



# DO YOU REALLY BELIEVE SCRIPTURE?

## Part II

September 26 and December 12, 2025

Perry Atkinson and John Mittendorf

### INTRODUCTION

Webster's New World Dictionary defines *believe* as "to take as true/real, to trust a statement or promise, to have trust/faith/confidence."<sup>1</sup> When this definition is applied to Scripture, a person who is reading the Bible is directly confronted by the trustworthiness of Scripture as stated in 2 Timothy as follows:

*"(16) All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness,(17) that the man of God may be complete, thoroughly equipped for every good work"*  
2 Timothy 3:16-17

These two verses clearly indicate that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God and provides the comprehensive and complete body of divine truth necessary for life and Godliness. In addition to 2 Timothy 3:6-7, Proverbs states:

*"Do not add to His words, Lest He rebuke you, and you be found a liar"*  
Proverbs 30:6

Additionally, this verse, as well as several others (such as Deuteronomy 4:2 and Revelation 22:18-19) give a clear warning that to add to God's Word is to deny God as the standard of truth, and you will be rebuked (reprimanded).<sup>2</sup> Taken together, the previous verses emphasize the importance of upholding the integrity, trustworthiness and completeness of God's Word, in addition to also warning against altering or distorting it.

So, with the aforementioned Scriptures and the introductory thoughts in mind, let's apply the title of our discussion – ***Do You Really Believe Scripture*** – to the second tenet of our discussion – the *Genesis Creation Account*, and see how it applies to the two previous Scriptures of 2 Timothy 3:16-17 and Proverbs 30:6.

## GENESIS CREATION ACCOUNT

One of the most common portions of biblical Scripture that is either passively or conditionally accepted to outright rejection is the Genesis Creation account that is found in Genesis, chapters 1 thru 8, beginning with the initial phrase of “*God creating the heavens and earth,*” to the conclusion of the global Flood. Surprisingly, even when some people confidently declare that they believe the Bible (and maybe even carry one), they waffle and/or modify the aforementioned Genesis portion of Scripture. The primary reasons for this conundrum are twofold as follows:

- Although God is viewed as the “*one true God,*” He is not viewed as the Sovereign God
- Secular science, evolutionary theory and long ages that have been aggressively and globally propagated since the mid 1800's by secular science, the news media, schools (including many seminaries), the print media, and the list goes on

Although the two aforementioned reasons can place a measure of doubt into the Genesis Creation account, the real problem for Christians comes from skepticism that is incorporated into the Sovereignty of God. Either God is Sovereign over every atom/molecule in the universe and also used Scripture and Genesis to say exactly what He wanted to say, or He is not Sovereign over everything and only used portions of Scripture to convey some of His truth. If this perception were true, then what other portions of the Bible are true, and conversely, what other portions of the Bible are false. Obviously, the Bible is not a true or false document but is clear in its complete written truth as stated in Psalms as follows:

*“The entirety of Your Word is truth”  
Psalm 119:160*

Additionally, if a person does not believe the as-written Creation account in Genesis or supposes it needs to be “*modernized/updated*” with secular scientific theory, then that person is not only minimizing the Sovereignty of God as the Creator, but is also defying 2 Timothy and Proverbs as follows:

*“All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, thoroughly equipped for every good work”  
2 Timothy 3:16-17*

*“Do not add to His words, Lest He rebuke you, and you be found a liar”  
Proverbs 30:6*

So, why is there a partial to full distrust in the Genesis Creation account, particularly when the disbelief in Genesis originated from a secular scientific curriculum which is grounded in secularism and naturalism in addition to constantly being modified with each new "*discovery*." Additionally, when the Genesis Creation debate often centers on the definition of the age of the universe/earth, evolutionary beginnings, and the perception there never was a global Flood, most people are surprised when introduced to the fact that real scientific evidence does not support secular scientific evolutionary theory, and instead, supports the Genesis Creation account.

