



**Phil Enlow** 

All scripture quotations, unless otherwise indicated, are taken from the HOLY BIBLE, NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION<sup>®</sup>. NIV<sup>®</sup>. Copyright ©1973, 1978, 1984 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved.

Copyright 2008

First Printing - January 2008

Published by Midnight Cry Ministries P.O. Box 685 Southern Pines, North Carolina 28388 USA

Website: www.midnightcry.org

# **Table of Contents**

Introduction
Chapter One: A Personal Journey
Chapter Two: A Tale of Two World-views
Chapter Three: What Does the Bible Actually Teach? 11
Chapter Four: Noah and The Flood
Chapter Five: Jesus and Creation
Chapter Six: <i>Thus Far</i>
Chapter Seven: <i>What About Science</i> ?
Chapter Eight: Is The Earth Old?
Chapter Nine: In Conclusion

## Introduction

The word "genesis" means "beginning." The Book of Genesis is the beginning of God's revelation given to us in the Bible. Its pages reveal the foundation of all that follows. All biblical truth rests upon the simple assertion in Genesis 1:1, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

There is a renewed debate in our day, both in the world and within the church concerning Genesis, particularly chapters 1-11. Is it history? Or do these pages contain mere religious myths and legends, nice moral stories, but ones that certainly cannot be considered historically true in a modern world?

What about the claims of modern science? Have not scientists proven that the world and the universe are billions of years old and therefore that the Bible is not true — or at least that its account of beginnings cannot be taken at face value? It would be fair to say that this is the prevailing opinion in the world today — yet there is a growing challenge.

But on what basis can modern science reasonably be challenged? Is this challenge simply a "hide-your-head-in-the-sand" and "refuse-to-face-reality" effort on the part of a few religious fanatics desperate to defend their blind faith in the midst of a post-Christian world? Or—as some contend—is this whole issue merely a diversion from our real business—preaching the gospel? In other words, do these questions make any difference? Isn't it enough to simply believe that God created everything?

I hope with the Lord's help to tackle these issues head-on. As a minister of God's Word I am called to preach the whole counsel of God. The Bible does not begin with Genesis 12 and Abraham but with God's account of the creation and fall and also the flood of Noah's day. I refer often in both preaching and writing to these accounts and I believe it is important that they be understood not simply as Sunday school stories but as real history involving real people. My convictions were not always quite so clear cut.

### Chapter One

## **A Personal Journey**

In the last couple of centuries or so there has been an unprecedented attack against the Bible and Christian truth. In our day this assault is often very frontal and bold but in the beginning it was a much more subtle attack, focused on Genesis, the book of beginnings. Satan is well aware that if the foundation of truth is destroyed the rest will crumble in time. After all, if Genesis isn't true, then what else in the Bible isn't true? In fact, why believe any of the Bible?

And so unbelieving scientists began to contend that the earth was not a few thousand years old as a straightforward reading of the Bible would lead you to believe but was rather much older. At first the claims were on the order of many thousands, but thousands grew into hundreds of thousands and hundreds of thousands grew into millions, and so forth. But few Christians saw any real problems with this growing belief. "A side issue," they said. "Let's just preach the gospel." And so, most compromised, trying in various ways to fit these new-found millions of years into God's Word.

#### My Own Background

The religious environment in which I grew up was a product of that compromise. My father was a minister, a man of simple and genuine faith who faithfully preached God's Word as he was enabled to understand it. However, given the prevailing compromises regarding the creation account, I don't remember my father, or anyone else for that matter, raising any serious objections to "millions of years." I will say, however, that it was my father who years later pushed me to take another look at the issue so it is likely that he had privately questioned the compromises all along.

Still, I have vivid memories of my fascination with dinosaurs as a boy, a fascination that is, no doubt, shared by most boys! Picture books, stories, and miniature dinosaur figures fed my active imagination with images of wonderful and mysterious ages gone by.

Of course, everything I heard in school helped to reinforce the now-standard "old-earth" view of things. I certainly knew enough to see through and resist the doctrine of evolution but I did not have the means nor did I even see the need to question the age of the earth as it was everywhere taught. And so I believed that God had created everything, that the Garden of Eden was a real place, and that dinosaurs had become extinct 65 million years ago. Conflict? What conflict?

#### College

Then I went to college. Had I gone to a typical secular college there is no question as to what I would have been taught. But I didn't. I attended a major Christian college, a very conservative institution with a strong view of biblical inspiration. How did they deal with this issue?

It didn't take long to find out. One of my first courses was Old Testament Survey. The Old Testament begins, of course, with Genesis so on the very first day of classes we were launched into a discussion of the creation account! Along with an acknowledgment of what the text actually said we were presented with a sort of "menu" of various ways to harmonize the Genesis creation account with the (seemingly) well-established scientific facts regarding the age of the earth. All of these options were presented as legitimate scriptural views and it was sort of up to us to pick the one we liked the best!

I'm sure that somewhere during my college days it was acknowledged that there were those who took the Genesis account literally and believed that the earth was about 6000 years old but I don't remember ever encountering someone who actually believed that and I even heard the idea ridiculed. Surely no one could reasonably cling to such a view in the modern world! And what a needless hindrance it would be to evangelism if converts were expected to commit intellectual suicide and embrace such a ridiculous and outmoded idea!

I seem to remember three main views being presented (at least those are the ones that stand out as I think back). One of them was called the "Age-Day" theory. The days weren't really 24-hour days but rather long ages. Of course it was noted that order of what happened on the six days has little correspondence with the apparent order in which things happened from a scientific point of view. However, that difficulty was dismissed by the oft-repeated saying that the Bible was not written as a scientific textbook and that the creation account could be understood as a logical—or perhaps theological—account of things. In other words, it was designed to convey spiritual truth and it wasn't, therefore, a problem that the days were seemingly out of order.

As I look at the subject today it seems to me that what is currently called the "Progressive Creation" view is either the same as, or at least overlaps the Age-Day view as it was presented to us then. This view counters Evolution by contending that God—over long ages—gradually introduced the various "kinds" of animals into the world as special acts of creation.

Another view was the "Gap Theory." This view, popularized by the Scofield Bible, contends that there is a gap between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2. In this view there was another world that was created and then ruined during that "gap" and that the creation we now know is more a re-creation than a creation. This allows those who hold this theory to account for millions of years and ancient fossils and the like while still holding that the creation of Genesis took place about 6000 years ago.

Yet another view was "Theistic Evolution." How such opposite views can reasonably be integrated into one theory is a mystery to me! It's like saying, "Up Down," or "Black White." In any case Theistic Evolution contends that God used evolution to create and never intended the Genesis account to be taken literally.

I suppose I came nearer to an "Age-Day" view than the others but mostly I sort of filed the whole issue away as "secondary" and "not that important" and went on. All of this took place in the 1960s and many years went by before I began to really examine the question again. If you had asked me, say, 15 years ago how I understood and reconciled the Genesis account of creation with science I would have answered—with some condescension, I'm afraid—that it wasn't important. "I know God created everything and I don't care how He did it. It's a secondary issue. We need to concentrate on preaching the gospel and getting people ready for the Lord's coming."

In other words, I still believed that God had created everything, that the Garden of Eden was a real place, and that dinosaurs had become extinct 65 million years ago. Why was that a problem? You see, in the providence of God, my faith was strong enough that I didn't need such questions answered. Unfortunately these issues are a real stumbling block to many people and there is no reason to duck them.

#### Another Look at the Issue

Then sometime in the 1990s my Dad introduced me to a series of audio tapes that presented a different view. For the first time that I recall I heard actual highly qualified scientists who not only believed—as I did—that evolution was wrong, but who also believed that the earth was a few thousand years old and that Genesis should be taken as literal history. And they did not seem to see any conflict in science. In fact they actually presented the idea that science is much more friendly to the biblical view than it is to the evolutionary one! And, more than that, some had actually begun their science careers as evolutionists!

Now this was interesting—and intriguing! I thoroughly enjoyed the various presentations that showed how preposterous atheistic evolution is but the evidence for a young earth kind of set my wheels in motion. I began to consider the heretofore unthinkable idea that maybe, just maybe, the earth really was young after all. I didn't jump on the "band wagon" about it but it did stir up my curiosity and I began occasionally to visit various websites that presented that viewpoint to see what they had to say. Mostly, however, I just filed it away as "interesting" but not exactly all that important.

One website I visited was that of the Institute for Creation Research (*www.icr.org*). About three years ago or so as I write this several brethren and I were at a convention where who should one of the exhibitors be but ICR! My interest had been piqued to the point that I devoured everything they would let me have and as I read, suddenly I "got it." I realized that this was not merely an intellectual debate about some secondary issue but that it really mattered and that Christians could and should confront it with confidence in God's Word.

The following year the convention was held in Anaheim, California so I suggested to the brethren that we go a day early and take a side trip down to the San Diego area to visit ICR. This we did and were graciously received and shown virtually everything down to the broom closets by none other than the president, Dr. John Morris. We had the privilege of spending around 15 minutes sitting down with his father, Dr. Henry Morris, who passed away sometime the following year. What a privilege! It was his book, "The Genesis Flood," written together with Dr. John Whitcomb and published in 1961, that had laid the foundation for a return to a more biblical view of creation and the flood. Would that I had known of it in college.

