the time came to go, the student picked up her books, smiled, said, “Thanks, Doc!” and left. On the outside, Dr. Lumsden appeared confident, but on the inside, he was devastated. He knew that everything he had told his student was wrong.

Dr. Lumsden had the integrity to face his new doubts honestly. He undertook a personal research project to investigate the arguments for evolution and over time, found them wanting. Based on the scientific evidence alone, he eventually decided he must reject Darwinism, and he became a creationist. But as morning follows night, he had to face the next question, “Who is the Creator?” Shortly thereafter, by coincidence or not, his sister invited him to church. It was so out of character for this formerly crusty, self-confident evolutionist to go to church! Not much earlier, he would have had nothing to do with religion. But now, he was open to reconsider the identity of the Creator and whether the claims of the Bible were true. His atheistic philosophy had also left him helpless to deal with guilt and bad habits in his personal life. This time he was open. This time, he heard the good news that God had sent his Son to pay the penalty for our sins, and to offer men forgiveness and eternal life. ... “Truly, at that moment, I came to know him, and received the Lord Jesus Christ as my Lord and Savior.” There’s room at the cross even for know-it-all science professors, if they are willing to humble themselves and bow before the Creator to whom the scientific evidence points.

Dr. Lumsden rejoiced in his newfound faith, but discovered there is a price to pay also. After his dynamic conversion to Christ and creationism, he was removed from the science faculty where he had served so well for so many years. The Institute for Creation Research invited him to direct their biology department, which he did from 1990 to 1996. Dr. Henry Morris said of him, “He had a very vibrant testimony of his conversion only a few years ago and of the role that one of his students played in confronting his evolutionism with persistent and penetrating questions. He became fully convinced of the bankruptcy of his beliefs and realized that the only reasonable alternative was that there must be a Creator.”⁴¹

Dr. Bergman is a member of MENSA, holds two earned doctorates and five master’s degrees, and has taught college biology for over 20 years.⁴² His father was an agnostic and his mother was a Jehovah’s Witness.⁴³ At first he was a very active Jehovah’s Witness. He then writes:

In time, I became totally disillusioned with not only the Watchtower, but also all religion. ... I became involved in the atheism movement and soon knew (and counted as friends) many of the leading atheists of the day, including Gordon Stein, Ph.D.; Garry DeYoung, Ph.D.; and of course, Madalyn Murray O’Hair. I have also published scores of articles in their various magazines. I read atheistic literature religiously for years (and still do). It soon became apparent while I was devouring atheistic literature that the arguments atheists used to prove

⁴¹ Coppedge, 211-213.

⁴² Bergman, 42 & 48.

⁴³ Bergman, 39.

their worldview boiled down to only two basic concerns – the existence of evil in the world and the assumption that evolution (meaning evolutionary naturalism or Darwinism) could totally explain the existence of the living and nonliving world. Consequently, scientists had “no need of that hypothesis” (the hypothesis that a God exists) because they believed that everything, including life, could be adequately explained by naturalism.⁴⁴

When I became convinced that evolutionism was simply wrong, just as I had become convinced that the Watchtower was wrong, I was led inevitably to the conclusion that, if life cannot be explained by naturalistic means, it can be explained only by an intelligent Creator, requiring theism. If a Creator existed, this meant that humans might have some obligation to Him. This led me to the conclusion that one of the theistic religions had to be valid. I started exploring the major world religions, and since I was convinced that life required a Creator, I focused on the three main theistic religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, that teach about a Creator God. My study of these three theistic religions has led me to the conclusion that Christianity, specifically historic Christianity, is true.⁴⁵

David Bradbury is an atheist who decided in 1969 that it would be easy to collect a \$1,000 prize by providing the first physically verifiable evidence elevating the hypothesis of macroevolution to the status of scientific theory. After several years he realized that there was no such evidence.⁴⁶ Bradbury eventually became a Christian. He writes:

Once the artificial “intellectual” (scientific) barrier against religion posed by evolution was exposed, and serious consideration again given to spiritual matters, my return to Christianity has been personally most rewarding. For a while I was led to accept Richard Dawkins’s view that “Darwin made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist,” but having once been blind, it makes the truth and light available to all mankind in Scripture all the more appreciated.⁴⁷

Part 4 – Ministry Considerations Regarding Creation

Evolution is a very real temptation in today’s world. This anti-Christian teaching is presented as fact nearly everywhere: TV, internet, news, advertising, radio, magazines, schools, museums, and zoos. Evolution has led many to abandon their faith in Jesus.