To support that viewpoint, let's begin with a brief Genesis Creation Overview as an initial baseline. Then, let's look at the most debated word in the Genesis Creation account, "*day*," and lastly, we will consider some of the real scientific evidence that is against the secular scientific dogma that opposes the Genesis Creation account in Genesis 1-11.

### **GENESIS CREATION OVERVIEW**

In the beginning when nothing existed except God, God created the universe in six 24-hour days (Genesis 1; Exodus 31:17; Psalm 33:6-9; John 1:3; Acts 17:24; Hebrews 11:3; Colossians 1:16), meaning the universe, earth and life were created about 6,000 years ago. God chose to create the universe and all that is within it to reveal His glory, divine nature, eternal power, infinite wisdom and supreme authority (Isaiah 43:7; Psalm 19:1-2; Jeremiah 10:12; Romans 1:20; Revelation 4:11). All people are descendants of Adam and Eve, whom God created personally and individually and as complete human beings (Genesis 1:26-27; 2:7; 2:21-22; 1 Corinthians 11:8-9).

The fall of Adam and Eve due to sin infected all subsequent people with sin and death, but the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ gives the opportunity to all people to receive God's gift of eternal life (Romans 5:18-19; 1 Corinthians 15:21-22). God rules over His creation and is involved in the lives of individual people (Job 12:10; Acts 17:25; 25:28; Colossians 1:17; Hebrews 1:13; Ephesians 4:6). Lastly, and due to rampant sin, God destroyed the early earth by a catastrophic global Flood that covered the entire earth and killed all living things on the face of the ground. Only Noah and those that were with him on an Ark remained alive to repopulate the earth after the Flood waters subsided (Genesis 6:13-22; 7:1-24; 8:1-19; 2 Peter 3:6).

### **THE GENESIS HEBREW WORD YOM (DAY)**

Although the previous basic overview of the Genesis Creation account is straightforward, simplistic and the inspired Word of God through Moses, it is disappointing that it forms the foundation for a major area of disagreement in the modern-day church along with other biblical subjects such as the millennium and the presence of the church in the tribulation. So, as the Creation account, the global Flood and the Hebrew/English word *yom/day* is easily capable of creating contentious debate within the Christian church, let's continue and look at an analysis of the Hebrew/English word *yom/day* beginning with

some basic parameters that can be useful in analyzing the Hebrew word “*yom*” as the Old Testament was originally written in Hebrew.

The following translation provisions are useful in helping to understand the conversion of Hebrew text to English text for Genesis 1-11:<sup>3</sup>

- Genesis is an accurate historical account. A linguistic and statistical probability analysis of 0.999987 of the original Hebrew demonstrates it is a narrative, not poetry, and is also supported by the fact that other biblical writers treat the Genesis Creation account as real history
- Biblical writers believed they were writing about real history and writing in a manner of real historical narrative, not poetry that incorporates feelings and ideas
- The world’s greatest Hebraists *all* affirm the Genesis text is narrative prose. Narrative refers to the historical accounts in the Bible which tell about real people, events, and places to convey a divine purpose and reveal truths about God. Prose is ordinary written or spoken language that follows a standard grammatical structure, using sentences and paragraphs rather than the rhythmic and metrical patterns of poetry. It is the everyday ordinary language
- Ordinary Hebrew narrative text with extraordinary content is found throughout the Hebrew Bible, where writers often use simple, direct descriptions to describe momentous, miraculous, or divine events such as Creation. As an example, the beginning of Genesis recounts the Creation of the universe in a matter-of-fact, repetitive manner. The text uses a simple narrative form (“*and God said, and it was so*”) to describe the most profound act in the universe’s history
- Genesis is also referred to as Magisterial Literary Presentation. This title refers to a presentation that is authoritative, masterfully crafted, and often deeply informative. Employs a high level of authority, expertise, and control, evoking a sense of being an absolute master of the subject
- In reading the Bible (particularly Genesis), readers should understand the text/words the normal way the Hebrew was written
- The biblical Genesis text is not compatible with the conventional template of secular evolutionary science.....PERIOD

