Creation Instruction Association - FTB 2
www.creationinstruction.org

Was a day of Creation only 24 hours?

One of the most common ways in which to explain away Scripture so that it fits into the scientific theories is to form your belief system around the old earth theory; that is, a world billions of years old. In order to make this theory fit the Bible, 24 hour days must become vast periods of time. When God says there was morning and evening, the first day, does it really mean many years?

Before we answer this question let us look at why people feel they need to alter what Scripture plainly says. Today one cannot escape the idea of an old earth because it has infiltrated our entire lives and so called "scientific facts." Radiocarbon dating (combined with evolution) has suggested an age of the earth at 4.5 billion years old . If this number turns out to be false what will that say about the credibility of the scientific community, let alone our own credibility for believing them? No one likes to admit they're wrong! But the truth is, evolution is dead unless great amounts of time are possible. Therefore, rather than admit our folly, we will make sure enough time is given to fit our theory, no matter what.

First, let us look at the Hebrew word for day, "yom." Yom can have three different meanings in Scripture: a solar day, daylight, or an indefinite period of time. Never does it mean a set period of time over 24 hours. This word occurs 2,291 times in the Old Testament and almost always means a literal 24 hour solar day. In 359 cases (outside of Genesis 1) yom appears where it is modified

by another number (and the 5th yom), none of which means anything but a literal 24 hour day. The plural, yamine, occurs 845 times, again always meaning 24 hours. In addition, 38 times this word is modified by "evening and/or morning" with every case meaning 24 hours.

Many people marvel at how God could create such an overwhelming universe in so short a time. On the other hand, I have wondered why He took so long. I believe the answer to that question lies in Exodus 20:8-11 where we read, "Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work . . . For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it." Clearly, the reason God took so long to create the universe was to set an example for us and give a pattern for our 7 day week. Because God created in six days and rested on the seventh, we too are to work six days and rest on the seventh.

Even honest evolutionists admit yom is to be interpreted as 24 hours. Replying to a letter written by David Watson asking various scholars the meaning of yom in Genesis, James Barr writes, "Probably, so far as I know, there is no professor of Hebrew or Old Testament at any world-class university who does not believe that the writer(s) of Genesis 1-11 intended to convey to their readers the ideas that (a) creation took place in a series of six days which were the same as the days of 24 hours we now experience..."

Furthermore, if each day was a million years or so, how did the flowers, which were created on day three get pollinated by insects which were not created until eons later. If the sun was not created until day four, how were those plants the day before surviving millions of years without photosynthesis. Also, Adam lived through day six and day seven yet was only 930 years old. Clearly

God created the universe in six, 24 hour days!

The Tales of Dr. Hugh Ross!

Many of you may be familiar with Dr. Ross's scientific attempts to unite the ununitable, creation and evolution. Dr. Ross is a disciple of the Big Bang theory; this belief argues that about 15-20 billion years ago the universe and all its energy was compressed into a single mass about the size of an atom. This "mass" exploded, spreading hydrogen, helium and perhaps lithium, which eventually formed the stars and planets as we view them today.

In order to evaluate this theory and others proposed by Dr. Ross we must understand two things. First, one need not think too strenuously to realize we must believe in either eternal God or eternal matter. This original mass had to come from somewhere, something, or someone. Second, the Bible is clear that we do not have billions of years to work with, rather 6 days.

Dr. Ross needs to have a very old earth to support his opinion of the Big Bang. To give this support, Ross lists a number of our church fathers and other scholars who, as he somehow interprets, all claimed the Genesis days to be long periods of time such as Josephus, Origen, Basil, Augustine, and Aquinas. However, close examination of the work of these men clearly contradict what Ross says they expressed. About the time of Christ the famous Jewish historian wrote in his book, Antiquities of the Jews, "[God] considered the whole mass, and separated the light and the darkness, and the name he gave to one was Night, and the other he called Day; and he made beginning of light and the time of the rest of the Evening and the Morning; and this was the first day. . .." Further, Josephus held that the fourth day God created the sun whereas Dr. Ross says the sun came about on the first day when light first began but just didn't appear until the fourth day when a

dense cloud was removed to reveal it. Such reasoning does not explain why there was light before the sun. Accordingly, the New Jerusalem of Rev. 21:23 needs no sun to give light, rather the glory of God gives the light (See also Is. 60:19,20).

Origen, another of Dr. Ross's so called reliable scholars, continually tried to make the Bible speak figuratively in almost all cases, including Christ's resurrection. He also denied the existence of Hell, believing Satan and his followers would, in the end, be reconciled. Does this sound like a man whose Scriptural interpretations can be trusted?

Augustine, Aquinas, and Basil were quite specific in sharing their belief in natural evolution. Therefore, they must view the Bible as symbolic in order to have the much needed "time." Otherwise their beliefs do not fit. Again, science was used to interpret Scripture, not Scripture to interpret science.

Yet another of Dr. Ross's tall-tales involves the atmosphere of the new earth. Ross says, "Science and the Bible totally agree concerning the initial condition of planet earth, that the earth began with an atmosphere dominated by ammonia and methane." The last time I looked, ammonia and methane are not mentioned in Genesis let alone the rest of Scripture. Ross believes the darkness that was upon the face of the deep (Gen. 1:27) was actually induced by ammonia and methane, even though since the early 1980's, this evolutionistic theory has been widely denied. The May, 1983 issue of Science Digest states that Dr. Joel Levine, of NASA found that ammonia and methane would be chemically unstable at the earths present distance from the sun. However, a new fallacy of a nitrogen and carbon atmosphere has quickly replaced the ammonia-methane theory.

