



The Book of Job Lesson 14 4Q 2016

Some Lessons From Job

SABBATH

When you consider the book of Job, what are the main lessons you take from it?

- God is not the source of evil
- There is a reality beyond which we can see, a dimension with which we are currently out of phase
- That there is a real intelligent being who is evil, consumed completely with selfishness
- That bad things can happen to good people through no choice or wrong of their own
- That people with good intentions can be the voice of the evil one
- That sometimes the circumstances we are in don't make sense to our current level of understanding—yet God is still good and is worthy of our trust!
- That we have genuine freedom and God doesn't use His power to control His intelligent creatures like puppets.
- The way the world currently operates is out of harmony with God's design—in other words, we cannot look at nature and say, the strong prey on the weak, innocents are slaughtered all the time, therefore God is the one doing this, or it is God's will for it to be this way, or it is God's design. No! God challenged Job's assumption on this and pointed out that Job was not there when God created earth and life on it, and Job's current view is misinformed. Much of our modern world, both Christian and scientific need to learn this lesson!
- others?

Read second paragraph, “We have no reason...” What do you hear this saying? That just because we cannot currently understand something doesn't mean God is not good or that God cannot be trusted. That the problem is in our limited awareness of all the facts and variables involved, **but**, is this saying that because we are limited in our understanding that we should NOT try to comprehend and understand? No! God invites us to reason, to think, to intelligently understand as far as we are able and to never rest satisfied in our current understanding but to keep moving forward in the truth! thoughts?

SUNDAY

The lesson points us to 2Cor 5:7: “We live by faith, not by sight.” and 2 Cor 4:18: “So we fix our eyes not on what is seen, but on what is unseen. For what is seen is temporary, but what is unseen is eternal.”

Thoughts about these passages?

What does it mean to live by faith and not be sight? Does it mean believing without evidence?



Remember this quote from a quarterly a few years ago:

“There is always a need for faith, which is belief in something we don’t totally see or understand. If we could totally see it or understand it, then there would be no room for faith. We don’t need faith to believe that the sky is over our heads. We can look up and see it. Faith is needed, instead, to believe in the God who lives beyond that sky, because we can’t see Him.”¹

Is this correct, or is there an error in this line of thinking? What is the error? If this is the correct way to understand faith, then when Jesus comes and we see Him face to face do we say, “Jesus I used to have faith in you, but now that I meet you, see you, come to know you and understand you I don’t have faith in you any more?” Or will our faith be so much stronger on that day?

So how do understand the passages?

This lesson did a good job of describing it correctly, read first paragraph, “The immediate...” How is this correct and the paragraph about the sky incorrect?

Because this paragraph is about faith in a promise for something not yet experienced, and we have no evidence of what has been promised, thus we live by trusting or having faith in the One who promised. But, even though we don’t have evidence of the future promise, do we have abundant evidence of the existence of God and His trustworthiness? Yes, so the point is this:

Our faith in God is based on EVIDENCE of His existence and His trustworthiness, which He has provided in abundance. However, we do not have current evidence to prove that everything He has promised is real, that we take on faith because of the evidence of the trustworthiness of the One who promised.

Does this make sense? I want to hammer this point home, because in Christianity texts like these have been used to teach a lie that we don’t have or need evidence to believe in God, not so, our faith in God is supposed to be based on the evidences He has provided and what are the three threads of evidence?

- Scripture
- Science
- Experience

Jesus followed the **divine plan of education...** His education was gained directly from the **Heaven-appointed sources; from useful work, from the study of the Scriptures and of nature, and from the experiences of life--God's lesson books**, full of instruction to all who bring to them the willing hand, the seeing eye, and the understanding heart. {Ed 77.2}

¹ *Bible Biographies, Actors in the Drama Called Planet Earth.* Adult Bible Study Guide (Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press Pub. Assn. [April-June 2001]): 128.



What do you say to those who report it is illogical to believe in God because we cannot see Him?

What are answers that can put this argument to rest?