We also met geologist, Dr. Steve Austin, who stepped out of his lab for a few minutes to visit with us. Dr. Austin, once an evolutionist, was one of the speakers on the audio tapes I had heard years before. His research has actually affected the entire field of geology and even secular geologists have had to acknowledge his findings in several areas of study.

Since then my interest has steadily grown and I have read many things, listened to videos, attended seminars, visited websites, and

met others whose ministry focuses on this area of truth—men such as Ken Ham of Answers in Genesis (<u>www.answersingenesis.org</u>). These men have a unique and important calling. It is not my calling but, as I said earlier, Genesis 1-11 is not only a part of God's Word but it is also foundational to the rest.

#### Chapter Two

## A Tale of Two World-views

First of all I want to very briefly summarize the two principal world-views that are in conflict in our society today. A "world-view" is a basic way of looking at and explaining the world we live in. One world-view is naturalistic evolution—basically atheism—and the other is a biblical one.

In the evolutionary world-view there is no God, or at least not one who is involved in the natural world. Everything is the product of time and chance. Around 13 billion years ago or so everything in our universe including space itself existed in a "singularity," an infinitely dense, infinitely small "point" that suddenly expanded. (Where would such a point come from?!) From this "big bang" stars, galaxies, and planets gradually formed, including earth in a primitive form. Somewhere in the dim distant past—by pure chance—just the right combination of chemicals and energy combined and became living, reproducing cells. Over immense amounts of time, guided only by the hand of "Chance," small changes in living things occurred. Good changes were kept and bad changes were lost and, to make a long story short, here we all are! As some have put it, this is the "goo to you by way of the zoo" theory. To put it another way, we are all simply slime plus time.

In such a world there is really no logically defensible answer as to where we come from (just a nice story), no meaning to life, no logical basis for right and wrong, and no rational hope for the future. Why, for example, in a meaningless world of chance would it be wrong to walk up to someone and shoot them? By what rational standard based on such a world-view would that be either right or wrong? On top of that, the evolutionary world-view actually values "survival of the fittest" (the one with the gun!?) in which the strong triumph over the weak. The rapid spread of this world-view explains a lot that we see in our daily news.

### The Biblical World-view

The biblical world-view is radically different. A good and loving God created a perfect world, a paradise in which he pronounced everything "very good." There was no suffering, no pain, no death. He put this paradise under the charge of the first man, Adam, and his wife, Eve. Only one thing was forbidden: fruit from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Partaking of that fruit would be an act of rebellion leading to death. Nevertheless they were tempted and seduced into that act by a rebellious former servant of God and thus death entered the heretofore perfect creation.

It only took one generation for the first murder to occur. Over the next centuries the trend of humanity was downward into sin and darkness. Only a few remained faithful until finally it was only Noah and so God determined to destroy the corrupted race with a global flood. Noah and his family were saved along with representatives of the animal kinds so life could begin again.

After the flood, Noah and his family landed in a radically altered world and, after God forced men to separate by confusing their languages, the roots of all of our nations and peoples of today were laid as men spread across the earth.

Spiritual darkness quickly reasserted itself and God began unfolding His great plan of salvation ultimately brought about by His Son, the very instrument of our creation, coming to earth to live as a man and to die that we might live. And scripture not only tells us our history and the "why" of our world but shows us our destiny. The world is destined for fire but there is a new creation brought about through the resurrection from the dead of Jesus Christ. And those who lay down their arms of rebellion, turn their back on the world, and put their trust in Christ and what He did for them on the cross have a share in the new creation—forever!

How can two such radically world-views be mixed? Yet that is what so many Christians seem to feel they must do—what I once did.

#### Why Atheism?

The real rationale behind atheism with its belief in an old universe is the desire to be rid of God. Many leading atheists have not been shy about this. One example is Aldous Huxley who said, *"I had motives for not wanting the world to have a meaning; consequently assumed that it had none, and was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption. The philosopher who finds no meaning in the world is not concerned exclusively with a problem in pure metaphysics, he is also concerned to prove that there is no valid reason why he personally should not do as he wants to do…. For myself, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation, sexual and political."* (Notice the word "assumption"!)

After all, an all-powerful Creator would be Someone to Whom we must answer and men don't want any interference in their efforts to live as they please, gratifying their lusts. And trying to contend that there is no God AND that the earth is only a few thousand years old would go far beyond intellectual suicide. It would merit a one-way trip to an insane asylum! But add vast amounts of time and—magically—anything seems possible! Any problem, any scientific difficulty can be overcome if only we add enough time. It is not difficult to understand how influential thinkers can so stubbornly insist upon millions and billions of years: they simply must. It is a matter of will, a will that refuses to acknowledge its Creator. Peter tells us in 2 Peter 3:5 of those who "deliberately forget" the facts of creation and the flood.

I believe that any reasonable person would have to admit that the idea of millions of years would never occur to anyone based on the biblical record alone. It is an idea that has come entirely from outside the Bible. More than that it is an idea rooted in atheism and naturalism. Why in the world do Christians feel it is necessary to interpret scripture in the "higher light" of atheistic ideas?! Why not, for example, reinterpret the Bible to accommodate the ideas of modern psychology or psychiatry? Why, then, is evolutionary science allowed to sit in judgment of God's Word?

#### **Our Image of Scientists**

No doubt a major problem concerns the image of science and scientists that so many have. We tend to think of scientists as very smart men in lab coats devoted to an unbiased pursuit of truth. We frequently hear the claim that science deals with facts whereas religion deals with beliefs. And yet Darwinism—a belief—is rarely allowed to be challenged, even on purely scientific grounds, in our public institutions today. One could easily assemble an extensive chronicle detailing the intimidation and brainwashing that occurs daily in our society over evolutionary theory. Unbiased? Hardly!

Mano Singham, a university science professor writes about the trust placed by students in their highly-educated professors: "And I use that trust to effectively brainwash them. We who teach introductory physics have to acknowledge, if we are honest with ourselves, that our teaching methods are primarily those of propaganda. We appeal—without demonstration—to evidence that supports our position. We only introduce arguments or evidence that support the currently accepted theories, and omit or gloss over any evidence to the contrary." Singham may not have been so much advocating such methods as he was stating a fact, but the context of his words makes it evident that he believes himself to be doing right, acting in the best interests of his students.

In such a climate it is no wonder that many Christians have simply "thrown in the towel" and tried to fit the pronouncements of modern science into the Bible. After all, very smart, and seemingly unbiased men have "proven" all these things. Who are we to say differently? And what difference does it make anyway?

## Chapter Three

## What Does The Bible Actually Teach?

As we said earlier, in a biblical view of history, God created everything in six days and pronounced it all "very good." Genesis 1:4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25. Genesis 1:31 sums it all up: "God saw all that he had made, and it was very good." There was no suffering or death. Animals ate plants and not each other. Such corruptions only entered creation as a direct consequence of Adam's disobedience. His sin brought the curse of sin and death upon us all. Rom. 5:12 says, "Therefore, just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all men, because all sinned...." 1 Corinthians 15:21 & 22 tells us that "death came through a man," and, "in Adam all die."

Our world today lies under that curse. It is only in the new creation that there will be no more death, no more pain. These things will have passed away. Rom. 8:19-21 says, "The creation waits in eager expectation for the sons of God to be revealed. For the creation was subjected to frustration, not by its own choice, but by the will of the one who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself will be liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the glorious freedom of the children of God." See also Revelation 21:1-5. Revelation 22:3, in describing what is to come says simply, "No longer will there be any curse." There is an unbroken thread of truth beginning in Genesis 1:1 that runs all the way through Revelation 22:21.

#### The Issue That Turned The Light On

The principal issue that turned the light on for me was the simple fact that EVERY attempt to fit millions of years into the Bible means that there was death before Adam—LONG BEFORE! And such a belief seriously undermines the whole message of the Bible.

Simply put: if there was death before Adam then death is just a part of the created order of things. In other words, God meant it to be that way! He meant for animals to kill and eat each other and for others to die of horrible diseases. He meant for there to be pain and suffering in His creation—and called it all "very good"!

Try to picture the God of the Bible looking down from heaven upon hundreds of millions of years of animals suffering and dying. Perhaps He looked down one day and said, "You there, T-rex, you're not doing your job! I don't see enough blood. I want to hear more screaming as your prey dies." As Mr. T-rex raises his level of violence the Lord says, "That's much better! That's just what I intended. I'm so pleased! What a joy it is to watch my creatures scream in terror and die. Just think how many millions of years more I get to enjoy all this!"

Do you see anything wrong with this picture? Could the God of the Bible have pronounced such a creation "very good" and found pleasure in it? Are any of God's revealed purposes consistent with, not thousands, not millions, not tens of millions, but (at least) hundreds of millions of years of pain, disease and death of morally innocent animals? Think about it! How could a God Who has no pleasure in even the death of the wicked find pleasure in the suffering and death of the innocent? Ezekiel 33:11. How could anyone imagine that a holy, righteous and loving God would establish such an order of things? Animals don't sin. The only possible reason for such an order would be that God desired it to be that way.