Our WELS congregations, schools, and other ministries proclaim that God created everything in six days, and that evolution is false. This is certainly a blessing from our Loving Father, as so many churches teach evolution as truth. But are we teaching our people all the details we should regarding origins? Are we teaching our people why evolution is so deadly to the Christian faith, and how some Christians twist Scripture to accommodate evolution?

⁴⁴ Bergman, 42.

⁴⁵ Bergman, 46.

⁴⁶ David A. Bradbury, “A Reluctant Convert from Evolution,” in *Persuaded by the Evidence: True Stories of Faith, Science, & the Power of a Creator*, ed. Doug Sharp and Jerry Bergman (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2008), 26-27,32.

⁴⁷ Bradbury, 33.

The following are discussion ideas to aid in evaluation of ministry where it touches on creation/evolution issues.

Evolution Attacks The Gospel

Have we taught our people how evolution attacks the very Gospel itself, the need for a Savior, and the doctrines of man, original sin, actual sin, the fall into sin, the law, and death? For an excellent resource, see Lyle W. Lange's *God So Loved the World – A Study of Christian Doctrine* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2005), 158-161.

Beyond Genesis 1-11

Do our people know that creation and Noah's Flood are taught as true history throughout Scripture? That Jesus and the Apostles spoke about Adam, Eve, Cain, Abel, Enoch, Noah, the flood, Eden, creation, the fall into sin, and the curse, as real people and true events?

Exodus 20:8-11	God created everything in 6 days, and rested on the 7 th day.
1 Chronicles 1:1	The genealogy of Noah includes Methuselah, Enoch, Seth, and Adam.
1 Chronicles 1:1-27	Noah's descendants formed The Table of Nations (Genesis 10).
Psalms 90:3	We return to dust when we die.
Psalms 103:14	The Lord knows how we are formed and that we are dust.
Psalms 104	Shows the order of creation.
Ecclesiastes 3:20	We come from dust and to dust we will return.
Isaiah 54:9	The waters of Noah covered the earth.
Matthew 19:3-6	Jesus defends marriage by referring to creation.
Matthew 19:28	Jesus refers to the restoration of all things to their original perfection.
Matthew 23:34-35	Jesus refers to the blood of righteous Abel which was shed.
Matthew 24:36-39	Jesus refers to Noah, the ark, and how the flood swept away people.
Mark 10:6-9	Jesus defends marriage by referring to creation.
Luke 3:23-38	The genealogy of Jesus includes Noah, Methuselah, Enoch, Seth, and Adam.
Luke 11:50-51	Jesus refers to the blood of the prophet Able being shed.
Luke 17:26-27	Jesus refers to Noah, the ark, and how the flood swept away people.
Acts 3:17-21	Peter refers to the restoration of all things to their original perfection.
Romans 5:12-21	Death came to all men through the sin of Adam.
1 Corinthians 11:8	For man did not come from woman, but woman from man;

1 Corinthians 11:12 For as woman came from man, so also man is born of woman.

1 Corinthians 15:20-22 Death came through a man. In Adam all die.

1 Corinthians 15:42-49 Adam, the first man, was of the dust of the earth.

2 Corinthians 11:3 Eve was deceived by the serpent.

1 Timothy 2:13-14 Adam was formed first, then Eve. Eve was first to be deceived.

Hebrews 11:4 Cain's and Abel's sacrifices.

Hebrews 11:5 Faithful Enoch was taken away by God and did not experience death.

Hebrews 11:7 Noah condemned the world, built an ark, and saved his family.

Hebrews 12:24 The blood of Jesus speaks a better word than the blood of Abel.

1 Peter 3:20 In the days of Noah, an ark was built which saved 8 people.

2 Peter 2:5 God destroyed the ungodly with a flood but saved Noah and 7 others.

2 Peter 3:3-6 The earth was formed from water and the world was once destroyed by water.

1 John 3:12 Evil Cain murdered his righteous brother Abel.

Jude 11 Godless men have taken the way of Cain.

Jude 14 Enoch, the seventh from Adam, was a prophet.

Revelation 22:3 In heaven there will no longer be any curse.