Read third and fourth paragraphs:

A preacher stood before a church in a large city. He asked the congregation to be quiet. For a few seconds there was no sound. He then pulled out a radio and turned it on, running the dial across the channels. All sorts of sounds came out of the radio.

“Let me ask,” the preacher said, “Where did these sounds come from? Did they originate in the radio itself? No, these sounds were in the air all around us, as radio waves, waves just as real as my voice is now. But the way we are wired, we don’t have access to them. But the fact that we can’t see or feel or hear them doesn’t mean that they don’t exist, right?”

Are there other examples of things we cannot sense, but are proven to be real?

- Light beyond our visual spectrum—ultraviolet, infrared
- Sound beyond our ability to hear
- Smells beyond our ability to smell—
 - Dogs are believed to have sense of smell 10,000 to 100,000 times as sensitive as ours. If we translated the 10,000 times better to vision—we can see a third of a mile, then a dog could see 3,000 miles!
 - Dogs can sense up to 1 part per trillion. For instance, we could tell if we had a teaspoon of sugar in a cup of coffee, a dog could sense that same teaspoon of sugar a million gallons of water, the amount in two Olympic size pools.
 - There are reports of dogs finding 35 pounds of marijuana packed in plastic container submerged in gasoline within a gas tank.
- Radiation
- Gravity
- Nuclear forces—the force that hold nucleuses of molecules together
- What about quantum forces?

Are there spiritual lessons we can learn from this?

Why should we believe that life is intelligently designed rather than just randomly coming to be on its own?

Last week I mentioned the differences between origin science and evolutionary science. Origin is science on how things came into existence, whereas evolutionary science is about how things adapt and change based on experience. The problem with godless evolutionary science however is that you



cannot start evolving until origin happens, if nothing originates then there is nothing to evolve. And all the origin science supports creation and refutes a godless origin.

If you examine the big premises of what evolution teaches about origins versus what creation teaches about origins in light of the scientific method, i.e. what is testable and reproducible, we find something quite interesting—that creation is more scientific than evolution. Here are the big premises:

- Evolution—something came from nothing
- Creation—something came from something else

- Evolution—order came from disorder on its own with no intelligent input—this idea violates the second law of thermodynamics and all scientific experiments disprove the theory
- Creation—order came from disorder with intelligent input—this idea is in harmony with the second law of thermodynamics and life proves this to be true every day

- Evolution—life came from non-living matter on its own, spontaneous generation—which has been proven scientifically to be false, so scientists came up with a new name—abiogenesis, which also has no evidence in science.
- Creation—life comes from living matter—which the entire planet every day demonstrates to be true

Further problems with the godless view of origin are well described in Nancy Pearcey's book *Finding Truth* (I want to thank Marilyn Holm an online listener for gifting me this book) writes:

The origin of the universe has given rise to a puzzle known as the fine-tuning problem. The fundamental physical constants of the universe are exquisitely balanced, as though on a knife's edge, to sustain life. Things like the force of gravity, the strong nuclear force, the weak nuclear force, the electromagnetic force, the ratio of the mass of the proton and the electron, and many other factors have just the right value needed to make life possible. If any of these critical numbers were changed even slightly, the universe could not sustain any form of life. For example, if the strength of gravity were smaller or larger than its current value by only one part in 10^{60} (1 followed by 60 zeroes), the universe would be uninhabitable. (page 25)

She goes on to say:

What makes the fine-tuning problem so puzzling is that there is no *physical* cause to explain it. "Nothing in all of physics explains why its fundamental principles should conform themselves so precisely to life's requirement," says astronomer George Greenstein. p. 26

Why do you think chemists have never been able to create life in a lab? Pearcey quotes Physicist Paul Davies and says:

The central role of information explains why scientists have failed "to cook up life in the chemistry lab. Chemistry is about substances and how they react, whereas biology appeals to



concepts such as information”—which is clearly *not* chemical. Genetic information can be described only by using terminology borrowed from the mental world of language and communication: DNA is “a genetic ‘database,’ containing ‘instructions’ on how to build an organism. The genetic ‘code’ has to be ‘transcribed’ and ‘translated’ before it can act.” p 27