What happened to the God who feeds the birds of the air (Matthew 6:26)? or the God who spoke of a time when, "The wolf will live with the lamb, the leopard will lie down with the goat, the calf and the lion and the yearling together; and a little child will lead them. The cow will feed with the bear, their young will lie down together,

and the lion will eat straw like the ox. The infant will play near the hole of the cobra, and the young child put his hand into the viper's nest. They will neither harm nor destroy on all my holy mountain, for the earth will be full of the knowledge of the LORD as the waters cover the sea"? Isaiah 11:6-9.

#### An Attack on God's Character

The idea that God would create a world of suffering and death is nothing short of a satanic attack upon God's character as revealed in His Word. It is one thing for His righteous wrath to be poured out on sin; it is something else again to create a suffering world where no sin exists (at least before Adam). Try to explain the suffering and tragedies of this world to your kids while holding to this compromise. You are left with no rational explanation except that God meant it to be this way. Then try to convince them of His love and His worthiness of their trust.

Even evolutionists recognize that evolution and the Bible don't fit together! Tom McIver, an anti-creationist writer wrote about the "day-age" and "gap theory": *"Each...involves critical compromises with the plainest, most literal reading of the Bible to force Scripture into concordance with scientific evidence regarding the age of the earth."* 

Jacques Monod said, "The struggle for life and elimination of the weakest is a horrible process, against which our whole modern ethics revolts. An ideal society is a non-selective society, is one where the weak is protected; which is exactly the reverse of the so-called natural law. I am surprised that a Christian would defend the idea that this is the process which God more or less set up in order to have evolution." Indeed, particularly in view of Paul's instruction to Christians to "help the weak." 1 Thessalonians 5:14.

In a biblical view man was placed over all of the works of God's hands. In a compromised view he is a very late-comer to a world already corrupted and out-of-control. In a biblical view, the corruption in the world is a result of the willful disobedience of the

one that God put in charge. In a compromised view corruption is simply a "design feature" of creation. In such a world, exactly what is it that God is going to "restore"? Acts 3:21. If suffering and death have always been with us then what is there in creation's past that can serve as a model for the promised corruption-free new creation? Corruption ultimately comes from Satan's rebellion, not God's loving design.

### **Adam's Place in Creation**

This issue of Adam's place in the created order and of the consequence of his sin and rebellion is not a minor secondary issue. If the Genesis account is not true then the rest of the Bible has no meaning. That is what is at stake.

Listen to what Genesis 1:26-31 says: "Then God said, 'Let us make man in our image, in our likeness, and let them rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air, over the livestock, over all the earth, and over all the creatures that move along the ground.' So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them. God blessed them and said to them, 'Be fruitful and increase in number; fill the earth and subdue it. Rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air and over every living creature that moves on the ground.' Then God said, 'I give you every seed-bearing plant on the face of the whole earth and every tree that has fruit with seed in it. They will be yours for food. And to all the beasts of the earth and all the birds of the air and all the creatures that move on the ground — everything that has the breath of life in it — I give every green plant for food.' And it was so. God saw all that he had made, and it was very good."

In God's order, man is a unique creation with a special place. David wrote: "When I consider your heavens, the work of your fingers, the moon and the stars, which you have set in place, what is man that you are mindful of him, the son of man that you care for him? You made him a little lower than the heavenly beings and crowned him with glory and honor. You made him ruler over the works of your hands; you put everything under his feet: all flocks and herds, and the beasts of the field, the birds of the air, and the fish of the sea, all that swim the paths of the seas." Psalm 8:3-8.

But Adam sinned and fathered a race of sinners who needed a Redeemer. The whole meaning of Christ's death is tied to Adam's sin. Both Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15 make it plain that Christ came as the "last Adam," born into Adam's race in order that in Him might be brought forth a new race, redeemed from sin and fitted for a brand new creation. Turn Adam into a myth, a nice religious story, and Christ's death becomes pointless.

Some compromisers attempt to escape this conclusion by contending that Adam's death was "spiritual," that he would have died physically anyway since death was part of the created order. But listen to God's pronouncement to Adam following his disobedience: "Cursed is the ground because of you; through painful toil you will eat of it all the days of your life. It will produce thorns and thistles for you, and you will eat the plants of the field. By the sweat of your brow you will eat your food until you return to the ground, since from it you were taken; for dust you are and to dust you will return." Genesis 3:17-19.

Notice that the ground was cursed "because of you." The natural world was affected by his disobedience. And especially notice the final part of the curse: "for dust you are and to dust you will return." That sounds like physical death to me. If he only had to be redeemed from "spiritual" death then why did Jesus die a horrible physical death to make salvation possible? When Adam and Eve sinned, the process of physical death began even as they were immediately separated from God spiritually. Christ suffered an agonizing separation from His Father AND also died physically. He also rose physically, and reigns at the Father's right hand until His promised return to finally and forever destroy the last enemy, death. 1 Corinthians 15:26.

If death is so regarded by God as an enemy, how is it that so many teach that his "very good" creation was designed to be "red in tooth and claw"? Once again, atheists understand this. That is why their efforts to undermine Genesis have been so relentless.

Atheist G. Richard Bozarth wrote, "Christianity has fought, still fights, and will continue to fight science to the desperate end over evolution, because evolution destroys utterly and finally the very reason Jesus' earthly life was supposedly made necessary. Destroy Adam and Eve and the original sin, and in the rubble you will find the sorry remains of the Son of God. If Jesus was not the redeemer who died for our sins, and this is what evolution means, then Christianity is nothing."

In attacking Genesis, Satan avoided a direct assault upon the cross. Such an attack would have resulted in a vigorous defense from Christians. Rather he cleverly attacked the record of the creation and fall, the historical foundation upon which the very need for the cross rests and his attack was, for the most part, ignored. Modern evolutionary science is nothing less than atheism with a lab coat for respectability.

#### Is God's Word Reliable?

Another very foundational issue is that of the reliability of God's Word. If we cannot trust the record of our beginnings then why trust any of the Bible?

Clearly there are portions of the Bible that are not to be taken "literally" in the strictest sense. In the scriptures we find poetry: Psalm 114:4 says, "the hills skipped like rams, and the hills like lambs." Wouldn't that be a sight! We find prophecy with symbolic language: Rev. 13:1 says, "...And I saw a beast coming out of the sea. He had ten horns and seven heads...." We find parables: Matthew 13:3 says, "Then he told them many things in parables, saying: 'A farmer went out to sow his seed."

Sometimes spiritual lessons are drawn from historical events: in Galatians 4:22-24, Paul makes note that Abraham had two sons, one by the slave woman and one by the free woman. In verse 24 he tells us that "these things may be taken figuratively...." Paul certainly didn't

mean, as some claim, that the history didn't happen, only that he saw a spiritual lesson in those historical events!

There are, of course, many other doctrinal passages, but the very backbone of the Bible is its history. It is set forth as a chronicle, in fact, of the redemptive history of mankind from the garden and the fall through the cross and the beginnings of the church. Those passages meant to be understood as poetry, prophecy, parable, allegory drawn from history, etc., are self-evident from the context in which they occur.

#### **Genesis is History**

Genesis 1-11 is clearly set forth as history. Any honest reader, considering only the text itself, would have to admit that it was written and meant to be understood that way. It is only the challenges of modern science that have caused people to back-pedal in their search for a way to harmonize the two. The style is a straightforward narrative, a recounting of events that actually happened. The style is no different from the narratives of the life of Moses, or David, or Jesus himself. Genesis may indeed not be a "science textbook" but it clearly is meant to be seen as simple history.

I am no Hebrew scholar—not at all—but those who are have demonstrated that the very construction of the creation account indicates a narrative. If I were to say to you, "Such and such happened and then this other thing happened and then something else happened and then another thing happened," you would rightly understand that I was recounting events that had actually happened in the order in which they happened. The words, "and then," make that clear. The Hebrew of the creation account has a similar construction.

And there is no need to reinterpret words like "was" and "day," as some do, in order to bow down before the sacred cows of atheistic science. Those who do are elevating the ever-changing and unproven theories of science above the Word of God. Doing so has disastrous consequences. Some—I was one—may not turn away from truth over these issues but teach the compromises, wait a generation or two and see what happens. You'll wonder why so many of your young people grow up, go off to college, and leave their "faith" behind. We cannot and must not compromise the Word of God, nor can we simply tell them to "shut up, believe, and don't ask questions."

Moses clearly believed that Genesis 1-11 was history. He was the one who, inspired by God, wrote it! He was the one who went up on the mountain to receive the Ten Commandments on stone tablets. One thing written on those tablets concerned the Sabbath and is recorded in Exodus 20:11. There we read, "For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, but he rested on the seventh day." Now think for a moment just Who it was Who wrote that! It was written in stone with "the finger of God." Exodus 31:18, Deut. 9:10. God Himself wrote it. He says He did it all in six days. Say different if you want to but I believe He is a reliable witness!