Concerning the moon, astronomers have come up with six different theories of its origin; however, Dr. Ross states, "We know for

certain that the moon came from the earth." Sound a little biased? This "opinion" evolved because his belief is that the indentation in the floor of the Pacific Ocean is the signature of the moons original abode. How can this be when the moon is over thirty times larger than the Pacific Ocean?

Most of you have heard of DNA and RNA. Dr. Ross once made the statement that these two "proteins" are essential for life. DNA and RNA are not proteins; in fact, it is the protein that allows the genes of hereditary traits, a part of DNA, to function. DNA and proteins cannot exist without each other. It is analogous to the age-old question of which came first, the chicken or the egg.

Finally, a key question: Did man progress from apes? Dr. Ross believes, "Starting about 2 to 4 million years ago, God began to create man-like mammals or 'hominids.' These creatures stood on two feet, had large brains, and used tools. Some even buried their dead and painted on cave walls. However, they were very different from us. They had no spirit. They did not worship God or establish religious practices. In time, all these man-like creatures went extinct. Then about 10 or 25 thousand years ago, God replaced them with Adam and Eve" (Leaflet #8909, emphasis added).

What evidence is there to warrant this interpretation of Scripture? The average person only gets to read of Neanderthal man and see pictures of a hairy, hunched over, knuckle-dragging creature. However, what do many in the scientific community say? Marcellin Boule was the man who gave us the original ape-like creature interpretation. However, upon further examination by many other respected scholars, Neanderthal became much more human. William J. Straus Jr., an anthropologist at Johns Hopkins University, and A.J.E. Cave of the Department of Anatomy at St. Bartholomew's College in London also examined these fragmented remains and have stated, "He cannot, in view of his manifest pathology, be used to provide us with a reliable picture of a

normal, healthy Neanderthalian. . .provided he were bathed, shaved and dressed in modern clothing - - it is doubtful whether he would attract any more attention than some of its other denizes." M.F. Ashley Montigu, a well known anthropologist also wrote, "Neanderthal man walked as erect as any modern man; he did not have a bull neck and he was not knock-kneed. And it has long been proved by many independent scientific investigations that the form of the brow or of the head has nothing whatever to do with intelligence. As a matter of fact, we have very good reasons to believe that Neanderthal man was every bit as intelligent as we are today." Again, C. Arambourg and E. Pattie, two more respected anthropologists, also oppose the idea of an ape-like man. The list of doubtfuls goes on and on, yet Dr. Ross can state dogmatically that Neanderthal was ape-like and did not worship God. Isn't it amazing what science can tell us?

Incidentally, there have been some skeletal remains showing humans to be hunched over, but through X-rays of the bones amazing evidence of the flood has been found. Scientists now have discovered Neanderthal men had Rickets, a bone disease caused by cool, damp environments and a Vitamin D deficiency. This expected environment came after the flood and during the ice-age while many fully developed, intelligent humans lived in caves.

Even though Dr. Dobson has, in the past, supported this local flood, Big Bang believing, theistic evolutionist, the scientific and Biblical evidence strongly repudiates Dr. Ross. As always, we must abide by Christ and his Word rather than the words of fallible men who, while may seem intelligent and accepted, were not present when the foundation of the universe was laid. To Christ be the glory forever and ever, AMEN!

Dinosaurs and the Bible

When growing up I never knew if dinosaurs really existed. Childhood questions were left unanswered because what science was telling us about these great creatures wasn't Scriptural, or so I was taught.

Why don't we read about Dinosaurs in the Bible. Quite simply, the Bible was not translated into English until 1600, 240 years before the word "dinosaur" was invented. Sir Richard Owen, an opponent of Darwin gave this name to these large fossils which were first found in 1830. Therefore, the word dinosaur isn't in the Bible because it wasn't around when the Bible was written.

To search further we must go all the way back to creation in Genesis 1:21 when God created great whales (KJV). What exactly were these creatures? The same Hebrew word for "great whales" appears over a dozen times elsewhere in Scripture and is translated as dragons. Isaiah 43:20 reads, "The beast of the field shall honor me, the dragons and the owls." (Ps 74:13; Ps 148:7; Is 13:22; Is 27:1; Is 34:13; Ez 29:3; and Micah 1:8 are a few other examples where this Hebrew word is translated dragon).

The folklore of dragons has filled childrens books for generations but how did these legends originate? I know if I saw a dinosaur I would tell my grandchildren, who would tell there grandchildren and so on. If these animals died out, only a legend remains. In fact, legends of dinosaurs (dragons) have been left all over the world with many of them involving fire-breathing dragons. Something like this must be a myth, Right? Not so fast. The Bombardier Beetle is alive today and has been equipped with a self defense mechanism that allows it to shoot out its abdomen a noxious gas at over 212 degrees Fahrenheit. This is made possible by complex chemicals and enzymes stored in the beetle's body which combusts when mixed with the oxygen in the air. Those who have heard the Pre-Flood lecture may recall that we once had 30% oxygen compared to todays 16% to 19% which would allow for greater

combustibility.

Some dinosaur fossils, such as the Parasaurolophus have been found with hollow chambers on top of there heads with a passage which leads down to the nostril. Though not scientifically proved, these chambers could have been used to store chemicals which when came into contact with the oxygen rich air. . . Kaboom! Job 41 speaks of a great creature called Leviathan which is mighty among God's creations and even breathes fire. The Bible says it so I believe it. Also, Job 40:15ff speaks of another great monster called Behemoth which has a tail like a cedar tree and can not be captured or killed. Sound like a dinosaur? Many Bible commentaries explain this creature as an elephant. Have you seen an elephant's tail? It is not a cedar tree nor would an elephant be as terrifying as what is related here. Always remember commentaries are the words of fallible men who weren't there and don't know everything. But God's Word can be trusted because He was there and does know everything.