Theistic Evolution

Have we taught our people about false Christian teachings like the Gap Theory⁴⁸, Progressive Creation⁴⁹, Theistic Evolution⁵⁰, and the Framework Hypothesis⁵¹? Do our people know the Bible interpretation methods used by Christians who accept evolution, as

⁴⁸ Gap Theory: Some Christians falsely believe that there is a gap of millions of years between Genesis 1:1 and 2:2.

⁴⁹ Progressive Creation: Some Christians falsely believe that God created new kinds of living things many times over billions of years.

⁵⁰ Theistic Evolution: Some Christians falsely believe that God started and maybe guided evolution for billions of years.

⁵¹ Framework Hypothesis: Some Christians falsely believe that Genesis 1 is a "framework" of religious lessons but not real history.

compared to the correct interpretation of Scripture⁵²? Some Christians falsely believe that the Bible contains God's Word, and we must decide which parts are God's Word and which are the views of fallible human authors. Some Christians falsely believe that Genesis 1–11 is a myth, allegory, or metaphor. Some Christians falsely believe that Jesus taught creation and the flood as real, historical events, only because he did not want to hinder his ministry by correcting false ideas.

Bible History

When we teach Bible history,

- do we address the ways evolution and modern society attack historical accounts in Scripture?
- do we highlight the importance of Genesis 1–11, which chapters provide the foundation and background for so many Biblical teachings?
- do we teach our people that all things were created in 6 consecutive 24-hour days, including extinct life forms such as dinosaurs?
- do we explain the difference between the Biblical “kind” and the modern term “species”?
- do we envision Noah's ark as being small and tipsy, or do we envision the massive sea worthy ship described in the Bible, a ship far larger than needed?
- do we show that Genesis 1–11 answers many important questions, such as:
 - Why is a week 7 days long?
 - What is the purpose of stars?
 - Why do we marry?
 - Why do we die and return to dust?
 - Why do we need a Savior?
 - Why do we wear clothes?
 - Why do thorns and thistles grow in our gardens?
 - Why don't we live as long as people before the flood?
 - Why do people speak different languages?
 - Does God approve the eating of meat (for those of us who do so)?

Bible Certainty and Changing Science

We must be careful to distinguish between teachings of Biblical certainty and observations about how the world seems to be very much as expected (from a creation viewpoint). Doctrines which God reveals to us in the Bible never change, for they have been revealed by an all-knowing and unchanging God. Conclusions based on observations

⁵² Correct and incorrect methods of interpreting the Scriptures are covered by David Kuske in his excellent book *Biblical Interpretation: The Only Right Way* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1995).

(science) often change, since they are made with limited human reason which is corrupted by sin. This is true for both evolutionists and creationists. Biblical certainty never changes, as it has been revealed by an all-knowing and unchanging God.

Concepts which have been discarded by many creationists:

- A pre-flood “vapor canopy.”⁵³
- Little dust on the moon means a young moon.⁵⁴
- Distant star light created “in-transit.”⁵⁵
- Woolly mammoths were flash frozen during the flood.⁵⁶

Concepts which have been discarded by many evolutionists:

- “Piltdown Man” as our ancestor.⁵⁷
- “Vestigial” organs.⁵⁸
- “Nebraska Man” as our ancestor.⁵⁹

False Claims

Have we taught our people some of the ways evolutionists attack creation? False claims by some evolutionists:

- Creationists are against science.
- Only the uneducated reject evolution.

⁵³ Bodie Hodge, “The Collapse of the Canopy Model,” *Answers in Genesis* (2009), <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/2009/09/25/feedback-collapse-canopy-model> (accessed January 22, 2012).

⁵⁴ Don DeYoung, “Far out Claims About Astronomy,” *Answers in Genesis* (2007), <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v3/n1/far-out-claims> (accessed January 22, 2012).

⁵⁵ Paul Taylor, “Can Creation Models be Wrong?” *Answers in Genesis* (2007), http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v2/n4/can-creation-models-be-wrong#fnList_1_3 (accessed January 22, 2012).

⁵⁶ Michael Oard, “Woolly Mammoths: Flood or Ice Age?” *Answers in Genesis* (2004), <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/fit/wolly-mammoths-flood-ice> (accessed January 22, 2012).