Now, with the preceding thoughts in mind, let’s continue with our examination of the Hebrew/English word *yom/day* with the understanding that the Bible was written so that it is easy to comprehend, and most importantly, is God’s written Word to not only the early Israelites, but also to modern day people. As an example, consider the following Scripture that is self-descriptive and easy to comprehend:

*“(6) By the word of the Lord the heavens were made, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth. (9) For He spoke, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast”*

*Psalms 33:6 and 9 (NKJV)*

From the preceding Scripture, and in the interest of simplicity, there should not be any doubt that God made the heavens and its contents by speaking with the breath of His mouth, and in a *very short period of time*. So, on the matter of Genesis Creation days being 24-hour literal days or meaning long ages of time (billions and millions of years as some people strongly advocate), we should be able to understand the correct meaning from Scripture alone by using a straightforward *exegesis* (which means reading out of the text or letting the text teach you), instead of *eisegesis* (meaning reading one's own ideas into the text). Consider the following Scripture from Deuteronomy that is discussing the commandments, statutes, and judgments for the Israelite people and their responsibility to teach them to their children:

*"You shall teach them diligently to your children, and shall talk of them when you sit in your house, when you walk by the way, when you lie down to sleep, and when you rise up"*

*Deuteronomy 7:6*

This verse indicates that Scripture was discernible to children so they could comprehend it, and without the assistance and re-interpretation of modern secular science. If this is not sufficiently clear, remember the use of the word *day* is repeated again in Exodus 20:8-11 – *"For in six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day."* The word *"for"* (Hebrew *"ki,"* also having the sense *"because"*) at the beginning of this expression is a causal explanation, showing that the Creation week is the very basis of the working week<sup>4</sup> which is commonly accepted by pastors and Bible study commentaries alike. Moreover, the notes in the ESV Study Bible on Exodus 20:8-11 states – *"The Lord had already begun to form the people's life in the rhythm of working for six days, and resting on the seventh day as a sabbath. Here, the command is grounded further in the way that it imitates the Lord's pattern in creation."* In this Exodus passage, it is explicit that the Creation days were the same as those of the human work week which is further highlighted by the fact that Creation by God in six normal days is significant because a week (how we organize our lives) is based on God creating in 6 days and resting on the 7<sup>th</sup> day so that we have a day off, and is affirmed in Exodus 20:8-11.

There is no point even trying to understand the Bible if the word *"day"* in the same passage and with the same grammatical context can switch meanings from Genesis 1:2-1:31 to Exodus 20:8-11 without any hint of change in the text itself. Additionally, if a biblical day is supposed to mean billions and millions of years, then is the Sabbath day billions and millions of years in length? It is not an accident that the only place in Scripture the word *day* is under attack and allegedly needs to be subjected to re-interpretation is in the Genesis Creation account.

The semantic range of a word is all the possible meanings of that word in the given language. As an example, *in the original Hebrew language of Genesis*, the word *day* is *"yom."* This occurs 2,300 times in the entire Old Testament, with 1,450 in the singular, and 845 in

the plural, and five in the dual form. Its semantic range is restricted to only five meanings:<sup>5</sup>

- A period of light in a day/night cycle
- A period of 24 hours
- A general or vague period of time
- A specific point of time
- A period of a year

With the preceding five meanings of the Hebrew word *yom*, let's use the principle of Unwarranted Expansion of An Expanded Field<sup>6</sup> to determine if the meaning of *yom* is much broader than the context of the Genesis text itself allows, bringing with it the word's entire semantic range. To simplify this consideration, we need to determine how it is used in the specific context, not by possible meanings in unrelated contexts.<sup>7</sup> As an example, and in keeping with this discussion, when *yom* means a period of time, it is heavily modified by other time indicators such as the words for evening and morning. And even in those cases, it is that other time unit that gives its length of duration, not the singular use of the word *yom* as follows:

- *Yom + Number*<sup>8</sup>

When *yom* is modified by a cardinal number (one, two three, etc.) or ordinal number (first, second, third, etc.), as used 359 times in the Old Testament outside Genesis 1, *yom* always means a literal day of about 24 hours, or the light portion of the day-night cycle. In particular, a cardinal number with the word day denotes a specific duration of time

