

FROM THE BEGINNING

www.creationinstruction.org (402) 756-5121 Creation1@juno.com

1770 S Overland – Juniata NE 68955

JUNE-AUGUST 2004 VOL. 37

This is a very important message as I am seeing the old earth compromise almost everywhere I go. I pray this will equip you to defend your faith and give others the hope that comes from true faith in the inerrancy of God's Word.

I am sending two newsletters because I am a little behind so I thought I might as well be a little early as well.

IMPORTANT: To keep our newsletter costs down we are asking the you send a postcard to let us know that you want to continue receiving these FREE of charge. Otherwise your name will be taken off of our list very soon.

The following will show how old-earth creationists OEC (truly, theistic evolutionists) use the Bible to say that it supports the earth being old. There is NO truth in this lie, and I believe you will see that a "compromise" is an accurate description.

First, OEC say that the Hebrew word *yom* (day) can mean more than just a 24 hour period. Although this is true, there are rules that must be applied to make this true. *Yom* appears nearly 2300 times in the Bible, and every time it is in the plural *yamine* (845) or in conjunction with a number (first, second etc.) it means 24 hours. It can have five usages: 1) 24 hrs. 2) vague concept of time 3) time of light 4) specific period of time, and 5) period of a year. The question then becomes, could the days of Genesis be any meaning other than the 24 hours? Absolutely not! In fact, at no time in the entire book of Genesis does it mean anything but 24 hours. One rule of thumb is that you must always read the context and

interpret it accordingly. You can't read a letter from your best friend and take a word from that letter's context and apply it to a letter from your father. One must read the context of a word to find the meaning of that word. With that said, the most common Biblical argument used for an old earth is Genesis 2:4 which says, "**These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day (*b'yom*) that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens.**" They point out that the word day in this verse means six days of creation and, therefore, the other "days" of creation could be long periods as well. However, what they don't tell you is that you have a preposition before *yom* that is not translated in English which changes the meaning. In fact, Hebrew lexicons tell you that when it is *b'yom* it means "when," not day.

They also try to use Genesis 2:17 when Adam eats of the forbidden fruit: "For in the day (*yom*) that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," pointing out that Adam lived to be 930 years so does a day mean 930 years since he didn't die that day? Actually, the Hebrew, and most commentaries will even tell you, the Hebrew reads, dying you will die. Adam began dying that very day. You might compare it to a plant as it is cut off from its vine. It begins dying at that point but it still is alive.

On the seventh day of creation in Genesis there is no morning or evening mentioned so, therefore, they say the seventh day is continuing today. Well let's be consistent, if it didn't end, did it really begin? Besides, the context makes this very clear that it is a 24 hour day.

Genesis 2:2 clearly states, "And on the seventh day God *ended his work* which he had

made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made." They then say John 5:17-18 shows God is still creating through the process of evolution: "My Father is always at his work to this very day, and I, too, am working." However, in context, this shows God's redemptive work continues, not His creating work.

How can there be 24 hour days measured by the sun for the first three days when the sun had not been created? Their answer is that God really made the sun on day one and simply removed the clouds on day four so that it was revealed. There are many problems with this. First, if God created the sun on day one, what did He put it in if the firmament wasn't made until day two? Secondly, no man was there to reveal it to. Thirdly, this makes God a liar. Fourthly, to have day and night you only need light coming from one direction and an earth that is rotating. Simply put, on day one God had the earth rotating and Jesus, the light of the world, was shining upon it.

What about Ps 90:4 where it states, "For a thousand years in your sight are like a day that has just gone by, or like a watch in the night?" As earlier mentioned, one must take this in context. Let's be consistent again. If a day is a 1000 years than so is a watch in the night. In context we see God is not bound by time and as my book on Revelation describes, God does use the seven days of creation as symbolism for all of time, but this doesn't change a day from being a 24 hour period.

Another favorite argument is that there was too much to do on day six. Genesis 2 says God planted a garden, trees grew, Adam was created, all animals were made, Adam was put to sleep, then Eve was made and Adam says "at last" (*happa'am*). Why would Adam say "at last" if it was just one day? This is an all out lie. They say the Hebrew *pa'am* means at last but *Happa'am* means "this time" with the definite article before it. It is simply NOT TRUE that it means "at last" in any major translation KJV, NIV, NASB, NJKV or any Hebrew Lexicon. See Judges 6:39, Gen 18:32. As far as too much to do, God only had to speak and boom it was done. The plants didn't have to grow, they were created mature. As for naming the

animals, they say this would take days. Not at all. First, Adam didn't name any of the marine animals insects, arachnids, or invertebrates. This takes the number of "kinds" of animals down a lot. In fact, it would be generous to suggest that Adam had to name 2500 animals. He could do such a task in less than four hours time naming one every five seconds and having a five minute break each hour.

A further attempt to undermine the Scriptures to fit man's fallible wisdom comes from Genesis 2:4 where we read, "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created." OEC say "generations" is plural and therefore God used many generations to make the heavens and earth, not six days. Once again, this is a misleading lie. Even the lexicon quoted by the OEC's to defend this point says this only means "what is brought into being by someone" and in Gen 2:4 it means the events that followed the creation of heaven and earth. The NIV correctly states, "This is the account of." In fact, the word is always plural so that doesn't support an old earth here either.

The Gap theory that is proposed states that God destroyed the first creation in chapter 1 of Genesis and made the earth again in chapter 2. Again, there are many problems with this idea starting with the fact that it was invented in 1814 by a Scottish theologian (and Masonic Lodge member) named Thomas Chalmers. It clearly violates the Scriptures by putting death before Adam's sin- Rom. 5:12, I Cor 15:2. It also has Satan falling before day 7- violating Gen. 1:31; 2:8; Ezek. 28:12-15. It accuses God of creating a world with suffering and calling it good.