⁵⁷ Tourist Guy, “History’s Hoaxes,” *National Geographic News* (2010), http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2003/03/0331_030401_aprilfool_2.html (accessed January 22, 2012).

⁵⁸ Maggie Koerth-Baker, “Vestigial Organs Not So Useless After All, Studies Find,” *National Geographic News* (2009), <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2009/07/090730-spleen-vestigial-organs.html> (accessed January 22, 2012).

⁵⁹ Ian Taylor, “‘Nebraska Man’ Revisited,” *Answers in Genesis* (1991), <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/cm/v13/n4/nebraska> (accessed January 22, 2012).

- All true scientists are evolutionists.^{60 61}
- Dawkins states, “No serious biologist doubts the fact that evolution has happened.”⁶²
- A belief in evolution is required to do real science.⁶³
- Scientific American declares, “There is no scientifically credible challenge to evolution, only long-ago-debunked creationist claptrap.”⁶⁴
- There is not enough water to cover the mountains in a global flood.

Straw Men

Have we taught our people about the “straw men”⁶⁵ which evolutionists erect and then easily knock down? Here are some of the false claims about creation which are advanced by some evolutionists:

- God made all animals as they are today.
- Dinosaurs never existed.
- Every species of land animal had to fit into a 450 foot boat to survive the flood.
- Men have one less rib than women.
- All fossils are from the flood.

⁶⁰ This statement is logically wrong (a logical fallacy). “The ‘No True Scotsman’ fallacy: When an arguer defines a term in a biased way to protect his argument from rebuttals. ... Person A asserts that no Scotsman puts sugar in his porridge. Person B refutes this claim by providing a counter example: ‘Angus is a Scotsman – and he puts sugar in his porridge.’ But Person A responds by saying, ‘Ah, but no *true* Scotsman puts sugar in his porridge.’ He has essentially redefined the term ‘Scotsman’ in a way that his original claim cannot be wrong. But since the definition is fallacious, so is his argument.” Cf. Jason Lisle, *Discerning Truth: Exposing Errors in Evolutionary Arguments* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2010), 78.

⁶¹ “I have in my library more than 5,000 books and monographs written by people critical of Darwinism. Many were written by Ph.D.-level scientists who were not creationists (or even Christians).” Bergman, 45.

⁶² Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker: Why Evolution Reveals a Universe Without Design*, revised ed. (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2006), 407.

⁶³ The National Academy of Sciences states that biological evolution is “the most important concept in modern biology, a concept essential to understanding key aspects of living things.” However, many real scientists are creationists. Even many scientists who are evolutionists say they would not have done their work differently even if they thought Darwin was wrong. Cf. Jason Lisle, “Can Creationists Be ‘Real’ Scientists?” in *The New Answers Book 2: Over 30 Questions on Creation/Evolution and the Bible*, ed. Ken Ham (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2008), 143-144. Thomas Hayden says in “What Darwin Didn’t Know,” “‘Nothing in Biology Makes Sense Except in the Light of Evolution,’ the pioneering geneticist Theodosius Dobzhansky titled a famous essay in 1973. He could not have been more right – evolution is quite simply the way biology works, the central organizing principle of life on earth.” *Smithsonian*, February 2009, 42.

⁶⁴ Glenn Branch and Eugenie C. Scott, “The Latest Face of Creationism,” *Scientific American* (January 2009), 98.

⁶⁵ “The straw man fallacy: misrepresenting an opponent’s position and proceeding to refute the misrepresentation rather than what the opponent actually claims.” Lisle, *Discerning Truth*, 61.

- Plants did not die before Adam sinned.

Evolution – Its Effect On Our Thinking

Have we taught our people about evolutionary terminology and false concepts so embedded in our daily lives? We often do not even realize how they bend our thinking toward evolution? Here are some of these false concepts:

- “Early” life forms such as alligators are more “ancient” than mammals.
- “Cave men” were less intelligent than we are today.
- Humans are improving morally and ethically.
- Dinosaurs never lived contemporarily with people.
- The sun is older than the earth.
- Prehistoric.
- “Young” and “old” stars, stellar nurseries, etc.⁶⁶

Evolution – A Belief That There Is No Creator God

Do our people know that evolution starts with a belief that everything came about through natural causes? Evolution eliminates the possibility of a Creator God before any evidence is considered.⁶⁷

Scientific Problems For Evolution

Have we taught our people some of the many scientific problems with evolution?