Earlier we quoted what David said in Psalm 8 about creation. There are many other Psalms in which God is clearly regarded as Creator in such a way that it is evident he saw the creation account as history. See Psalm 19:1, 74:16, 104:24, 136:9, 147:4, just to list a very few such references.

Beginning in Job 38 we find God addressing Job in no uncertain terms. And even though the language itself is poetic the underlying truth of creation shines through. He begins with a question in verse 4: "Where were you when I laid the foundations of the earth?" This passage goes on and on describing God's hand in the created order.

#### **Real People?**

Was Adam a real person? He is everywhere treated as such in the Bible. Besides the account of his life in Genesis he appears in the genealogies of mankind in 1 Chronicles 1:1 and Luke 3:38. Paul refers to him by name in Romans 5:14, 1 Corinthians 15:22 and 45, and also 1 Timothy 2:13-14. He also refers to Eve in the 1 Timothy scripture and in 2 Corinthians 11:3. Jude refers both to Adam and also to

Enoch, the seventh from Adam, in Jude 1:14. Enoch is also mentioned in Hebrews 11:5. In every case Adam and the others are treated as real people.

Abel is referred to in Matthew 23:35 and Luke 11:51 (by Jesus), Hebrews 11:4, and Hebrews 12:24. Cain, who murdered his brother, Abel, is mentioned by name in Hebrews 11:4, 1 John 3:12, and Jude 1:11.

### Chapter Four

## Noah and The Flood

And then there is Noah. It is fashionable in our day to ridicule a simple historical understanding of the account of Noah and the flood. The evident fact that there are many flood stories in various parts of the world makes it difficult to deny that there was indeed a flood of some sort in man's history but most regard the Genesis account as just one legend among many.

One of the casualties of the compromise belief in millions of years to account for the fossil record is a corresponding denial that the flood of Noah's day was universal. The flood tends to be treated as a "local" or "regional" event that perhaps killed wicked men but certainly did not inundate the entire globe. This belief results from the recognition that a flood of worldwide proportions as described in Genesis would have destroyed the fossil record they so carefully wish to preserve as evidence of long ages prior to the flood. Those who hold such a view understand that a universal flood is an alternative explanation of the fossil record and is totally incompatible with an "old earth" belief.

But what saith the scripture? Hear God's pronouncement in Genesis 6:7: "I will wipe mankind, whom I have created, from the face of the earth — men and animals, and creatures that move along the ground, and birds of the air — for I am grieved that I have made them." That sounds pretty universal to me!

In verse 13 the Lord tells Noah, "I am going to put an end to all people, for the earth is filled with violence because of them. I am going to destroy both them and the earth." Note: God promised to "destroy both them and the earth." The flood was not only meant to kill wicked men but also involved major changes to the earth itself.

See verse 17: "I am going to bring floodwaters on the earth to destroy all life under the heavens, every creature that has the breath of life in it. Everything on earth will perish." Genesis 7:4 says, "...I will wipe from the face of the earth every living creature I have made."

Genesis 7:11-12 says, "In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, on the seventeenth day of the second month — on that day all the springs of the great deep burst forth, and the floodgates of the heavens were opened. And rain fell on the earth forty days and forty nights." Note: it wasn't just a lot of rain but the "springs of the great deep" bursting forth. All of the water on the planet was suddenly brought to bear upon every land-dwelling, air-breathing creature God had made.

We saw, in December 2004, just a little glimpse of what an underwater earthquake and the resulting tsunami can do. Can you imagine that happening everywhere all at once, and for an extended time?! Not only would nothing on land survive but untold billions of sea creatures would be washed over the land masses and suddenly buried in great layers of sediment, hundreds and even thousands of square miles in size. By the way, that's exactly what you find in the fossil record!

In Genesis 7:19-23 we find that the waters, "rose greatly on the earth, and all the high mountains under the entire heavens were covered. The waters rose and covered the mountains to a depth of more than twenty feet. Every living thing that moved on the earth perished — birds, livestock, wild animals, all the creatures that swarm over the earth, and all mankind. Everything on dry land that had the breath of life in its nostrils died. Every living thing on the face of the earth was wiped out; men and animals and the creatures that move along the ground and the birds of the air were wiped from the earth. Only Noah was left, and those with him in the ark."

After the flood, Noah and the animals came out of the ark and the Lord made a covenant with Noah in part of which He promised never

again to destroy "all living creatures" as He had done (Genesis 8:21). I am aware that all of this raises many science questions and many books have been written on these subjects but for the present my purpose is simply to establish what the Bible clearly says.

I don't know how anyone can read these scriptures and still attempt to contend that this was a local flood! If it truly was local or regional then language means nothing. The language is utterly clear as to what happened. The only possible reason for trying to make such clear language mean something other than what it says is the seeming "need" to compromise with evolutionary science. Now let's look at how the rest of the Bible treats Noah and the flood.

### **Other References to Noah's Flood**

In Isaiah 54:9 God gave a comforting word to His people: "To me this is like the days of Noah, when I swore that the waters of Noah would never again cover the earth. So now I have sworn not to be angry with you, never to rebuke you again." In Ezekiel 14:14 and also 20 we find Noah referred to by name.

Hebrews 11:7 says, "By faith Noah, when warned about things not yet seen, in holy fear built an ark to save his family. By his faith he condemned the world and became heir of the righteousness that comes by faith."

In 1 Peter 3:20 we read that "...God waited patiently in the days of Noah while the ark was being built. In it only a few people, eight in all, were saved through water...."

In 2 Peter 2:5 we see that God, "did not spare the ancient world when he brought the flood on its ungodly people, but protected Noah, a preacher of righteousness, and seven others...."

In Luke 17:26-27 Jesus said, "Just as it was in the days of Noah, so also will it be in the days of the Son of Man. People were eating, drinking, marrying and being given in marriage up to the day Noah entered the ark. Then the flood came and destroyed them all."

In each of these cases Noah is referred to by name but there are other references to the flood and its consequences. Psalm 104:5-9 says, "He established the earth upon its foundations, So that it will not totter forever and ever. You covered it with the deep as with a garment; The waters were standing above the mountains. At Your rebuke they fled, At the sound of Your thunder they hurried away. The mountains rose; the valleys sank down To the place which You established for them. You set a boundary that they may not pass over, So that they will not return to cover the earth." NASU. The language is poetic but the underlying historical reference is clear.

Listen to Peter's words of warning in 2 Peter 3:3-7: "First of all, you must understand that in the last days scoffers will come, scoffing and following their own evil desires. They will say, 'Where is this "coming" he promised? Ever since our fathers died, everything goes on as it has since the beginning of creation.' But they deliberately forget that long ago by God's word the heavens existed and the earth was formed out of water and by water. By these waters also the world of that time was deluged and destroyed. By the same word the present heavens and earth are reserved for fire, being kept for the day of judgment and destruction of ungodly men."

Very straightforward language indeed! There is no hint in any of these scriptures, including the words of Jesus Himself, that the account of Noah and the flood was understood to be anything but a simple historical account, something that really happened.

There are many references that make it obvious that the human authors of the Bible understood the fact of divine creation. Among them: Psalm 33:6, 96:5, 100:3, Matthew 13:35, 25:34, John 17:24, Romans 1:20, Ephesians 1:4, Hebrews 4:13, 1 Peter 1:20, just to name a very few. But when did this creation take place?

### Chapter Five

## Jesus and Creation

In Mark 10:6-8 Jesus replied to a question about divorce by saying, "...at the beginning of creation God 'made them male and female.' 'For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and the two will become one flesh.'" That is pretty plain language! Jesus didn't say, "Billions of years after the beginning...." He directly quotes Genesis 1:27 and 2:24, recorded in the creation account. Clearly the institution of marriage occurred during creation week, called by Jesus, "the beginning."

When Jesus quoted scripture He didn't take it lightly. He plainly believed that all scripture was the Word of God. In John 10:35 Jesus said, "...the scripture cannot be broken...." Matthew 5:18 says, "I tell you the truth, until heaven and earth disappear, not the smallest letter, not the least stroke of a pen, will by any means disappear from the Law until everything is accomplished."

After His resurrection Jesus told the two on the road to Emmaus, "This is what I told you while I was still with you: Everything must be fulfilled that is written about me in the Law of Moses, the Prophets and the Psalms." Luke 24:44. In Jewish reckoning the law of Moses included Genesis. In fact the first prophecy of the gospel was in Genesis 3:15 where God spoke to the serpent and said, "And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers; he will crush your head, and you will strike his heel." And so it was at the cross: Christ crushed the serpent's head!

Let's consider for a moment just who Jesus was. Was He, as "modernists" contend, simply a child of His time, ignorant of all of our advanced knowledge? Anyone who believes that might as well throw out the whole Bible and quit any pretense of following Christ. Jesus had, in fact, a most particular position of authority when it came to creation.

The Bible plainly sets forth the fact that while the Father was the "architect" of creation, His Son was the "project engineer." Hebrews begins, "In the past God spoke to our forefathers through the prophets at many times and in various ways, but in these last days he has spoken to us by his Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, and through whom he made the universe." Hebrews 1:1-2.

Hebrews 1:10 says of the Son, "In the beginning, O Lord, you laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of your hands." This is a quote from Psalm 102.

