

Is the Bible Divinely Inspired? -- *Special Edition* (2nd Ed.)

By Richie Cooley

A few legal notes...

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

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

Some Scripture is taken from the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD BIBLE®, copyright © 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission.

Licensed by:

Richie Cooley (Creative Commons: Attribution)

Hello and welcome. I began several years ago writing on Biblical topics and started self-publishing booklets on Amazon. After I had written about 7 or 8 I felt like I was beginning to dilute my original intent of simplicity, so I began the process of combining my writings, first in an all-in-one, volume format, and then by condensing this large work into the smaller book, **Is the Bible Divinely Inspired?**

However, having finished that, I still wasn't satisfied by the state of my writing efforts. Mainly, I didn't like to think that I was "selling" something very meaningful to me; so I've decided to quit using Amazon Kindle and instead publish the electronic version on free sites. Also, for anyone who read the original, this version has been given a lot of new bells and whistles. For example, I decided to re-include my Messianic prophecy discussions from an earlier version of "Mashiach ben Elohim," and I also included an appendix which was taken from a booklet that I published under a pen name. In the "Major Divine Patterns" section there is a lot of new material as well, including a full reworking of the Davar/Devir thesis. Anyway, thanks for reading.

Sincerely,
Richie Cooley
September, 2014

A few instructional notes...

1. The words in brackets [] within direct quotations are from the translator/author; the words in the special brackets { } are from me.

2. Abbreviations for the Bible versions used are as follows:

Analytical Literal Translation (3rd edition) = **ALT3**

English Standard Version = **ESV**

King James Version = **KJV**

New American Standard Bible (1995) = **NASB**

Rotherham's Emphasized Bible = **REB**

Young's Literal Translation (modified) = **mYLT**

3. Two of the Bibles have special features. The NASB places an asterisk beside a present verb that has been translated in the past tense (only in the New Testament). The ALT3 indicates if "you" is plural or singular by putting an asterisk beside the plural form.

4. "LORD," "GOD," or "Hashem (meaning 'the Name')," signify the personal name of God, which is popularly rendered "Jehovah" or "Yahweh."

5. For the most part the direct quotes utilize American spelling while my writing uses European spelling.

6. Most of the Bible versions quoted capitalize divine pronouns; however, I do not follow this practice in my writing.

7. Long quotes begin with a "<" symbol.

Table of Contents

[General Introduction](#)

[Chapter 1. What is Truth? \(Origins vs. Evolution\)](#)

[Chapter 2. Are the Biblical Documents Trustworthy?](#)

[Chapter 3. The Messianic Prophecies of Divinity](#)

[Chapter 4. The Messianic Prophecies of Salvation](#)

[Chapter 5. Major Divine Patterns \(in the Word\)](#)

[Chapter 6. Major Divine Patterns \(in the World\)](#)

[Chapter 7. Eschatology \(End Times Prophecy\)](#)

[Appendix 1: Pim Fortuyn and Revelation 13](#)

[Appendix 2: Dino-flesh; Ussher's revenge](#)

[Citations](#)

General Introduction

<Any physical theory is always provisional, in the sense that it is only a hypothesis: you can never prove it. No matter how many times the results of experiments agree with some theory, you can never be sure that the next time the result will not contradict the theory. On the other hand, you can disprove a theory by finding even a single observation that disagrees with the predictions of the theory. As philosopher of science Karl Popper has emphasized, a good theory is characterized by the fact that it makes a number of predictions that could in principle be disproved or falsified by observation. Each time new experiments are observed to agree with the predictions the theory survives, and our confidence in it is increased; but if ever a new observation is found to disagree, we have to abandon or modify the theory. At least that is what is supposed to happen, but you can always question the competence of the person who carried out the observation.*1

This is the *scientific method* as stated by Stephen Hawking. If the academic world actually lived by such sentiments than there would be need no to write a book in defence of God and his revealed truth; unfortunately, this isn't the way "higher education" always works. John Lennox, a colleague of Richard Dawkins at Oxford, referenced a disturbing attitude in his book, *God's Undertaker...*