- Scientific observations fit creation as well, or even better, than they fit evolution.
- DNA is information, and the only known source of information is intelligence.⁶⁸
- Statistics show the chance forming of life is impossible.
- C14 dating problems in formerly living things.

⁶⁶ “Scientific fact: Using the Hubble Space Telescope and Earth-based observatories, scientists now have photographic evidence documenting each stage in the formation of a solar system: ... photographs of nebulae condensing into hydrogen burning stars. ... Why, then, should we arrogantly presume that our own solar system arose in a radically different and miraculous way?” David Mills, *Atheist Universe: The Thinking Person’s Answer to Christian Fundamentalism* (Berkeley: Ulysses Press, 2006), 99.

⁶⁷ Mark Bergemann, “Can Evolutionists Be Neutral?” *LSI Journal* (May-August 2010), <http://www.lutheranscience.org/2010-EvolutionistNeutral.html> (accessed January 19, 2012).

⁶⁸ Dr. Werner Gitt, writes: “There is no known law of nature, no known process, and no known sequence of events which can cause information to originate by itself in matter.” *In the Beginning Was Information: A Scientist Explains the Incredible Design in Nature* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2007), 28. Dr. Jason Lisle agrees; cf. *The Ultimate Proof of Creation: Resolving the Origins Debate* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2009), 18-20.

- C14 in coal, diamonds, and most carbon containing things.⁶⁹
- Uranium/potassium dating problems in cooled magma rock like granite and in cooled lava flows.⁷⁰
- Irreducible complexity in living things on the molecular level.⁷¹

Invalid Arguments for Creation

Have we taught our people to avoid invalid arguments for creation? A great resource is Warren Krug's article "Shaky Creationism" in the journal of the Lutheran Science Institute.⁷²

Discussing Evolution with Unbelievers

My personal experience is that many who accept evolution as fact, both believers and unbelievers, have major gaps in their knowledge of basic evolutionary claims. In addition, many of them know very little about the biblical teaching of creation, and much of what they know is not correct. This seems to open up avenues for discussion, and without trying to do so, I find myself in discussions about evolution.

If you find yourself talking about evolution with an unbeliever, move the discussion toward the law and Gospel. Such a discussion may start by discussing some aspect of evolution or creation. You may wish to transition to the Law and Gospel by describing the fall into sin, and explaining God's plan to restore our broken relationship with him (the biblical worldview).

Many unbelievers today have no religious background. The concept of sin needs to be carefully explained to them, because they have many misconceptions about it. Mentioning the perfection of God's original creation, and then the fall into sin and its consequences, leads into the Good News about Jesus.

⁶⁹ Jason Lisle, *Ultimate Proof*, 21-22.

⁷⁰ Andrew A. Snelling, "Radiometric Dating: Problems with the Assumptions," *Answers in Genesis* (2009), <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v4/n4/assumptions> (accessed January 19, 2012).

⁷¹ Michael J. Behe, *Darwin's Black Box* (New York: Touchstone, 1998); and Jason Lisle, *Ultimate Proof*, 20-21.

⁷² Warren Krug, "Shaky Creationism: Questionable Arguments Sometimes Used by Creationists," *LSI Journal* (May-August, 2006). <http://www.lutheranscience.org/2006-ShakyCreationism1.html> (accessed January 19, 2012).

An *LSI Journal* article entitled “How Did Life Begin?” somewhat follows the course that a discussion with an unbeliever may take. It starts with several aspects of evolution, moves to presenting a Biblical worldview, and finishes with the Gospel.⁷³

Appendix: Examples of Creation Arguments by WELS Authors

Here are some examples of extra-biblical arguments from reason and history advanced by WELS authors in pointing out logical problems with evolution:

Mark A. Paustian writes:

Science has nothing important to say about miracles. It has no place even venturing an opinion. Learning always more about natural laws through controlled observation cannot add one thing to the question of whether these laws can be interrupted by something or someone that exists outside of them. And science should not complain too loudly that it has never seen a miracle, for neither has it seen a “Big Bang,” nor any small bit of life ever emerge from nonlife, nor any of the most critical processes evolution requires. Instead, notice that while I am free to accept or dismiss someone’s claim of a miracle based on honest investigation, the atheistic mind is not free. It is made up in advance. It cannot consider the mountain of evidence for miracles objectively. It has a doctrine against miracles. In this case it is the materialist, not the Christian, who is constrained by a creed. If one has an *a priori* assumption that the material universe is the whole show, that person has no intellectual freedom but must accept the wildest, most improbable natural explanations.

