

quite natural for any of us to ~~make a statement~~ such a statement as this:

the following:
"There [to An] 17e"

B ~~been the only~~ ~~formulated at the fallacy that God could not accomplish all the work of each day in the short period of the forty four hours.~~ *OUR SIXTH POINT is that the work of each day in the short period of the forty four hours.* (p.9)

The sixth argument is stated as follows:

Of course this is not the question under discussion at all. God could have done everything that is described in Genesis 1 in 6 24-hour ~~days~~ *periods of each* or in 6 periods of 24 minutes each or of 24 seconds each. He could have done it all in one second. The question is

not what he could have done, but what he did. *He could have sent his son to earth as a full grown man, if he chose. Instead he chose to let him grow up in his to see what the Scripture says about it. As Rimmer himself says on page 2:*

⑤ "A MAN OF BRAINS AND ABILITY CAN MAKE UP A PLAUSIBLE CASE FOR ANY SIDE OF ANY

QUESTION." *Such arguments as these prove nothing, the only thing that matters is what*

are the actual facts. *E to (7) below.*

④ Similarly, the ~~10th~~ *ninth* argument is that since evolutionists believe in long periods of creation we should not believe in them. I certainly feel that we should not accept any view because unbelievers hold it, but neither should we reject a view because unbelievers hold it. We should go to the Scripture and see what it teaches. Such arguments as these are interesting and often seem convincing but prove nothing.

Cp. 13-14 asserts that
The 12th argument that since the sun's rays were not visible, since the sun was not

visible to the earth on the ~~3rd~~ *third* day, the ~~3rd~~ *third* day could not have been a long period because vegetation could not grow without the sun. *This is simply an argument and we have*

no right to limit the power of God.
We cannot say what God might have chosen to do. Anyway, the first day provided light, and what the vegetation needs *for the* to grow is light, not necessarily direct rays of the sun. Such arguments prove nothing. *As Rimmer himself says in p. 27 (5) above not such arguments as these, but definite*

⑦ What really matters is the specific evidence that Rimmer advances. I did not find a great deal of this in the 14 pages of the debate. However, there were a few statements which ~~seem to point specifically to definite evidence.~~ *claim* *was* Rimmer is an able speaker, capable