<...In his review of Carl Sagan's last book, the Harvard geneticist Richard Lewontin makes it abundantly clear that his materialistic convictions are *a priori* {*meaning prior to proving through examination*}. He not only confesses that his

materialism does not derive from his science, but he also admits, on the contrary, that it is his materialism that actually consciously determines the nature of what he conceives science to be: 'Our willingness to accept scientific claims that are against common sense is the key to an understanding of the real struggle between science and the supernatural. We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs... in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment... to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our *a priori* adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated.'*2

Many universities have shoved the masses into this very precarious corner. They've actually built their whole temple of "knowledge" on the slippery supposition that there is nothing supernatural. If some of these "intellectuals" would conduct their research on the front lines of fruitful missionary outposts or even at the places in the world where dark magic is still practiced, their edifice would crumble...

<The spirits arrived again, only this time riding a fire burning at the base of the poteau mitan. The hounsis was mounted violently -- her entire body shaking, her muscles flexed -- and a single spasm wriggled up her spine. She knelt before the fire, calling out in some ancient tongue. Then she stood up and began to whirl, describing smaller and smaller circles that carried her like a top around the poteau mitan and dropped her, still spinning, onto the fire. She remained there for an impossibly long time, and then in a single bound that sent embers and ash throughout the peristyle, she leapt away. Landing squarely on both feet, she stared back at the fire and screeched like a raven. Then she embraced the coals. She

grabbed a burning faggot with each hand, slapped them together, and released one. The other she began to lick...and then she ate the fire, taking a red-hot coal the size of a small apple between her lips. Then, once more she began to spin. She went around the poteau mitan three times until finally she collapsed into the arms of the mambo. The ember was still in her mouth {*the woman was not harmed in any way; this is a description of a supernatural Haitian ceremony witnessed by a Harvard scientist*}.*3

In this book we are going to survey the proof of supernatural realities in a way that doesn't require travel to exotic lands; we are going to view the divine finger which is evidenced in the written Word of God. Our study has a simple, five-point outline. First, since deep agnosticism and crass materialism are currently the norms in academic circles, we are going to point out some of the major flaws in these theories. Second, having taking these modern stumbling-blocks out of the way, we are going to investigate the Bible as to its authenticity and overall reliability. Third, having proven the historicity of the Scriptures themselves, we shall then examine in detail the extensive prophetic passages that were fulfilled with the coming of Jesus Christ nearly 2,000 years ago. Afterwards we will consider the divine patterns that are displayed in nature and the Scriptures, while the final section will discuss what the Bible predicts for the future.

Chapter 1. What is Truth? (Origins vs. Evolution)

<We are in the position of a little child entering a huge library filled with books in many different languages. The child knows someone must have written those books. It does not know how. It does not understand the languages in which they are written. The child dimly suspects a mysterious order in the arrangement of the books, but doesn't know what it is.

That, it seems to me, is the attitude of even the most intelligent being toward God. We see a universe marvelously arranged and obeying certain laws, but only dimly understand those laws. Our limited minds cannot grasp the mysterious force that moves the constellations.*1

-- *Albert Einstein*

1. The Anthropic Principle

The more scientists study the universe the more it appears that things are adjusted for life in a way that defies all explanation. Even Stephen Hawking has written of this phenomenon and the conclusions one could draw from it...

<The laws of science, as we know them at present, contain many fundamental numbers, like the size of the electric charge of the electron and the ratio of the masses of the proton and the electron. We cannot, at the moment at least, predict the value of these numbers from theory -- we have to find them by observation. It may be that one day we shall discover a complete unified theory that predicts them all, but it is also possible that some or all of them vary from universe to universe or within a single universe. The remarkable fact is that the values of these numbers seem to have been very finely adjusted to make possible the development of life... Most sets of values would give rise to universes that, although they might be very beautiful, would contain no one able to wonder at that beauty. One can take this either as evidence of a divine purpose in Creation and the choice of the laws of science or as support for the strong anthropic principle.*2

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

<What happens when we try to assign a probability to the fine-tuning of these constants? Such a probability would look

like $1/N$ (one over N). How big is N ? Oxford physicist Roger Penrose concluded that if we jointly considered all the laws of nature that must be fine-tuned, we would be unable to write down such an enormous number because the necessary digits would be greater than the number of elementary particles in the universe.*3

2. Who Created the “Big Bang?”

What science currently postulates is that a giant, random explosion caused all the intricate order, and even if the odds are astronomical that life could have ever been supported, then we simply have hit the universal lottery. Even if this ridiculous thesis could be swallowed there still would be a gaping, unsolved quandary: *who created the components of this explosion?* Evolutionists will quickly reply, “Well who created God?” God claims to be eternal (cf. Deuteronomy 32:27; Psalm 90:2), energy does not. In fact, we know that energy cannot be eternal. How? The first and second laws of thermodynamics.