Wilbert R. Gawrisch writes:

The half-life of Uranium 238 is 4,510 millions of years. According to this method the age of the earth is estimated to be 4½ billion years. Other scientists have pointed out flaws in this method. If, for instance, the rate of decay was [assumptions for U238 dating are listed]. ...Radioactive Carbon-14, produced by cosmic rays entering the upper atmosphere of the earth, is taken in by living plants and animals. When a plant or animal dies, it no longer absorbs Carbon-14. But the C-14 in its structure continues to disintegrate. The radioactivity of the carbon can be measured, and so the age of the tree or fossil can be estimated. This method too is based on certain assumptions which cannot be proved. It is assumed, for example, that [assumptions for C14 dating are listed]. ... Our confidence in the Scriptures is, of course, not in the least dependent on the so-called “assured results” of scientific investigation. We are certain that if there does appear to be a conflict between science and the Scriptures, it is science that is in error, not the Word of God. “Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away,” our Savior tells us. It is well for us to be aware, however, of how uncertain and changeable the “assured results” of science are, and of the unproved and unprovable assumptions on which these results are based.

⁷³ Mark Bergemann, “How Did Life Begin?” *LSI Journal* (March–April, 2005), <http://lutheranscience.org/2005-LifeBegin.html> (accessed January 19, 2012).

But it is saddening to note how some theologians wrest the Scriptures in an attempt to bring them into harmony with the dicta of science.

David C. Thompson writes:

But Darwinism is not about scientific evidence. The evidence was not there when Darwin began his investigation, and almost a century and a half later it is still not there. The fossil evidence shows no evidence of gradual, mutated change from one species to another. The missing links are still missing, and those minuscule few that are alleged to be transitional forms cannot be shown to be anything other than stand-alone species coming from nowhere and going nowhere; or they are transitional forms that remain within species.

Roland Cap Ehlke writes:

This example illustrates how some long-standing questions about Scripture have been resolved by modern archeology. During the last century and a half, archeological discoveries have brought to light many people (such as the Hittites) and places (such as Nineveh) that were mentioned in the Bible but denied by those who belittled Scripture's historical accuracy. The late Nelson Glueck, one of the world's most renowned archeologists, said, "It may be stated categorically that no archeological discovery has ever controverted [contradicted] a biblical reference".

Allen Quist writes:

When considering the truthfulness of the Old Testament, It should be mentioned that numerous archeological discoveries have confirmed the accuracy of the Old Testament at many points, including verification of the names of various prominent people, their positions, the time at which they lived, their exploits and the like. Here are just a few details of the Old Testament which have been substantiated. [8 detailed examples are given.] Many additional examples of archeological verification of the accuracy of the Old Testament could be added, but these should be sufficient to show that the level of substantiation is significant indeed. ... So just as those who were contemporaries with the prophets were able to observe if the prophecies came true, so also we are able through research to observe that the historical narrative is true.

Carl J. Lawrenz and John C. Jeske write:

Since the offspring of two mates can embody various combinations of the genetic factors (size, color, shape, and other features) belonging to a kind, this allowed for considerable variety within the kinds of land animals. It did not allow for new kinds or mixtures of kinds. Modern study of genetics, which began with Gregor Mendel, underscores these truths. Mutations, due to damage of reproductive cells, are slight and regressive and do not develop new kinds.

Cleone H. Weigand writes:

Louis Pasteur opened the eyes of the world to one of these laws when he demonstrated in his famous experiments that "life comes from life." This law is called the "*law of biogenesis*." A second set of laws were explored in depth by Gregor Mendel and are known

as Mendel's laws. Briefly, they are the laws that govern traits inherited from one generation to the next. Modern focus on the role of DNA and the extensive effort being made in the study of genes further explore these laws. These studies tell us that these genes must first possess the information that governs how a life form will grow before they can pass on this information. They also tell us that most mutation is a destructive process, a subtraction process. Nothing new is formed in a mutation; information that existed before is taken away.