To further this gap theory they say Genesis 1:28 states, "And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth" Why does God clearly say to refill the earth? In 1611, when the KJV was written, the word "replenish" meant nothing but "fill" and any commentary will tell you this. Even the Hebrew is clear that this is a first time event. What about Revelation 21:1 which says, "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and

there was no more sea?” How can this be the first earth if there was an earlier earth that was already destroyed?

Probably the most aggravating and destructive long earth argument is that the death caused by sin in Genesis was only a spiritual death and that is why dinosaurs and other animals could die physically before the fall into sin. This puts death, disease and suffering in a “very good” world. If this is true, how do we answer those people who say, “I don’t believe in God, He let my dad die?” If there wasn’t a literal Adam who fell into literal sin that caused literal death and disease we have no answer. But if these events are literal history, I know why death and disease exist today. They say Romans 5:12 proves physical death was only for man: “Therefore, just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all men, (not animals?) because all sinned” Again, context is everything. Romans tells us the “Whole creation was subjected to frustration.”

1 Cor 15:20-23 says “But now is Christ risen from the dead, . . . For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” With the kind of reasoning used by these compromisers we must ask, did Jesus only rise spiritually? Genesis 3:19 says “you are dust and to dust you shall return.” (Sounds physical to me).

In Genesis 3:16 God said, “I will greatly increase your pains in childbearing; with pain you will give birth to children.” How can there be pain in a good world? First, zero to some is an increase. Secondly, at low thresholds pain can be enjoyable as we see many runners and weight lifters attest to. (Although I believe the first explanation is best).

To make evolution fit into their theory they need the flood of Noah to be a local one, not a global one. We read in Gen 7:18-23 “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” The Hebrew *kol* – (all, every) is emphasized so the context alone puts this argument to shame. What about the rainbow? If Noah’s flood was a local one this makes God a liar because He promised never to do such a thing again. Why did God take birds on the ark? Couldn’t they just fly away? Why not tell Noah just to move? How could the waters in a local flood raise 600 feet to get the boat to Ararat? 2 Peter 3:3-7 and Matt 24:37 use the flood as a symbol of endtimes judgment. Will that only be localized? Why is there a specific Hebrew and Greek word used only for Noah’s Flood (mabbul and kataklusmos) while there are plenty of other words that could have been used?

Despite all these logical defenses they try to say “all” doesn’t really mean all when it comes to the flood by going out of context and quoting, Luke 2:1: “There went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed.” Clearly, not the entire world was taxed. The context makes this a non issue by itself but for the skeptics there is an answer. The Greek *oikoumene* refers only to the Roman empire, not the earth. Caesar did take a census of all the Roman empire (*oikoumene*.)

In Genesis 7:19 we read, “And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth; and all the high hills, that were under the whole heaven, were covered (*kasah*)” They say *Kasah* means 1) residing upon, 2) running over, or 3) falling upon. Therefore, waters simply ran over or fell upon the mountains it did not “cover” them. Yes, *Kasah* does have three meanings, but in the Flood account it is combined with the verb *gabar* meaning to “prevail” or “rise” giving no other meaning than to “cover up.” Therefore, the Hebrew makes it clear that the waters rose until they covered the highest mountain. The context of covering the mountains by “twenty feet” also makes no room for water just falling on the mountains. One must do mental gymnastics to make this anything but a global flood.

They also say that Noah’s Ark was too big and that ship builders could not build a boat over the 350 foot mark with wood. Another lie! NO documentation of any shipyard shows they ever tried to build a boat over the 350 foot mark. Besides, Korean Naval architects have confirmed it would be safe to do so. Not to mention that *Leontifera*, described by Ussher, recorded a boat that needed 1600 rowers (800 each side) and 1200 fighting men, which was 400-500 feet long. Athenaeus tells of Ptolemy Philopator’s (244 BC) ship being 420 feet long, 57 feet wide and 72 feet high.

To undermine the scriptures they then try to point out gaps in the genealogical records. In comparing 1 Chron 3:10-12 with Matthew we see the following lineage:

In 1 Chron: -Asa—Jehoshaphat—Jehoram—Ahaziah—Joash—Amaziah—Azariah--Jotham . But in Matt 1:8-9 it is Asa—Jehoshaphat--Jehoram—Uzziah— Jotham Why the difference? It is true that the Hebrew *ab* means father or grandfather and *ben* means son, grandson or descendant. However, none of the gap examples mention age of father at birth. Also, Matthew was

intended to be incomplete to have three groups of 14 names. Finally, there is always an accusative particle (*et*) marking the direct object of the verb “begat” when *ab* means “father” not “grandfather.” In no “gap examples” is this accusative particle used. Though I do not believe or accept that there are gaps in the records, even if there were, to add even 10,000 yrs you need 250 missing generations. Even with this crazy number, it is a far cry from millions of years missing. Besides, Jude 14 confirms “Enoch was seventh from Adam.”

One last ditch effort to show the apparent inaccuracy of Scripture comes from Luke 3:36 where there is an extra name Cainan that isn’t in Genesis. However, the oldest LXX manuscripts don’t have this extra name there. Even Josephus didn’t show it being there.

Though we have only looked at a few of these ridiculous attacks on God, hopefully it is enough to show you that there are no contradictions in Scripture and the only reason one would try to reinterpret the Scripture is because they have placed their trust in man and his interpretation of science (false science) above that of God and His Word.