- *Cardinals and Ordinal*<sup>9</sup>

The days of Genesis 1 have an interesting pattern in the Hebrew which is not often reflected in English translations. The first day has a cardinal number, while the other days have ordinal numbers. So, a literal translation of creation week would be day one, a second day, a third day, a fourth day, a fifth day, the sixth day, and the seventh day. Evening is the transition from light/day to darkness/night. Morning is the transition from darkness/night to light/day. Thus, having an evening and a morning amounts to having one full day

- *Evening and Morning*:<sup>10</sup>

The two words 'evening' (*ereb*) and 'morning' (*boqer*) are combined with *yom* 19 times each outside of Genesis 1. Every time, they clearly mean a particular literal part of a 24-hour day, regardless of the literary context. All the instances of *yom* in the Genesis 1 account are qualified by the statement "*and there was evening, and there was morning*", which by comparing with other Scripture, must denote a 24-hour day. The use of evening and morning reinforces the fact of literal days

- *Day with Night:*<sup>11</sup>

The word for night (*layil* or *layla*) is combined with *yom* 53 times in the Old Testament outside of Genesis 1. Whether in the historical (26 times), poetic (16 times), or prophetic (11) times, it unambiguously means the dark portion of a 24-hour cycle. Because of the day-night cycle, this use of *yom* as the opposite of *layla* as a literal 24-hour cycle of light and dark is the core meaning

In summary, the word day (*yom*) in Genesis is associated with certain grammatical contexts, any of which alone indicate 24-hour days:

- With a numeric
- With evening and morning
- Associated with night

Yet, Genesis 1 has all three of the aforementioned features, so this becomes overwhelming evidence that the days are ordinary-length 24-hour days. In fact, one must ask – “If God really did mean to communicate creation in six ordinary days, how could He have done so more clearly?” Or conversely, “If God really did create over millions of years, how could He have been more misleading”? Therefore, in a biblical and Hebrew context in the Genesis account of Creation, the word *day* means a literal 24-hours. The resultant consequential implications are:

- **The long periods of time that an evolutionary perspective requires does not fit anywhere within the 6-day Creation account**
- **The evolutionary process within the 6-day Creation week is also not possible**
- **There is no room for evolution, anywhere, in the biblical account of Creation**
- **If a day is an age, then was Jesus:**
  - **Crucified for an age?**
  - **In the tomb for an age?**
  - **Buried for an age?**

Let's close this portion of our discussion on the meaning of the Hebrew/English words *yom/day* with the following quotes from two renowned Hebraists:

*“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 that creation took place in a series of 6 days which were the same as the days of 24-hours we now experience, and Noah’s Flood was understood to be worldwide”*

*James Barr, past Regis Professor of Hebrew,  
Oriental and Laing Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture,  
Oxford University<sup>12</sup>*

*"I have not met any Hebrew professors who had the slightest doubt about this unless they were already committed to some alternative by other considerations that do not arise from a straightforward reading of the Hebrew text as it stands"*

*Hugh Williamson, current Regis Professor of Hebrew at Oxford University<sup>13</sup>*

Now, let's look at some secular scientific dogma that opposes the Genesis Creation account in Genesis 1-11 and see if it supports secular science or the Genesis Creation account, beginning with the origin of long ages as opposed to thousands of biblical years.

## **LONG AGES**

The belief in long ages vs the Genesis account can typically be looked at from three perspectives as follows:<sup>14</sup>

- Young Earth Creationists:
  - Believe that Genesis is literal history
  - Believe that Creation is a narrative written in prose, which is historically accurate
  - Genesis is a clear transparent text of what happened
- Old Earth Creationists:
  - They introduce the concept of deep time and a different way of looking at Genesis
  - Believe that Creation is a myth written in poetry which may be interpreted with great latitude (framework hypothesis, day age theory, gap theory, etc.)
  - Believe that something happened, but they borrow the historical model from the materialist naturalism, therefore believing in an old earth agenda
- Materialistic Naturalism:
  - Believe that the Creation narrative is written in prose, which is an erroneous archaic account
  - Old Earth Creationists believe that the author of Genesis intended Genesis to be read as history, but don't believe that it is history