Joel C. Gerlach writes:

When Huxley, an outspoken critic of the Christian faith because Christians accept things on faith, was asked to explain his acceptance of spontaneous generation, he replied in effect: We know the world came into being through evolution. Evolution could not have occurred without spontaneous generation. Therefore we know that spontaneous generation has occurred. That is what is commonly called arguing in a circle. It is a classic example of taking something on faith. So, either way, whether one is a creationist or an evolutionist, his conviction rests on faith. Which is right, to rest our faith on what God has said, or to rest it on what man thinks? God's truth never changes. Man's theories change frequently.

Roland C. Ehlke writes:

Another startling testimony in behalf of a worldwide flood comes from the numerous flood traditions which are found around the world. Many features of the biblical account appear in ancient stories from Babylonia, Persia, Syria, Asia Minor, Greece, Egypt, Italy, Lithuania, Wales, Russia, China, India, Alaska, Hawaii, the Indians of Canada, the United States, Mexico, Peru, Brazil, and other places. Although often distorted in detail, all these faint recollections point to the reality of a great deluge which almost destroyed mankind.

Bibliography

- Balge, Richard D. *Acts*. The People's Bible. 2nd ed. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2001.
----- "Preaching Repentance and Remission of Sins –With Application to Personal Witnessing." *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 75:2 (April 1978), 98-109.
- Becker, Siegbert W. *The Foolishness of God: The Place of Reason in the Theology of Martin Luther*. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1982.
- Behe, Michael J. *Darwin's Black Box*. New York: Touchstone, 1998.
- Bergemann, Mark. "Can Evolutionists Be Neutral?" *LSI Journal* (April–June 2010), <http://www.lutheranscience.org/2010-EvolutionistNeutral.html> (accessed January 19, 2012).
- "How Did Life Begin?" *LSI Journal* (March–April 2005). <http://lutheranscience.org/2005-LifeBegin.html> (accessed January 19, 2012).

- Bergman, Jerry. "Cultlike Characteristics of Atheism," *Persuaded by the Evidence: True Stories of Faith, Science, & the Power of a Creator*. Ed. Doug Sharp and Jerry Bergman, 39-50. Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2008.
- Borgwardt, Michael J. "The Apostle Paul As Apologist." *Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary On-line Essay File* (November 16, 1993), <http://www.wlsessays.net/node/209> (accessed January 19, 2012).
- Bradbury, David A. "A Reluctant Convert from Evolution," *Persuaded by the Evidence: True Stories of Faith, Science, & the Power of a Creator*. Ed. Doug Sharp and Jerry Bergman, 25-33. Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2008.
- Branch, Glenn and Eugenie C. Scott. "The Latest Face of Creationism." *Scientific American* (January 2009).
- Coppedge, David F. "Mocker Turned Apologist," *Persuaded by the Evidence: True Stories of Faith, Science, & the Power of a Creator*. Ed. Doug Sharp and Jerry Bergman, 211-214. Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2008.
- Dawkins, Richard. *The Blind Watchmaker: Why Evolution Reveals a Universe Without Design*, rev. ed. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2006.
- DeYoung, Don. "Far Out Claims About Astronomy." *Answers in Genesis* (2007). <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v3/n1/far-out-claims> (accessed January 22, 2012).
- Ehlke, Roland Cap. *Be Prepared To Answer: A Bible Course for Adults*. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1982.
- . Preface to Allen Quist, *The Marks of the Nail: A Survey of the Evidence for Christianity*. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1985.
- . *Speaking The Truth In Love To Muslims*. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2004.
- Gawrisch, Wilbert R. "The Biblical Account of Creation and Modern Theology." *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 59:3 (July 1962), 161-202.
- Gerlach, Joel C. *The Word Is Now: A Bible Study Course for Young People – Teacher's Guide*. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1978.
- Gitt, Werner. *In the Beginning Was Information: A Scientist Explains the Incredible Design in Nature*. Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2007.
- Guy, Tourist. "History's Hoaxes." *National Geographic News* (2010). http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2003/03/0331_030401_aprilfool_2.html (accessed January 22, 2012).
- Hayden, Thomas. "What Darwin Didn't Know." *Smithsonian* (February 2009).
- Hodge, Bodie. "The Collapse of the Canopy Model." *Answers in Genesis* (2009) <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/2009/09/25/feedback-collapse-canopy-model> (accessed January 22, 2012).
- Hoenecke, Adolf. *Evangelical Lutheran Dogmatics*, vol. 1. Tr. James Langebartels and Heinrich Vogel. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2009.
- Koerth-Baker, Maggie. "Vestigial Organs Not So Useless After All, Studies Find." *National Geographic News* (2009). <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2009/07/090730-spleen-vestigial-organs.html> (accessed January 22, 2012).
- Krug, Warren. "Shaky Creationism: Questionable Arguments Sometimes Used by Creationists." *LSI Journal* (May-August 2006). <http://www.lutheranscience.org/2006-ShakyCreationism1.html> (accessed January 19, 2012).