Pearcy points out:

Biologists’ favorite analogy for DNA is a computer. The molecule itself (the physical chain of chemicals) is the hardware. The DNA (the encoded information) is the software. In the origin-of-life research, the focus is on building the hardware. “Attempts at chemical synthesis focus exclusively on the hardware—the chemical substrate of life,” Davies writes; they “ignore the software—the informational aspect.” Yet any twelve-year-old kid with a laptop knows that building an electronic device out of copper, plastic, and silicone has nothing to do with writing the code to create the software program.

The surprising implication is that even if scientists succeeded in coaxing all the right chemicals to link up and form DNA molecules in a test tube, *that would do nothing to explain where the encoded genetic information came from.* p 27.

And, if the scientists in a lab did get the chemicals to form strands of DNA they would deny that they were using their intelligence to create the very conditions needed for the DNA to form—meaning it didn’t happen randomly on its own, but with intelligent input.

There are other lines of reason to support intelligent design to be much more reasonable than a godless origin. First the principle of cause and effect, in order for an effect to occur the cause has to be capable of producing the effect.

Pearcy puts it like this:

Because humans are capable of knowing, the first cause that produced them must have a mind. Because humans are capable of choosing, the first cause must have a will. And so on. Philosopher Etienne Gilson captures the argument neatly: because a human is *someone* and not a *something*, the source of human life must also be a *Someone*.

Materialism cannot explain human consciousness. There is nothing in science that has ever even come up with a theory for the existence of human consciousness.

Philosopher Even Fales calls it a mystery: “Darwinian evolution implies that humans emerged through the blind operation of natural forces. It is mysterious how such forces could generate something nonphysical.” Pearcy p. 109



Philosopher Colin McGinn treats it akin to a miracle. “We do not know how consciousness might have arisen by natural processes from antecedently existing material things. One is tempted, however reluctantly, to turn to divine assistance...” Percy p. 109

So, we come to the deep denial and foundation of a faith with evidence system of belief for those who deny the existence of God:

In the words of philosopher Galen Strawson, the denial of consciousness “is surely *the strangest thing that has ever happened in the whole history of human thought.*” It shows “that the power of human credulity [ability to believe without evidence] is unlimited, that the capacity of human minds to be gripped by theory, by faith, is truly unbounded.” It reveals “the deepest irrationality of the human mind.” Ibid. p 110

When we speak of evolution, the adaptation of things over time, the Bible teaches that this process is the way God designed reality to work. This is why God said to Adam and Eve that they would create beings in their image. It is found in the commandments that the sins would pass down 3 and 4 generations. It is found in Psalms that we are born in sin and conceived in iniquity. The Bible teaches that we were created with the ability to learn, adapt, change and pass those changes along to the next generation. This is epigenetic modification which happens within a few generations and which science has documented in thousands of examples.

Any examples of adaptation?

- Darwin’s famous finches – with all the different beaks; the diversity of beaks Darwin observed didn’t happen over millions of years due to random mutation, but happened in 1-2 generations due to environment and epigenetic modification. Amazingly, Darwin’s finches are evidence of creation, not evolution.² Had Darwin had the advantage of modern DNA science his theory of change over millions of years would have been refuted.
- Not all changes, since humankind deviated from God’s design are adaptive and consistent with how God designed life to operate.
 - Telomere shortening, which contributes to aging
 - Epigenetic modification in response to famine, which contributes to obesity in offspring

² Abzhanov, Arhat; Meredith Protas, B. Rosemary Grant, Peter R. Grant, Clifford J. Tabin (September 3, 2004), "[Bmp4 and Morphological Variation of Beaks in Darwin's Finches](#)", *Science* (USA: AAAS) **305** (5689): 1462–1465, [doi:10.1126/science.1098095](#), [ISSN 0036-8075](#), [OCLC 1644869](#), [PMID 15353802](#), retrieved 2008-03-08