A prime cornerstone of secular science is their posterchild of long ages that typically incorporates billions, millions, and/or hundreds of thousands of years that are used to incorporate the theory of evolution (that needs long ages of time). As an example, according to secular science, the age of the universe is about 13.8 billion years,<sup>15</sup> the age of the earth is about 4.5 billion years,<sup>16</sup> and man first appeared on earth about 315,000 years ago.<sup>17</sup> It is virtually impossible to begin with a straightforward reading of Genesis and arrive at the opinion that the universe and earth are older than a few thousand years unless starting with an outside agenda. The order of Creation itself rules out the possibility that the days of Genesis 1 were really long ages and that is what a simple reading of Scripture plainly teaches. God simply spoke the word and brought forth out of nothing everything we see, and Scripture says He did it in six days. Absolutely nothing in the text of Genesis 1:1-2:3 speaks of evolution or long geological ages in the Creation process. The text itself is, in fact, a straightforward refutation of all evolutionary

principles if we simply take the statements of Genesis at face value. So, as there is nothing in biblical Scripture from Genesis to Revelation to allow for billions and millions of years,<sup>18</sup> then where did the perspective of billions and millions of years come from?

Prior to the eighteenth century, the issue of Creation being accomplished in six 24-hour days was not an issue as six 24-hour days were generally accepted by the church and the scientific community alike.<sup>19</sup> However, during the eighteenth century, evolutionary and naturalistic theories of the earth's creation based on uniformitarian assumptions (*the perception that the same natural laws and processes that operate in the universe now, have always operated in the universe in the past and apply everywhere*) and old-earth theories emerged in addition to two enlightenment-generated philosophical movements, deism and atheism. These movements began to elevate human reason to a place of supreme authority and took an anti-super naturalistic view of the Bible, holding it to be just another human book.

During the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, two notable events in 1830 and 1859 began to dramatically alter the course of secular science. In 1830, Geologist Charles Lyell, published a groundbreaking three volume book, *Principles of Geology*, that was largely responsible for the general acceptance of the view that all features of the earth's surface were produced by biological processes through long periods of geological time (billions and millions of years). This theory was (and still is) called uniformitarianism (the present is the key to the past) and was accepted as a replacement for biblical chronology, Noah's global Flood, and has been called the most important scientific book ever. A stunning claim, but Charles Lyell's *Principles of Geology* began to replace the prevailing views with how earth had been formed by vast geological ages. This led to the young Charles Darwin taking *Principles of Geology* with him on the voyage of the HMS Beagle and found it so revelatory that he used the concept of long periods of geological time to help explain the slow process of evolution by natural selection. Lyell later helped Darwin publish his book, *On the Origin of Species*, in 1859.<sup>20,21,22</sup>

So, by the end of the 1800's, there were three competing views of earth history as follows:

- Catastrophic view. Although the adherents of this viewpoint believed in God, they also believed in numerous catastrophic floods over millions of years
- Uniformitarian view. Although the adherents of this viewpoint may have believed in God, they did not believe in a global Flood and believed there were slow gradual changes over millions of years
- Biblical/Traditional view. Belief in a supernatural Creation, a global Flood, and a universe/earth that are about 6,000 years old

Although the 19<sup>th</sup> century witnessed the previous three competing views of earth history, the Christian church generally still believed in thousands of years and a global

Flood. Now, let's look at how the Christian church slowly began to incorporate millions of years into biblical Scripture:<sup>23</sup>

- 1810 – Introduction of the Gap Theory (insert long ages between verses 1 and 2 of Genesis 1)
- 1820 – Introduction of the Day-Age Theory (creation days are interpreted as long ages) and the concept of a Peaceful Global Flood theory
- 1830 – The strong introduction of the Local Flood Theory (Mesopotamian Valley area) and the perception of Genesis as a myth – not history
- 1850 – The general acceptance of millions of years by the Christian church that was framed on the foundation of *“everything can be explained by time, plus chance, plus the laws of nature”*