Paul says of Him in Colossians 1:16-17, "For by him all things were created: things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or powers or rulers or authorities; all things were created by him and for him. He is before all things, and in him all things hold together." Notice that not only did our Lord create all things but He presently holds everything together!

John 1:3 says, "Through him all things were made; without him nothing was made that has been made." Verse 10 says, "He was in the world, and though the world was made through him, the world did not recognize him."

That kind of makes Jesus an authority on creation! Not only was He there, He was the Creator! It was out of His mouth that the Words flowed that flung galaxies across unimaginable distances. And according to Paul, He is the One Who still holds everything together. The Mighty Creator stooped to become a man that you and I might become sons and daughters of God! What a dimension that simple fact adds to the great plan of salvation!

And think about this: when Jesus quoted from Genesis regarding the institution of marriage, He was not only quoting scripture; He was quoting His own words! He was the One Who uttered those words in the first place! Do you suppose He knew what He was talking about? I do! The Bible is clear and consistent, Genesis is written as a simple narrative, real history, and treated as such everywhere else in scripture. To contend otherwise is to set the pronouncements of science and the intellects of men above the Word of God.

#### **Foundational Issues**

And so, not only is the Bible's central message at stake—redemption from the sin of Adam that has passed down to all his children—but also the authority and trustworthiness of God's Word, not to mention the very character of God. These are not secondary issues! If we sacrifice such a foundational passage of scripture on the altar of modern science where will it stop? It is a slippery slope that leads to full-blown unbelief. The floodwaters of the modernism that has turned countless people away from genuine faith spring from these very issues.

Not only we, but our children also, are bombarded with evolutionary dogma. A day doesn't go by without references being made in the media to evolution and millions of years, etc. It is part of the flood out of the serpent's mouth aimed at sweeping away the church (Revelation 12:15). I wouldn't go so far as to say that everyone who believes in millions of years is necessarily lost—not at all—but such a belief did not come from God's Word!

Those God would call through the gospel will respect us far more if we take our stand on the Word of God and give a reason for the hope that is in us than if we compromise to maintain "respectability" in the eyes of unbelievers. God is not a beggar who bows down to men's ideas to avoid offending them. The gospel is a loving ultimatum delivered to those He would turn from the road to hell. It offers men the only hope they have of sharing in His original purpose in creation.

Of course, all of this begs the question: but what about science? What do we do with its claims?

### Chapter Six

## Thus Far...

Thus far we have taken note of the ongoing debate regarding whether the first eleven chapters of Genesis, and particularly the accounts of the creation and the flood, were meant to be taken as history. We noted that much of the Christian Church has long felt compelled, due to the claims of science that the earth is old, to embrace various views that seek to reconcile science's long ages with the straightforward Genesis account of creation by God in six days.

I believe it is obvious that such re-interpretations of Genesis would never occur to anyone apart from such claims, claims which come from outside the Bible. Effectively, the Word of God is being made subject to the supposed "higher light" of modern science. Yes, you read that right! Millions of Christians have essentially considered modern science to be a greater, more reliable source of light and truth regarding the history of the world than is the Word of God, who created it all!

I was a product of that sort of compromise and so I shared my own testimony regarding the issue. As a result of such compromises I went for years as a sort of agnostic concerning the creation account: I believed that God had created everything but didn't know exactly how or when—and didn't really care! Surely such issues were secondary at best to the preaching of the cross and the coming of Christ.

I briefly recounted the process by which the Lord gradually changed my mind. He made me aware of the biblical issues involved and also of the growing body of science that was emerging to challenge secular science, the work of fully qualified scientists who saw no conflict between the Genesis account and true science.

And so I set out to answer two basic questions: why does this matter? and what about the claims of science? So far we have focused on the first question.

#### **Truths Affected By Compromise**

In summary: atheistic evolution with its claims of an old earth has risen as a direct challenge, not so much to the cross itself, but to the foundational truths that establish the very reason for the cross. We noted three particular aspects of truth that are affected simply by compromising the Genesis account, let alone by embracing evolution itself.

One of these concerns the very character of God who claims to have created everything and then called it all "very good." Every compromise involves believing that there were at least hundreds of millions of years of suffering and death of morally innocent animals long before Adam arrived, let alone sinned. Suffering and death are not, therefore, due to sin's corruption of a perfect creation but are rather a "design feature" of creation. In other words, God meant it to be that way. Such an idea has serious implications for our understanding of the Bible, our Creator, and our world.

We also noted the intimate connection between the cross and Adam's sin. That sin resulted in a spiritual separation from God but also in his own physical death and a curse upon the creation that had been given into his charge. As a result he fathered a race of sinners who need a Savior. That leads to the cross where Christ, the last Adam, not only cried out, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" but also died physically. Salvation is consequently available to Adam's children who repent of their sin and put their trust in Jesus and what he accomplished for them through his death and resurrection.

The other issue concerns the reliability of God's Word. We noted that everywhere in the scriptures themselves the inspired writers

invariably regarded the creation account as history. Were they wrong? No less than Jesus himself referred to the institution of marriage as being at the beginning of creation. Mark 10:6-8. Who was he? Only the Creator, that's all! Hebrews 1:1-2, 10, Colossians 1:16-17. If Jesus was either mistaken or lying about creation why should we trust anything he said?

And in the ten commandments, written on stone tablets with the finger of God, we read that he created everything in six days! Exodus 20:11. If Genesis isn't true, what else isn't true? Is the whole Bible to be made subject to man's intellect and re-interpretation or is it the Word of God?

If we look only at the scriptures themselves there is an unbroken line of truth extending from Genesis 1:1 through Revelation 22:21. We learn our history, God's purpose, our need, God's provision for that need, and how we can share in His loving eternal plans expressed in a new creation free from every ill of the present one. As Revelation 22:3 says, "No longer will there be any curse." What the Bible says about these things is abundantly clear.

## Chapter Seven

## What About Science?

But once again, all of this begs the question: what do we do with the claims of science?

Science is simply the field of study that seeks to understand how things work in the physical world and universe in which we live. There are many categories of study that fall under the general heading of science. Examples are Biology, Geology, Astronomy, Chemistry, Physics, and so forth. For present purposes, however, it is important to understand two very different classes of science: one is operational; the other is historical or forensic.

#### **Operational Science**

Operational science is concerned with understanding physical processes by watching them as they happen. For example: what happens when you mix two chemicals together and then heat them? It operates under the assumption that things happen in accordance with consistent and predictable laws. This is, or course, exactly what a Bible-believer would expect based on an all-powerful Creator who established those laws.

This kind of science seeks to establish scientific principles as fact through careful experimentation and observation. The key is that these facts are established by observing something happening in the present. When such experiments are properly carried out, the resulting principles can be consistently demonstrated by scientists anywhere. They can then be used reliably to build better computers, more efficient cars, fly rockets to the moon, and the like. Operational science is the same whether one is a Christian or an atheist. It deals with observable events, the interpretations of which can be proven to be either true or false and therefore have nothing to do with the beliefs of the scientist involved. For the Christian, the mere fact that such science is even possible testifies to the divine Creator and the order he has established. If the world has arisen through randomness and by chance as the evolutionists contend, why should it be orderly?

#### **Forensic Science**

The other class of science is historical, or forensic, science. Those who have seen murder mysteries on TV will know what the word "forensic" means. It is the kind of science that is applied to the evidence found at a murder scene in an attempt to figure out what happened. Obviously the detective cannot witness the murder because it has happened in the past and so he must rely upon clues that are left behind. In this type of situation sometimes forensic science can establish the facts of what happened with virtual certainty but at other times the conclusions are less sure. Of course, reliable eyewitness testimony is the most desirable kind of evidence but the detectives and scientists themselves are not, in such cases, eyewitnesses. Where operational science asks, "How do things work?" forensic science asks, "What happened to cause this?"

All historical science is essentially "detective work" and not based on the kind of observation and repeatability of operational science. How many times have we seen detective shows where someone has such a strong belief about what they think happened that it warps their judgment and they reach a wrong conclusion? Their belief causes them to refuse to believe a witness, for example — and the witness turns out to be telling the truth. They confront physical evidence that can be interpreted in more than one way and they insist that it "proves" their belief, refusing to face other possibilities. Here we see just one example of belief playing a big role in determining so-called "facts."

# The Determining Role of Belief

It is, in fact, virtually impossible to reach any conclusion about the past without beliefs playing a determining role. The evidence exists only in the present. And, in the view of scientists in general, there are no eyewitnesses to the world and the universe of the past. In particular, they weren't there and so they are reduced to interpreting the evidence left behind in an attempt to determine what they think happened to cause that evidence.

But interpretations, which change all the time, by the way, are not facts. Yet how many times have we heard people talk about the fact of evolution as though it has been proven. Evolution is nothing more than an unproven and unprovable belief about the past. The evolutionary scientist may point to evidence that he sees as support for his belief but it is still belief and not fact.