Abzhanov, Arhat; Winston P. Kuo, Christine Hartmann, B. Rosemary Grant, Peter R. Grant and Clifford J. Tabin (August 3, 2006), "[The calmodulin pathway and evolution of elongated beak morphology in Darwin's finches](#)", *Nature* (UK: Nature Publishing Group) **442**(7102): 563–567, [doi:10.1038/nature04843](#), [ISSN 0028-0836](#), [OCLC 1586310](#), [PMID 16885984](#), retrieved 2008-03-08



- Epigenetic modification related to alcohol, which results in offspring of mothers who drink while pregnant have change in taste receptors such that alcohol tastes better than if mother didn't drink while pregnant
- 1000 new damaging mutations in the human genome every generation—the genome is degrading slowly—again consistent with the second law of thermodynamics and just the opposite of the evolutionary theory

So what if we changed the words in Genesis 1:1 from: “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” To:

“Earth began when an extra-terrestrial intelligence came and terraformed it establishing a viable atmosphere and a stable planet.”

Does this say anything that contradicts the traditional view? Would non-believers be more open to it? Would you be comfortable or uncomfortable using this language? If we did use this language wouldn't the most important question still be—who is this extra-terrestrial intelligence? Is he a being we can trust?

Why is it so many prefer the illogical, evidence-denying idea that there is no God and the universe came into being by itself, ordered itself, and generated life all by itself without any intelligent input?

Because the alternative from human history has been worse—a false god who is worse than the worst human dictator—supreme in power and a being who will torture those who don't love him for all eternity.

Many people who have rejected God and gone to a godless view of reality is because the god construct they have been presented with is one that rightly should be rejected. The good news however, is that that God construct is false. We have an incredible truth, a message about our Designer God whose laws are the protocols upon which reality functions, who is always love and is seeking to heal and restore all who trust Him!

MONDAY

Read second paragraph, “Evil is something put into...” Any questions or concerns about this paragraph?

I personally am not comfortable with this description. For me evil requires volition, intention, choice, thus inanimate nature is not capable of evil. Evil requires the choice to reject good and choose evil, without that choice it might be harmful, it might be destructive, it might be a result of some other evil, but itself is not evil.

- is water evil?



- What if water is used to drown someone? Now is water evil?
- What if the water was from a flood, is water now evil?
- Is the flood evil?
- What if the flood was due to a broken dam that broke simply because of age—was the dam evil? Was the water evil? Was it evil for the people to build the dam?
- What if the flood was due to heavy rains, are rains evil?
- What if the heavy rains flooded an area because of development of the area in a flood plane, was it evil to develop an area at risk for flooding?
- Could someone perpetrate evil by using water—drowning someone on purpose, blowing up a dam etc.? Is the water evil? Is the dam evil? Are the explosives evil? Is the flood which occurred because the dam was blown up evil? What was evil? The choice to deviate from love and act selfishly and destructively.
- What about pestilence—is a bacteria evil, or a result of evil in the world?

Read last paragraph, “In Job’s case...” What was the evil for which Satan was responsible? Is the evil in the natural event, or in the one who instigated the natural event to perpetrate harm?

Is a knife evil? What if a knife is used perform life-saving surgery, is the knife evil? What if a knife is used to murder someone, is the knife now evil?

This type of thinking, calling inanimate things evil leads to superstitious thinking:

- black cats are evil
- carved images, statues are evil
- pentagrams and goats heads are evil
- rabbits feet are good luck
- crosses are protection from evil
- a Bible in my car will keep me from a wreck

As we said last week in every culture of the world when you ask people to define evil it always involves exploiting or injuring another human being, and sometimes cruelty to animals, but never to cultures define evil by doing something to inanimate material.

TUESDAY

The lesson is about the friends who were more of a burden than a relief to Job and in the first paragraph it states, “However, after Job first started speaking, bemoaning the tragedies that befell him, they apparently felt it was more important for them to put Job in his place and set his theology straight than it was to encourage and uplift the spirits of their suffering friend.”