Once the concept of millions of years had gained the status of acceptable science, some influential and respected Christian authors and publications added to its credibility. Several examples are:<sup>24</sup>

- 1909 C.I. Scofield, Scofield Reference Bible. The margin notes for Genesis 1:2 states – *“The first creative act refers to the dateless past, and gives scope for all the geologic ages”*
- 2000 Dr. Norman Geisler, Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics. Pages 270 and 272 state – *“The problem is deepened by the fact that there is prima facie evidence to indicate that the days of Genesis are indeed twenty-four-hour periods.....Most scientific evidence sets the age of the world at billions of years”*

Although the ideology of vast ages and/or billions and millions of years is constantly used by the secular science/media to allegedly replace or minimize the biblical Creation account of literal 24-hour days, it is not surprising that with the constant mantra of vast ages, factual science ***does not justify*** the scientific theory of vast ages and/or billions and millions of years for the age of the universe and earth. Interestingly, there are many types of evidence for the age of the universe and earth that indicates they are much younger than is generally declared by modern secular science. All ages (called clocks) result from calculations that must involve making assumptions about the past as secular science is without any eyewitness accounts concerning the beginning of the universe or earth which then places the validity of secular science dating in question. Instead, ages of billions and millions of years are all started by initially *assuming* the rates of change of processes in ages past were the same as we observe today. This is called the principle of *uniformitarianism*, which is a foundation of modern secular science dating methodology.<sup>25</sup>

Still, in the absence of observation, there is no independent natural and/or reliable secular clock that uniformitarian assumptions of vast ages have witnessed, tested and verified. So, the balance of this discussion is not trying to prove the biblical age of thousands of years with factual science. Rather, it is demonstrating that factual science is overwhelmingly in favor of an age far younger than the current billions and millions of

years used by secular science,<sup>26</sup> yet evolutionary theory needs billions of years for any alleged credibility.

As radiometric dating methods are a major argument for vast ages, let's begin with how this methodology works and the assumptions behind it, and then we will continue with some other scientific evidences that do not support the evolutionary perspective of vast ages.<sup>27</sup> Remember, even though this section grants the vast-agers premises about uniformitarianism (for the sake of argument), the *science* is overwhelmingly in support of an age for the earth (and universe) far younger than billions of years.

## RADIOACTIVE DATING

Radioactive dating has served as a cornerstone for the “*vast ages hypothesis*” that is being taught as settled science in educational systems throughout the world and is one of the main reasons people believe in billions and millions of years of time. Over the past 400 hundred years, secular scientists have tried various methods to determine the age of this planet. In the twentieth century, scientists began to use radioactive dating (also known as radiometric or radioisotope dating) as a selective means to date surface rocks on earth (which are considered to be the oldest substances on the earth's surface), which is then applied to the age of the earth. The following typical secular quote summarizes how this is accomplished:

*“The age of the earth is measured by studies of radioactive elements. Radioactive elements are unstable and ‘parent’ atoms decay into other ‘daughter’ elements at a steady rate. For example, through a series of steps, atoms of uranium decay into atoms of lead. By measuring the abundance of ‘parent’ and ‘daughter’ atoms in rock samples and knowing the decay rate, geologists can calculate the age of the rock. Using several different sets of parent and daughter elements, geologists have measured the age of a variety of rocks, including terrestrial and lunar rocks as well as meteorites, which originate primarily from asteroids. The results consistently indicate an age of about 4.56 billion years for the earth.”<sup>28</sup>*

Why should there be an active interest in radioactive dating when — according to the previous quote — the basic premise of modern earth dating techniques with their companion of billions and/or millions of years appears to be a reliable and trustworthy scientific methodology? From the perspective of this discussion, the answer is much more than just using radioactive dating to date the time frame of the earth as the perspective of time is also a foundation upon which the Christian faith rests, and also begins in the book of Genesis. Without Genesis, death has reigned on the earth for millions and/or billions of years before the Fall, there was no basis for sin, and therefore, no reason for the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ. Conversely, radioactive dating is the support upon which the secular scientific theory of vast ages stands and depends on. If it fails, then the theory of vast ages fails as a viable explanation for origins without God (evolution).