He observes changes in living things, for example, and claims that fact as proof of his theory. BUT the kinds of change observed in the present are NOT the kinds of change necessary for evolution from single-celled creatures to man, not to mention the impossible leap from non-life to life before all that. Dogs may change into different breeds of dogs, BUT they are still dogs and always will be. This is entirely consistent with God's order that animals be created in "kinds." Those kinds determine the limits of change—and the changes themselves involve genetic information already there, or in some cases, the loss of genetic information through mutations. New information is not created as would be necessary for evolutionary theory to be true.

# **A Religious Foundation**

As we said earlier, in operational science it doesn't matter whether you are an atheist or a Bible believer. You are dealing with things in the present that can be observed and proven. But when it comes to the past it starts to make a very great difference. I mentioned that operational science assumes that things work according to consistent laws and principles that can be understood. Fine. But modern secular science has made a huge and unwarranted leap. That leap is from the observation that there are natural laws to full-blown naturalism.

Naturalism is simply the belief that nature is all there is, or to put it another way, there is no God, or at least not one that has caused anything in the natural world. The leap is from an operating principle to a world-view, a belief system, in a word, a religion. Science has, in our day, simply defined God right out of the picture. The minute you mention God, they immediately say, "That's not science." Before examining any evidence, God is ruled out.

That is hardly an unbiased approach! The scriptures proclaim, "The heavens declare the glory of God; the skies proclaim the work of his hands. Day after day they pour forth speech; night after night they display knowledge. There is no speech or language where their voice is not heard. Their voice goes out into all the earth, their words to the ends of the world." Psalm 19:1-4.

But as they look at the heavens they block their ears to those words and look instead for totally natural explanations for their origin. Modern science has become, in effect, the search for an atheistic explanation for everything! Answering the question, "How do things work?" is one thing. But answering the question, "Where do things come from?" is something else again. Just because things work according to natural laws does not mean they originated only from natural causes. That is belief, not science.

# **Blue-Tinted Sunglasses**

I recently preached on this subject and in that message used a simple prop: blue-tinted sunglasses. To illustrate the effect of beliefs I declared, "I believe that the world is blue! And since I believe that the world is blue, I believe that the correct way to view and understand the world is to use these blue-tinted sunglasses." I then put them on to the amusement of my audience and began to examine things around me. Sure enough, the microphone was blue, the pulpit was blue, my Bible was blue, and even the audience was blue! "I've proved it," I declared, "the world is indeed blue!"

The fallacy in my illustration, is, of course, obvious. But not so obvious is the fact that a belief in naturalism colors the conclusions about the past for those who hold that belief. In actual fact, those conclusions are predetermined by the starting point: atheistic naturalism. That belief acts just like the tinted sunglasses to color the way scientists see the world.

And, as we pointed out in part one, it is a belief that is strongly prejudiced by the desire NOT to believe in a God to whom we are responsible. Does this make a difference? Listen to the oft quoted words of Richard Lewontin, written in The New York Review in January of 1997:

"We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment, a 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. Moreover, that materialism is an absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door."

I salute the man's honesty but what an amazing confession! His quest is for material explanations based on belief alone, a belief that is NOT compelled by science! The starting point of secular science is simply a belief, and worse, a belief that rejects God. When so-called science is founded on that sort of belief there is no "evidence" alone that will ever turn up to change the conclusions. If a scientist met a dinosaur he would simply come up with some sort of explanation harmonizing with his beliefs! Only a supernatural work of God to confront the will can avail. This is a clear example of the kind of willful ignorance of which Peter writes in 2 Peter 3:5. The real conflict here is not science vs. religion but rather antichrist vs. Christ, the Creator and Judge of all men.

# Chapter Eight

# Is The Earth Old?

The issue that has most affected the professing Christian church is the claim by science that the earth and universe are billions of years old. But upon what basis do they make these claims? Does the evidence compel such a belief? I make no claim to being a scientist although I find science fascinating but I would like to offer a number of examples which were consistently taught to me as I grew up as proof that the earth is old. Let's see how the evidence holds up.

#### **Dating Rocks**

Perhaps the most common proof offered for an old earth is the dating of rocks. Simply put, there are radioactive substances in some kinds of rocks. These radioactive substances decay over time and turn into other substances. For example, most people who have been exposed to much science have learned that uranium changes over time into lead. There are other such examples that are more commonly used to date rocks but since so many have heard of the uranium-lead combination I'll use it as an example.

Operational science has determined that uranium changes into lead at a certain rate. Radioactive elements like uranium have what is known as a half life. That simply means that over a certain period of time one half of it will become lead. The half life for uranium has been determined to be in the range of billions of years. Based on that knowledge scientists carefully measure the amount of uranium and lead in a given rock sample and calculate its age based on that known rate of decay. Sounds "rock" solid, doesn't it! But is it?

# Assumptions

When such a conclusion is drawn there are, in fact, at least six things that are assumed to be true. That is, they are believed to be true yet cannot be proven. What are they? Well, in the first place how do they know how much uranium and lead there was to begin with? No one was there to measure it! How can they read a "clock" and determine how much time has gone by if they don't know what time it was to start with?! The type of measurement described above assumes that whatever lead there is in a rock was all uranium to begin with. Exactly how do they know that?

They are also assuming that no uranium somehow left the rock along the way. They are also assuming that no uranium entered the sample. They are assuming the same two things about the lead they find. On top of that they are assuming that the rate of decay has never changed. That makes six assumptions that their conclusion rests upon! And those assumptions don't all have to be false for the conclusion to be meaningless. It only takes one!

I remember awhile back hearing the testimony of a college Biology professor who was converted from atheism and evolutionism to Christ and a strong belief in the Genesis account of creation. This transformation took something like three years as one by one, different issues were confronted. The last issue was faced in a graduate course in geology that among other things dealt with radiometric dating (what we described above). This scientist testified to his fear upon entering the course that he would find solid evidence refuting the Genesis account. However, as the course progressed, he discovered just how flawed these dating methods are and in the end his confidence in the Genesis account was actually strengthened by his exposure to the course!

# **Dirty Secrets**

I should point out some of the "dirty secrets" of this dating method. Labs have been known to ask a scientist submitting a sample, "What sort of date are you expecting?" The same test run on different samples from the same source often gives widely varying results. Different types of tests run on samples from the same source also can give even more widely varying results. When scientists obtain unexpected results they will often simply throw those results out as unreliable. When they get the result they want and are expecting they declare the date "proven."

Even so it is difficult for a layman hearing the claims of science to gainsay them. What do we know? Wouldn't it be nice if some fully qualified scientists were to run tests on some rocks where the age is definitely known? That would be great, wouldn't it! Well, guess what! Such tests have been done and the results are enlightening.

# Examples

Here are some examples of such tests. I will first list the place, followed by the date the rock was formed from volcanic lava flows, followed by the age determined through radiometric dating by the same labs used by evolutionary scientists.

- Mt. St. Helens, Washington 1980-1986 —tests run on samples collected in the early 1990s produced ages ranging from 350,000 years to 2.8 million years!
- Mt. Edna, Sicily-122 BC-170,000 350,000 years old.
- **Mt. Edna, Sicily**—1972—210,000 490,000 years old. (How come the more recent lava flow is older?!)
- Hualalai, Hawaii—1800-1801—1.44 -1.76 million years old.
- Mt. Ngauruhoe, New Zealand—1954—3.3 3.7 million years old.

Mt. Kilauea, Hawaii—1959—1.7 - 15.3 million years old.

Sounds reliable, doesn't it! Not only are the laboratory ages amazingly off but the results themselves vary widely. And there are a number of other issues with standard dating methods that have been turned up by scientists examining the reliability of those methods. Nevertheless examples like those above should be enough for the Christian layman to realize that he doesn't have to tremble before the pronouncements of science regarding the ages of rocks. Quite obviously, some assumptions made by secular scientists are simply wrong and the results are therefore, meaningless.

Think with me for a moment just why it is that those scientists make such assumptions. Why, for example, when confronted with a rock sample containing uranium and lead do they assume it was all uranium to begin with? Such a conclusion is not an illogical one, but that logic begins with a prior belief in naturalism. That belief is the starting point for looking at the world and interpreting its past.

They observe a natural process happening at a known rate and assume, therefore, that this process can be projected back in time to a beginning point when there was no lead and the uranium in a newly-formed rock began the long process of changing into lead. But no matter how logical this seems it is still basically a belief and not a fact. And not only is this belief not proven, the examples listed above contradict it. If rocks of known age cannot be dated accurately then how can dates derived from rocks of unknown age be trusted?

# **A Sobering Thought**

Here is a sobering thought: when Christians simply accept at face value the pronouncements of science about the age of the earth, etc., what they are actually doing is agreeing with the idea that atheism is the correct starting point for understanding earth's history! Think about it. Instead of attempting to fit their millions of years into God's Word what we should be doing is rigorously examining and questioning science. If we do not, are we not setting the beliefs of men above the Word of God? It's a scary thought.

#### Fossils

What about fossils? If you were taught as I was, you learned that fossils take millions of years to form. But there is plenty of evidence to the contrary. One method of fossilization, or petrification, is readily observable and involves mineral-rich water. In Knaresborough, Yorkshire, England, there is a famous Petrifying Well where objects suspended in its flowing water are turned to stone in a matter of months. One common type of object petrified at this well is a Teddy Bear! Many other kinds of items have likewise been petrified.