- Lange, Lyle W. *God So Loved the World: A Study of Christian Doctrine*. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2005.
- Lawrenz, Carl J. and John C. Jeske. *A Commentary On Genesis 1-11*. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2004.
- Lisle, Jason. "Can Creationists Be 'Real' Scientists?" *The New Answers Book 2: Over 30 Questions on Creation/Evolution and the Bible*. Ed. Ken Ham, 143-148. Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2008.
- *Discerning Truth: Exposing Errors in Evolutionary Arguments*. Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2010.
- *The Ultimate Proof of Creation: Resolving the Origins Debate*. Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2009.
- Luther, Martin. "The Small Catechism." *The Book Of Concord: Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. Tr. Theodore G. Tappert. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959.
- Lyttelton, Lord George. *The Conversion of St. Paul*. New York and Boston: American Tract Society, 1900. <http://www.archive.org/details/conversionofstpa00lytt> (accessed January 19, 2012).
- McDowell, Josh. *Evidence That Demands a Verdict: Historical Evidences for the Christian Faith*, vol. 1. Rev. ed. San Bernardino, CA: Here's Life Publishers, 1988.
- Mills, David. *Atheist Universe: The Thinking Person's Answer to Christian Fundamentalism*. Berkeley, CA: Ulysses Press, 2006.
- Oard, Michael. "Woolly Mammoths: Flood or Ice Age?" *Answers in Genesis* (2004), <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/fit/woolly-mammoths-flood-ice> (accessed January 22, 2012).
- Paustian, Mark A. *Prepared To Answer: Telling the Greatest Story Ever Told*. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2004.
- Pieper, August. "Scripture and Reason," *The Wauwatosa Theology*, 1:151-187. Tr. James Langebartels. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1997.
- Pieper, Francis. *Christian Dogmatics*, vol. 1. Tr. H. W. Romoser *et al.* St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950.
- Quist, Allen. *The Marks of the Nail: A Survey of the Evidence for Christianity*. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1985.
- Schuetze, Armin. "The Dangers of Evolution and How to Meet Them." *Truth Unchanging: Is Evolutionism the Answer?* Ed. Werner H. Franzmann, 79-84. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1967. Originally published in the *Northwestern Lutheran* (1965-66).
- Snelling, Andrew A. "Radiometric Dating: Problems with the Assumptions." *Answers in Genesis* (2009). <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v4/n4/assumptions> (accessed January 19, 2012).
- Strobel, Lee. *The Case For Christ: A Journalist's Personal Investigation of the Evidence for Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998.
- Taylor, Ian. "Nebraska Man' Revisited." *Answers in Genesis* (1991). <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/cm/v13/n4/nebraska> (accessed January 22, 2012).
- Taylor, Paul. "Can Creation Models Be Wrong?" *Answers in Genesis* (2007). http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v2/n4/can-creation-models-be-wrong#fnList_1_3 (accessed January 22, 2012).
- Thompson, David C. *What in the World Is Going On? Identifying Hollow and Deceptive Worldviews*. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2010.

- Toppe, Carleton A. *1 Corinthians*. The People's Bible, 2nd ed. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2002.
- Valleskey, David J. *A Portrait of Paul: Making Disciples of All Nations*. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2002.
- . *We Believe – Therefore We Speak: The Theology and Practice of Evangelism*. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1995.
- Weigand, Cleone H. *Creation: God Made All Things*. The People's Bible Teachings. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2000.
- West, Gilbert and Lord George Lyttelton. *A Defence of the Christian Revelation*. London: voluntary subscription, 1748. <http://www.archive.org/details/defenceofchristioowest> (accessed January 19, 2012).