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

Modern science asks the public to believe in the existence of a universe (or even *multiple universes*) without an original first-cause, which is of course impossible. They get away with it because no one takes them to task. Actually, the average atheistic lay person is often a lot wiser than the “cutting edge” physicist, but the atheist isn’t aware of this, so he or she trusts the physicist blindly. People don’t realize that an unbalanced intellectualism often warps the reason of “great minds” in many fields (especially those deluded by

quantum mechanical indulgences). We laugh at the absurdities of ancient pagan philosophers; we have no need to look beyond our own culture to enter into fits of hysterics...

<If symmetry is perfect on a cosmic scale, the total amount of energy in the universe is actually zero. Does this mean that nothing caused the universe? If our universe is an absolute zero, absolutely nothing seems required to cause it! Is our universe such an ultimate absolute accident? Is it nothing that was caused by nothing for no reason at all? Extreme Big Accident Cosmology answers affirmatively. This cosmology is advocated by Quantum Cosmologists like Edward P. Tryon, Peter Atkins, A. Vilenkin, Victor J. Stenger, Quentin Smith, and a few others for whom the origin of the universe was a stupendous accident, having no cause whatsoever.*4

3. When Did Matter Begin to Live?

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

<Now there is one property that animals are found to have in common with plants. For some plants are generated from the seed of plants, whilst other plants are self-generated through the formation of some elemental principle similar to a seed; and of these latter plants some derive their nutriment from the ground, whilst others grow inside other plants, as is mentioned, by the way, in my treatise on Botany. So with animals, some spring from parent animals according to their kind, whilst others grow spontaneously and not from kindred stock; and of these instances of spontaneous generation some come from putrefying earth or vegetable matter, as is the case with a number of insects, while others are spontaneously generated in the inside of animals out of the secretions of their several organs.*5

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

This is an outlandish assertion. When considered on a miniature scale the simple building blocks of life are just as spectacular as the galaxies. One of the most well-travelled quotes of Richard Dawkins is where he states that the nucleus of a cell has a "database larger, in information content, than all 30 volumes of the Encyclopaedia Britannica put together" (originally from *The Blind Watchmaker*).

And not only is such information present, but it is living...

<The genome is not just a simple string of letters spelling out a linear series of instructions. It actually embodies multiple linear codes, which overlap and constitute an exceedingly sophisticated information system, embodying what is called 'data compression'...plus multiple, overlapping, linear, language-like forms of genetic information [with] countless loops and branches -- like a computer program. It has genes that regulate genes that regulate genes...genes that sense changes in the environment, and then instruct other genes to react by setting in motion complex cascades of events that can then modify the environment.

Some genes actively rearrange themselves...changing portions of the instruction manual...!

The bottom line is this: the genome's set of instructions is not a simple, static, linear array of letters; [it] is dynamic, self-regulating, and multi-dimensional. There is no human information system that can even begin to compare to it.

The genome's highest levels of complexity and interaction are probably beyond the reach of our understanding... All this mind-boggling information is [located] within a genomic package that is contained within a cell's nucleus -- a space much smaller than the smallest speck of dust (from J.C. Sanford, a Cornell University professor and plant geneticist). *6 {some of the quotes throughout this book have been taken from secondary sources, so I apologize for passing on any typos, etc.}

Yet there must have been simple organisms before natural selection could begin to have any sort of effect, so the original kernel of this wonderful microcosm could only have come about by chance. We are going to see how unlikely this is.