A similar example can be found in the famous miner's hat from Tasmania. A miner dropped his felt hat into mineral-rich water in the mine. Some 50 years later it was found and it had turned completely to stone and is currently displayed in a mining museum.

However, most fossils are not of that type but rather found encased in rock. What about them? The fact is that it takes very special conditions for fossils to form. Most animals die and their carcasses quickly fall prey to scavengers or decay. Nothing is left to fossilize. In order to fossilize something it is necessary for some sort of deep and very rapid burial to occur — the kind of burial that occurs during flood conditions. When animals of virtually any type are suddenly buried in just the right type of flood sediment they, or their body shape, will be preserved as stone over time.

But how much time? What about the Ediacara formation in Australia? It stretches some 300 miles and contains millions of fossils. There are, in this formation, large numbers of jellyfish, perfectly preserved. Have you ever noticed just how quickly jellyfish disintegrate when they die, and yet here are vast numbers perfectly preserved! The evolutionist who discovered these jellyfish said they must have been fossilized in less than 24 hours! When conditions are right it doesn't take long.

There's plenty of evidence that fossilized animals don't just die normal deaths and then become fossils. Many examples of virtually instantaneous catastrophic burial can be found. Some of these include one fish swallowing another, a lobster-like creature in the process of shedding its skin, a reptile in the process of swallowing another, enormous numbers of sea creatures such as shellfish suddenly swept in layers hundreds of square miles in size across continents and perfectly preserved. Kind of fits with Noah's flood, don't you think!

Most people don't know that neither fossils nor fossil-bearing rocks can be dated directly. The dates we so often hear claimed for

some new fossil find don't come from a test performed on the fossil but from a chart of earth's supposed history. Certain rock layers and fossils have been assigned certain ages on paper, the "story" of the history of life on earth—as imagined according to evolutionary theory. All the scientist has to do is simply fit his find to this story, no test needed! And so the news headline confidently proclaims, "100-million-year-old Fossil Found."

#### Coal

How about coal? Hundreds of millions of years, right? Well, not exactly. Coal samples that are claimed to be hundreds of millions of years old have been found to contain carbon-14. What is the significance of that? Carbon-14 is an unstable element that can only be detected in the range of thousands of years, not millions. Any carbon-14 in the coal should have long since decayed into nitrogen if the claimed ages are true. Besides that, coal has been produced in the laboratory!

#### Diamonds

What about diamonds? I remember before my wife and I were married I once got her a humorous gift, a do-it-yourself diamond kit. It was simply a bag of charcoal with instructions to place it under millions of pounds of pressure for millions of years and then cut to size! Fortunately she still married me! But that gag gift illustrates what we were all taught when I grew up, that diamonds required enormous pressure over staggering amounts of time. But is it so?

Today there are at least two commercial companies using two completely different processes each manufacturing gem-quality diamonds in days. It takes very sophisticated equipment to tell the difference between them and regular diamonds from mines. In fact, in one case, the way to tell the difference is that the manufactured diamonds are more perfect! I'm not talking about synthetic diamonds but genuine man-made diamonds. Besides that, mined diamonds have also been tested and found to have significant amounts of carbon-14 in them, something an evolutionary scientist would never think to look for as it would be impossible in their view of things. I guess the real gag in that gift was on me! It just doesn't take that kind of time, just the right conditions.

#### **Opals**

Another gemstone is the opal. How long does it take to form an opal? In Australia a "bush scientist" named Len Cram has a lab in his back yard and has learned to grow opals that are indistinguishable from the mined ones! It is evident that he has been allowed to discover one of the Lord's secrets and that opals don't take long ages of gradual processes to form. A good-sized opal actually takes about 3 months at room temperature with no pressure or special equipment!

## Oil

Then there is oil. Surely that takes millions of years. Hardly! Oil can be created in a laboratory in a matter of hours from common organic materials like garbage and sewage sludge (about anything, really). If men can make oil in hours why should it require millions of years in nature? Oh yes, and carbon-14 has also been found in oil! Are you getting the picture?

#### Caves

How long does it take for caves to form? Jerry Trout, a cave specialist with the Forest Service, wrote in 1993, *"From 1924 to 1988, there was a visitor's sign above the entrance to Carlsbad Caverns that said Carlsbad was at least 260 million years old. In 1988, the sign was changed to read 7 to 10 million years old. Then, for a little while, the sign read that it was 2 million years old. Now the sign is gone."* It seems the more we learn, the more evident it is that things don't take as long as we once thought!

Have you seen the stalactites and stalagmites in caves? They are the mineral rock formations that grow down from cave roofs and up from their floors. I remember being told of the immense amounts of time it takes for them to form but the same Jerry Trout mentioned above has, through photo-monitoring, observed them to grow inches in just days. Numerous other examples of rapid growth in these formations have been observed and reported over the years. Again, the speed of formation just depends upon conditions. Nothing mysterious, and nothing that requires millions of years.

## Canyons

How about canyons? Eons of time for a river to patiently wear away solid rock, right? That's what I always heard, but the eruption of Mt. St. Helens in 1980 changed many minds. The blast from that eruption drove a large quantity of mud outwards in one direction at an enormous speed and pressure. One result was a canyon one-fortieth the size of the Grand Canyon cut in part through solid rock and formed in hours!

Is it a little bit of water over a long period of time or a lot of water over a little bit of time?! Consider this scenario: Noah's flood repeatedly washes up great layers of sediment containing billions of sea creatures over the southwestern United States. As the flood ends and the water begins draining off the continents into deepened sea beds a very large lake — the size of several states — is for a time formed. Then its containment is breached and all that water suddenly flows across and through those layers of sediment towards the Gulf of Mexico. A huge "drainage ditch" is formed by the rushing waters and then it finishes hardening as the river left behind flows through the bottom. This scenario for the formation of the Grand Canyon is consistent both with the Bible and with the physical evidence left behind.

Here's some food for thought: I wonder why most rivers that have been around for awhile don't carve canyons? Why just the Colorado and a few others—if the standard story is correct?

#### **Rock Formation**

What about rock? How long does solid rock take to form? While it is obvious that lava flows can harden into rock in a short time the prevailing view, particularly when I grew up, was that soft sedimentary layers take millions of years to gradually harden into rock. Actually it just takes the right conditions and ingredients—concrete, for example. Bring the right materials and a cementing agent together and rocks can form very quickly.

The mudflows at Mt. St. Helens have quickly turned to rock. Scientists have observed rocks forming in months in a swamp in England. Spark plugs—probably from boat engines—have been found embedded in rock. On display at the Creation Museum at Answers in Genesis is a clock—once again, probably from a ship—that is half embedded in hard rock along with sea shells. Is the clock millions of years old? More and more scientists are discovering that rocks can form very quickly, certainly not requiring the timescale I was taught.

#### **Dinosaurs**

Do you remember hearing about the discovery of blood cells in dinosaur bones a few years ago? Not only were blood cells found but also soft stretchy tissue with blood vessels! Dr. Mary Schweitzer, an evolutionist, is the main figure in these discoveries. Did her discovery cause her to question the idea that dinosaurs died out 65 millions years ago? Not at all. Her comment was, *"It was exactly like looking at a slice of modern bone. But of course, I couldn't believe it. I said to the lab technician: 'The bones, after all, are 65 millions years old. How could blood cells survive that long?'"* The main interest of the scientists involved since has seemed to be to come up with an explanation for all this that doesn't contradict what they believe!

A finding like this shouldn't surprise someone who starts with the Bible's history. Although the name "dinosaur" is a modern one, not used before the 1800s, the Bible tells us exactly when dinosaurs were created. Are dinosaurs land animals? (Hint: the answer is "yes.") When were land animals created? How about day six? Then when were dinosaurs created? If you answered, "On day six," you get an "A." Now, what did they eat when they were first created (prior to the fall and the entrance of death into the world)? According to Genesis 1:29-30, they ate plants just like all the other animals. See how easy that was!

If you accept the speculations about the "age of dinosaurs" and what they think life was like, and the depictions in movies like "Jurassic Park" then the Bible's answer seems strange. But if you start with the Bible's history and then look at all the evidence it fits just fine. Just the other day a story was in the news from China. It seems that villagers in a remote area had, for some time, been digging up "dragon bones" and using them medicinally. Some they boiled and others were ground up and made into a paste. Apparently these bones had been dug up by the ton and sold in area markets for some two decades! Of course, scientists came along and informed the villagers that they were really 100-million-year-old dinosaur bones!

On more than one occasion fresh—not fossilized—dinosaur bones have been discovered in Alaska and other areas of the far north. No surprise to a Bible believer. It simply is an indicator the dinosaurs are much more recent AND perhaps that the climate in the far north was once much different, say, prior to Noah's flood.

This is a fascinating subject and I encourage anyone interested to pursue answers to the many questions that will arise at websites such as www.answersingenesis.org and www.icr.org. IF dinosaurs are truly extinct—and there are tantalizing hints from a number of remote areas that they may not be completely gone—then it really hasn't been all that long. Tales of encounters with dragons don't go back too many centuries.