Ultimately, the allegation that radioactive dating “*scientifically proves*” that the earth is about 4.56 billions years old (and dinosaurs disappeared about 65 million years ago) is not science but rather a belief.<sup>29</sup> These beliefs are based on the secular Humanist Manifestos<sup>30,31,32</sup> and accompanying articles and books.<sup>33,34,35</sup> Without an absolute authority, secular humanism is simply the opinion of a few very privileged people. The absolute authority that they adopted and cling tightly to is secular science — at least the science according to their definition.

Now, let’s specifically turn our attention to the important facets of radioactive dating by starting with the fact that all radioactive dating methods depend on four fundamental assumptions. The following assumptions are not observable, repeatable or testable, and most notably, are *secular scientific assumptions* that frankly are rarely ever publicized:<sup>36,37,38</sup>

- *Decay constants are constant throughout time:*

For many years, specific radioactive constants were assumed to be constant over long periods of time and based on uniformitarianism. This particular uniformitarianism-based assumption is common to all vast age earth variances. But recent secular research has indicated that radioactive decay rates can accelerate by as much as 10<sup>9</sup> over present decay rates under certain extreme conditions. This supports the data that decay is not constant over time which negates the secular uniformitarianism dependence on constant decay rates

- *The dated artifact is a closed system during the age of that system:*

For accuracy, current dating methods require a closed system meaning that no matter (contamination) enters or leaves an artifact during the entire age of the system. This also means that the artifact to be dated (and is alleged to be billions/millions of years old) must have existed as a closed system for billions/millions of years. Given the amount of volcanic, chemical, and hydrothermal activity on and in the earth’s crust, this seems to not only be a very bad assumption, but one that defies common sense and/or logic. Therefore, can any artifact remain unaffected by its environment over an alleged billions and/or millions of years

- *The initial concentrations of radioactive material being used for dating an artifact are known:*

When dealing with artifacts and vast ages for measurements, the initial concentrations of radioactive elements must obviously be known to achieve an accurate measurement of these elements. Originally, these initial concentrations were determined by educated guesses and then adjusted to fit the vast ages perception of evolutionary thought. Currently, some adjustments have been made although they still have unanswered problems. From a simple perspective, if an artifact is going to be dated and will potentially fall into the range of vast ages, how is it possible to accurately know the initial concentration of parent and daughter elements that are billions and/or millions of years old

- *Enough decay has occurred to enable measurement of daughter elements to be measured:*  
Lastly, there must be enough radioactive decay of the parent element to allow measuring of resulting daughter elements. Therefore, for an object that is thought to be one billion years old, it is necessary to measure daughter decay concentrations of 1 to 80 parts per million in the object of interest which is a formidable task even for modern technology. Not surprisingly, the measurement problem increases for time frames less than one billion years

Now, let's summarize the preceding radioactive dating discussion and look at a popular dating method that is currently utilized to produce the alleged dates that are commonly used to substantiate vast ages as applied to the age of the earth and potentially other items within the area of vast ages:

### **Radioisotope**

Radioisotope (or radiometric) dating is normally limited to dating rocks which are considered the oldest objects on earth. Rocks that can be dated with radioisotope methods are *metamorphic* (granite) and *igneous* (volcanic) rocks and are dated by comparing the amount of unstable radioactive “Parent” elements and their “Daughter” elements. Parent elements are unstable radioactive elements that decay into daughter elements over a period of time. There are also other radioisotope dating methods such as potassium-argon, rubidium-strontium, and lead-lead, but they all operate on the same basic principle and have the same previously mentioned four negative assumptions.