Do we ever see this today?



Do you remember the story from the beginning of *The God-Shaped Brain* of the young woman who came to see me distraught because she and her husband were unable to get pregnant? Her pastor had told her that God was punishing her because when she was a teen she had gotten pregnant and had an abortion and now God was punishing her by making her infertile.

Why would a pastor say such a thing to a young lady hurting as she was? What would motivate the pastor?

Who was the pastor trying to comfort—the young lady or himself? In other words, the pastor saying what he said because he needed to continue to promote a framework that brought him comfort regardless of who he hurt.

This is what Job's friends were doing—Job's friends saw the terrible tragedy that befell Job and it would most certainly cause them some anxiety and distress, and they would want to feel safe and secure in their situation. How? By finding fault with Job, it must be Job's fault and as long as it is Job's fault, something Job did to deserve this, then they didn't have to live in fear and anxiety as long as they didn't do something evil. So, Job just needs to admit he was wrong and deserved this so they can all go home and feel secure.

They wanted to be in control, believe that they were in control of what happened to them and could keep themselves safe. They didn't want to live in a universe in which they were not in control, thus they had this theology of rules and as long as they obey the rules they are safe.

This is very much one of the reasons for the penal views of theology we deal with today. God has His rules, if we know the rules and keep them then we are safe, we cannot be tagged out if we are on base so to speak. Thus many people cling to this false legal view and put burdens on innocents, just like Job's friends, so they can make themselves feel better.

The third paragraph compares how Jesus treated the woman caught in adultery with how Job's friends treated him. Then the lesson says this, "But even if he had been guilty like this woman, what Job needed from these men was what this woman needed, and what all suffering people need: grace and forgiveness."

What do you understand this to be saying? What does "grace and forgiveness" mean to you?

How can this be heard very accurately and correctly in God's plan and how can this be heard very inaccurately and even destructively?

What is grace? How would you explain it to a non-Christian you met on an airplane?

What about forgiveness, what do you understand it to be?



What law lens do you see these things through?

If we operate under the imposed law lens, broken rules which require inflicted punishment, grace means unmerited favor and forgiveness means legal pardon.

If we view these things through design law, we realize grace is God's constant interest, work, expenditure of energy and resources for the healing and restoration of His creation—because God is always gracious. And forgiveness is more than personal or legal pardon, it is the actual experience of being forgiven in the heart which brings repentance and reconciliation.

So the woman caught in adultery did not need to be legally pardoned, she needed to have her guilt, shame, self-loathing, self-disgust, fear of rejection and belief that she was too sinful for God or others to love removed. This is God's grace manifested in Christ's actions in dispersing the crowd and then asking where are her accusers. In other words, "Young lady, I am not accusing you." Why not? There is no need. Her actions were condemning her. Jesus is saying, "I know where you were just now and what you were doing. If you had not been caught and brought before me you would have snuck home, head hung low, consumed with guilt and shame, feeling worthless, searing your conscience and warping your character. I don't condemn you because your own actions are what are condemning and destroying you—why? Because you are acting outside my design for life and relationships and whenever someone chooses to do so they damage themselves. Please stop hurting yourself like this and go and live in harmony with my design—sin no more!

Here is an EGW quote:

God's forgiveness is not merely a judicial act by which He sets us free from condemnation. **It is not only forgiveness for sin but reclaiming from sin. It is the outflow of redeeming love that transforms the heart.** David had the true conception of forgiveness when he prayed, "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me." Psalm 51:10. {FLB 129.2}

If you have concerns about the "not merely a judicial act" meaning that is in part a judicial act, I would say this is because of the written law being added because of transgression to bring us to repentance, so for those who are still operating under the burden of the added written law God doesn't leave them in fear and insecurity, but adds for their peace the language of legal pardon, but there problem was never a legal problem it was always a condition of heart problem.

WEDNESDAY

Read fourth paragraph, "Secular writers, atheistic writers..." Do you know anyone who believes this way? How sad, to think we are only here for up to a 100 years and then we die and it meant nothing?