# Chapter Nine

# **In Conclusion**

As I said earlier, if a scientist who believed in an old earth somehow met a dinosaur it wouldn't cause him to question his belief. He would just try to figure out an explanation for the dinosaur to fit his belief.

I love the story about the psychologist who was struggling to help a patient who insisted that he was dead. In vain the psychologist tried one argument after another including several kinds of medical evidence. Still, the patient wasn't convinced, countering that medical evidence can be misinterpreted.

Finally, the psychologist had an idea: he asked the patient, "Do dead men bleed?" The patient replied, "No, dead men don't bleed." At that the psychologist pricked the patient's finger, showed him the blood and said, "Now what do you think?" The patient looked at his finger, thought for a minute and said, "Well—I guess I was wrong. Dead men do bleed!"

That's a pretty good example of the kind of mentality Christians confront in the world today regarding questions of origin. Entrenched belief reigns supreme for most scientists and no amount of evidence to the contrary will convince them to seriously consider the history God has given us in his word.

Christians need to understand this. Much of modern science, particularly when it reaches conclusions about the past, is not engaged in an unbiased pursuit of truth, but rather the pursuit of evidence supporting a belief that rejects the Creator. Many individual scientists are simply swept along with the prevailing view of things but that is still a fair description of "mainstream" science in our day.

There are, of course, some scientists who on purely scientific grounds have concluded that the world, and particularly the complexity of life, show evidence of "intelligent design." Their honesty in this is to be commended but that is not the same thing as recognizing the God of the Bible as the designer.

I have included just a very few examples of areas of science that I was told proved millions of years. There are, of course, many other areas I haven't touched on and they are all fascinating. I would encourage those interested to pursue their areas of interest and learn more. You will be surprised by many things you will learn. What a wonderful opportunity for accessing information has been afforded by the internet. I know the devil uses the internet but I'm glad the Lord does too!

# **Ongoing Research**

There are in our day a growing number of creation scientists investigating the many issues raised in the debate between secular science and a belief in the Genesis account. Is every question fully answered? No. But more and more answers are turning up every day and ongoing research is encouraging. Christians do not have to fear the pronouncements of secular scientists. In fact, the evidence fits the Bible's history much better than it does the story told by evolutionists.

Just think what the evolutionist has to defend: that something can come from nothing; that life can come from non-life; that complex genetic information can somehow invent itself; and that all of these things and the orderly universe we observe have arisen by blind chance! All of this is utterly contrary to every observed law of science. Imagine a computer that has somehow manufactured and programmed itself with no intelligence behind it! But that would be trivial beside the problem of accounting for the universe and life by pure chance. But if we start by believing God's account of history, THEN look at the world around us, it makes sense. We know why the world is in a state of corruption and decay. We understand why there is death and suffering. We see the wisdom of God demonstrated in the created kinds in their built-in ability to adapt and change. We see in earth's geology and in the fossil record evidence of Noah's flood and we know that God judges sin. And as these things are true so is the Bible's message of salvation through Jesus Christ. Our Creator has become our Savior that he might become our eternal Elder Brother! I'm with him, how about you?

#### No Need to "Prove" The Bible

It is not that we need to "prove" the Bible. Not at all. Forensic science cannot "prove" any belief about the past in the sense in which science can prove things they observe in the present. Secular science starts with nothing more than a belief. Creation science begins with the record given us by God through his word. It is wonderful to see confirmations of the Bible through true science and to have answers to the questions of unbelievers but ultimately faith is the result of a personal encounter with the Living God. That is the critical need. Still, it is good to be able to remove obstacles to faith.

In view of the impact of modern scientific ideas on our culture we need to be able to stand on God's Word without compromise and proclaim its truth starting with Genesis 1:1. That verse begins earth's true history, the history of man's fall into sin and of God's plan of redemption from that fall and of a glorious door of hope into an eternal future. The first chapters of Genesis explain the "why" of death and suffering as well as the "why" of the cross. The account of Noah's flood demonstrates that God judges sin and models the final judgment of this present world that is surely coming.

We must be able to both defend and proclaim the whole message of the Bible and to answer honest questions, both from our young people, and from those outside the church. We need to recognize the subtlety of Satan's attack mounted against Genesis. He recognizes far more than most Christians just how foundational it is. God has convinced me that I was wrong in my compromise and the way I used to minimize the importance of all this. How about you?

# **OTHER BOOKS**

#### Delivered From Demons, by C. Parker Thomas

The story of a young girl's deliverance from demon possession and also a collection of a number of other articles relating to Satan's kingdom and activity, specially as it relates to the end of this present age. Suggested Price - \$4.00.

#### Examine Yourselves by Phil Enlow

Paul told us in 2 Corinthians 13:5 to "examine yourselves." There must be a way to do that. An examination of modern Christianity in the light of true biblical salvation designed to lead the reader to genuine spiritual rest. Suggested Price - \$5.00.

#### How Do You Know You Are Right? by Phil Enlow

A study in spiritual knowledge. How have we come to believe what we consider to be truth? Have we been taught of men by tradition or of God by the anointing? Can we know? If so, how? Suggested Price - \$2.00.

#### Immortality, by Phil Enlow

The subject of immortality is one that has intrigued mankind down through the ages. What does the Bible actually teach on this important subject? What is the fate of the wicked? the hope of the believer? What about heaven and hell? What is everlasting life? What about the judgment? Suggested Price - \$3.00.

#### The Judgment of God, by C. Parker Thomas

A study of God's judgment as it affects both believer and unbeliever. The word says that "His judgments are in all the earth." Psalm 105:7. Do you recognize them? How do they affect you personally? Suggested Price - \$1.00.

#### The Keys of the Kingdom, by C. Parker Thomas

A clear study of the keys as they apply to us in today's world. Suggested Price - \$2.00.

#### Light in This Present Darkness, by Phil Enlow

From the series in MCM. Message for God's Remnant in the earth regarding the present hour of darkness. Suggested Price - \$4.00.

#### Lying Signs and Wonders, by C. Parker Thomas

A collection of articles concerning the end of the age exposing much deception as well as giving forth important truth needed by those who would be prepared for Christ's soon return. Suggested Price - \$4.00.

#### The Midnight Cry, by C. Parker Thomas

Contains two articles that set forth the truths concerning the midnight cry: what is it? who hears it? who makes it? what is its significance for us. A must for people who would understand this ministry. Suggested Price - \$1.00.

# **Sex and Marriage in the Light of God's Word,** *by C. Parker Thomas*

# From a series of articles covering a whole range of scriptural and practical truth designed to help God's people in this important area. Suggested Price - \$4.00.

#### Sudden Death Overtime, by Phil Enlow

A sober look at our present world: its destiny and the reason for its condition. Suggested Price - \$4.00.

#### The Sure Foundation, by C. Parker Thomas

A collection of four articles published in the early 1980's on the important subject of the foundation believers have in Christ. Suggested Price - \$3.00.

#### Tongues: My Testimony, by C. Parker Thomas

Contains the article by the same name as well as an article entitled "Tongues Should be Tested" by Gerald McGraw in which he recounts lessoned learned from testing to discover the spirit enabling someone to speak in tongues. Startling! Suggested price - \$2.00.

#### Your Adversary, by C. Parker Thomas

Recently, while looking through some of our oldest issues of the MCM, we uncovered this timely gem, published in about 1960! Originally published in two parts, it is reprinted here in its entirety. There is a simple directness and clarity in this teaching that will help anyone who desires to walk with the Lord and overcome in this hour. I believe that many of you will be amazed at how something written that long ago could be so perfectly relevant to the present need of God's people! Suggested Price - \$1.00.

**Note:** The prices listed above are suggested with the thought in mind of simply covering the costs of printing and mailing these materials. It is not our intention to become a "book-seller," selling books for profit. Our desire is to get out truth that can help set God's people free in this critical hour. Please write to us at:

#### Midnight Cry Messenger

P.O. Box 685 Southern Pines, NC 28388 USA

#### What About Genesis?

# – Other Ministries –

#### Midnight Cry Messenger

The *Midnight Cry Messenger*, a quarterly tabloid publication, has been published since the 1950s. The articles printed in this book were first printed in the *Midnight Cry Messenger*. The paper has gone to many parts of the world and been the means of sharing God's blessings with many of our brothers and sisters over the years. It is sent free to all who desire to receive it.

#### The Midnight Cry Broadcast

We can be heard weekly on Satellite and Cable TV in North America and much of the Pacific; weekdays on many local radio stations in North America and also around the world via shortwave; and on the internet 24 hours a day. Write, or check the website for the current broadcast schedule.

#### Recordings

Many audio and video tapes, as well as Cds and DVDs are available, recordings that have enabled many over the years to share the opportunity we have here to hear the living word as the Lord anoints. Many have discovered that these recordings provide a spiritual lifeline.

#### World Wide Web

What an opportunity for communication the internet has become! It is available to those connected to the internet 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. All of our books and many of our articles are published on the website in their entirety. We also have information available online regarding upcoming events, the tapelist, and local churches. Video selections taken from recent services are included as well. **Website**: <u>www.midcry.org</u>