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

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

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

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

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

Compare this to the fact that there are only 10 {to the power} 80 atoms in the whole universe.*7

4. Dependency

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

<Oversimplified, life depends on a complex arrangement of three classes of molecules: DNA, which stores the cell's master plans; RNA, which transports a copy of the needed information contained in the DNA to the protein assembly station; and proteins, which make up everything from the ribosomes to the enzymes. Further, chaperons and many other assembly tools are needed to ensure that the protein is properly assembled. All of these parts are necessary and must exist as a properly assembled and integrated unit. DNA is useless without both RNA and proteins, although some types of bacteria can combine the functions of the basic required parts.

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

Even if they existed, the many parts needed for life could not sit idle waiting for the other parts to evolve, because the existing ones would usually deteriorate very quickly from the effects of dehydration, oxidation, and the action of bacteria or other pathogens. For this reason, only an instantaneous creation of all the necessary parts as a functioning unit can produce life. No compelling evidence has ever been presented to disprove this conclusion, and much evidence exists for the instantaneous creation requirement, such as the discovery that most nucleotides degrade rather fast at the temperatures scientists conclude existed on the early earth (Irion, 1998). *8

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

<If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down. *9

5. The Exclusivity of Selection

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

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

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

<It may be said that natural selection is daily and hourly scrutinising, throughout the world, every variation, even the slightest; rejecting that which is bad, preserving and adding up all that is good; silently and insensibly working, whenever and wherever opportunity offers, at the improvement of each organic being in relation to its organic and inorganic conditions of life {*Darwin*}.*10

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

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

6. Helpful Glitches?

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

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

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

becoming reality if the sanctity of human life is completely undermined.

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

<So glibly do the phrases 'higher animals' and 'lower animals' trip off our tongues that it comes as a shock to realize that, far from effortlessly slotting into evolutionary thinking as one might suppose, they were -- and are -- deeply antithetical to it. We think we know that chimpanzees {our nearest ancestors according to evolutionists} are higher animals and earthworms are lower, we think we've always known what that means, and we think evolution makes it even clearer. But it doesn't. It is by no means clear that it means anything at all. Or if it means anything, it means so many different things as to be misleading, even pernicious {Dawkins}.*11

Humanism is living on borrowed time. It is a relic of Judeo-Christianity. In reality, if Dawkins is right, then there can be no purpose for life and no worth in morality of any sort, including basic respect for humanity.

Back to the point, in an attempt to prove that mutations could eventually cause macroevolution, Richard Dawkins in *The Blind Watchmaker* described a computer program he designed that sharply brought down the odds of a monkey randomly typing a short line from Shakespeare. Yet the program included features of intelligent design, as each guess from the monkey was weighed against what the final outcome was supposed to be, with any successes along the way being retained. Thus the process wasn't blind at all; it had a goal while guarding its "improvements" towards that goal.

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

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

The first monkey whacked the computer with a rock. Others urinated and defecated on the keyboard. In that time, the monkeys produced the equivalent of five typed pages but not a single word in the entire text. The text contained mainly strings of Ss and the occasional A, L, M, and J. The literary efforts of the six monkeys have been printed in a limited edition book entitled 'Notes Toward the Complete Works of Shakespeare.'*12

7. The Inner Being

Darwin recognized the danger to his theory that instincts posed yet did little to answer them. Read his introduction to a section where he attempts to discuss the issue in a very shallow and unsatisfying way...

<The subject of instinct might have been worked into the previous chapters; but I have thought that it would be more convenient to treat the subject separately, especially as so wonderful an instinct as that of the hive-bee making its cells will probably have occurred to many readers, as a difficulty sufficient to overthrow my whole theory. I must premise, that I have nothing to do with the origin of the primary mental powers, any more than I have with that of life itself.*13

He then goes on to describe instincts as habit or necessity for the most part, which is ludicrous. A spider spinning a web from birth skilfully with no teacher or a butterfly navigating a two thousand mile migration route without a guide can't be

Thank You for previewing this eBook

You can read the full version of this eBook in different formats:

- HTML (Free /Available to everyone)
- PDF / TXT (Available to V.I.P. members. Free Standard members can access up to 5 PDF/TXT eBooks per month each month)
- Epub & Mobipocket (Exclusive to V.I.P. members)

To download this full book, simply select the format you desire below