What does such a concept lead to?



Eat, drink and be merry for tomorrow we die—hedonism—live for the moment, no sense in planning for a future.

The loss of a sense of right and wrong, everything is right if you can get away with it....as some think.

THURSDAY

What parallels do you see in the story of Job and the story of Jesus?

- A conflict over the character of God in which Satan works to misrepresent God; Job and Jesus work to reveal the truth about God
- Job had friends who were suggesting lies to him—Jesus friends (Peter) also suggested lies to him
- Job was righteous and was accused of not being righteous, Jesus was sinless and accused of being sinful
- Job suffered by no wrong action of his own, but because of who he was in God's plan. Jesus suffered by no wrong action of his own but because of who is was in God's plan
- Job turned to nature for answers—but drew the wrong conclusions, Jesus turned to nature as illustration to reveal the right answers!
- Job's wife had no role in his struggle to overcome his dilemma, except to perhaps add an additional burden; Christ's bride played no role in his struggle to overcome his dilemma, except to add a burden (remember when Christ asked His disciples to watch with Him, they slept, and one betrayed Him.)
- Job converses with God and finally come to peace; Jesus prays to His Father during His greatest agony and in that conversation comes to peace.
- Job, even though he lost children and had property destroyed, receives a greater property and more children in the end. Jesus, even though He lose many of His children and has had His property (earth) destroyed, in the end has many children restored to eternal life and His universe renewed in perfection.

Other parallels?

FRIDAY

read and discuss questions.



ANNOUNCEMENTS:

We need HELP! With what? Well, after 10 years of ministry, this website has collected a huge number of articles, blogs, videos, podcasts, and notes that need to be categorized and indexed, so YOU can easily find all that's been said on a particular topic. The problem is, we don't have hundreds of eyes and ears on staff to search, read, listen, and find all these nuggets of truth. So, Come And Reason is calling on you, our faithful supporters, to help us with this task.

What do we need from you? Easy. Whenever you come across an article, blog, video, audio, or note that talks about a specific topic (like wrath, punishment, sanctuary, temple, mind, character, sin, death, etc., etc.), simply go to About > Contact Us and send us a note telling us where you found the information (page # in a document/note, time index in a video or audio file, the exact web address where you found the material, and the TOPIC the citation is talking about). We'll take those TOPICS and arrange them into categories and build a new menu entry to index all these resources.

Thank you, all, ahead of time for your participation and help in this rather significant endeavor!

Calendar: Come and Reason now has a Calendar of Events on our Website. If you would like to know what is coming up or where Dr. J is speaking or who is teaching a particular week, check out the calendar.

January 20, 21, 2017: Dr. Jennings will be speaking at The Haven in St. Helena, California

April 27-29: Dr. Jennings will be speaking at the AACC Event The Struggle Is Real at the Thomas Road Baptist Church at Liberty University at Lynchburg, VA. For more info visit <http://lynchburg.cmhcsummit.com/>

May 6, 2017: Dr. Jennings will be speaking at Summit Northwest Ministries, Post Falls, Idaho: for more info visit: <http://www.summitnorthwest.org/>

June 8-10, 2017: Dr. Jennings will be speaking at the AACC Event The Struggle is Real in Naperville, IL.

September 15,16 2017: Dr. Jennings will be speaking at the Church in the Valley, Aldergrove, British Columbia, Canada.

October 12-16, 2017: Dr. Jennings will be speaking at Garden Grove SDA church in Garden Grove, CA. This will be a multi-speaker event focusing on the atonement. For more information contact:

Garden Grove Seventh-day Adventist Church
12702 9th Street
Garden Grove, CA 92840
Church office hours: Monday - Thursday 9:00 am - 4:00 pm

Phone: (714) 534-1987
Fax: (714) 534-3877
Email: office@gardengrovesda.com

October 27, 28, 2017: Dr. Jennings will speaking at the Arlington SDA church in Arlington, TX. For more information contact: <http://www.arlingtonadventist.com/>