This is how radioisotope dating works using the uranium (U-238) – lead (Pb-206) method:

- The dating process starts with the assumption that U-238 has a half-life of 4.5 billion years (this means that it takes that amount of time for half of the original U-238 to decay into Pb-206). A measurement of the amount of uranium-238 and lead-206 that are present in the rock are taken including the amount of the intermediate isotopes as this will purportedly yield the age of the rock from the ratio of the uranium-238 to lead-206 that is found in the rock. The fatal flaw to this supposition is that secular science cannot confirm that the decay rate has been constant over 4.5 billion years, the rock sample has never been contaminated over 4.5 billion years, and most importantly, the *original* quantity of radioactive element (i.e., uranium-238) being measured cannot be known in an alleged 4.5 billion year-old rock, it can only be assumed.<sup>39</sup>

At this point in our discussion, a legitimate question is — “*how accurate are radioisotope dating methods?*” Based on the current measurements of rocks of *known* ages, radioisotope-dating methods are extremely inaccurate! Following are a few examples:<sup>40</sup>

- The Kaupulehu Flow, Hualalai Volcano, Hawaii, is known to have erupted in 1800-1801. Yet, radioisotope dating ranges from 1.32 to 1.76 million years old

- Lava flows at Mt. Ngauruhoe, New Zealand, are known to have erupted in 1954. Yet, radioisotope dating methods have yielded dates up to 3.5 million years old
- Mt. Saint Helens, Washington, erupted in May 1980. Yet, radioisotope dating of the lava flows yielded dates between 350,000 and 2.8 million years old

The previous examples give credibility to the reaction that radioisotope dating does not work on rocks of *known* ages, but is assumed to work on rocks of *unknown* ages. In many cases, it is a fact that published dates are in reality, selected dates by secular science, so the published date by secular science for the age of the earth is an assumption based on an inaccurate methodology. These studies also show large-scale errors for rocks known to be less than a century old. Similar results have been previously published for many other modern lavas which allegedly yielded exceedingly old ages.

*Note: Although radioisotope dating is used on rocks, it is not used on past living things, such as plants, animals and human remains. In this case, carbon-based radiometric dating (carbon-14) is used but is also hampered by the same basic parameters and noteworthy limitations.*

Although the previous examples of secular dating methodology do not give credibility to the mantra of long ages from radioisotope dating methodology, there are numerous other examples that also do not justify the secular scientific theory of vast ages and/or billions and millions of years. The following are three common examples:

### **(1) COAL AND DIAMONDS**

Coal is claimed to be between 360 to 290 million years old and diamonds are asserted to be 3.5 to 1 billion years old.<sup>41</sup> Yet, *readily* detectable amounts of carbon-14 (<sup>14</sup>C) has been detected in samples of coal, diamonds, and even fossils that are dated at 500 million years old (what makes this conundrum noteworthy is that <sup>14</sup>C has a rapid decay rate, so all traces of <sup>14</sup>C should be gone after about 60,000 to 90,000 years). Conventional <sup>14</sup>C laboratories have been aware of this anomaly since the early 1980's, and are unable to account for it as this points towards an earth that is thousands of years old, not billions of year's old.<sup>42</sup> The presence of <sup>14</sup>C in "*very old ancient*" materials consisting of coal and diamonds is clearly a major conflict with the vast ages time scale alleged by secular dating methods and ideology. Additionally, this <sup>14</sup>C data is firmly on the side of the biblical young-earth view of history.

### **(2) SOFT TISSUE IN FOSSILS**

This is a leading problem for the evolutionary dating process and the perspective of vast ages with its companion of millions of years. To summarize, in 2005 a research group led by Paleontologist Dr. Mary Schweitzer, University of Montana, reported the discovery of fresh red blood cells, hemoglobin, soft fibrous tissue, intact bone cells, fragments of collagen (primary protein in bone), <sup>14</sup>C and complete soft blood vessels in the fossilized femur (leg bone) of an alleged 68 million year old T. rex.<sup>43</sup> Remarkably, the tissue had

retained its pliable and soft characteristics that allowed it to be stretched and then quickly returning to its original shape. This discovery provides direct physical evidence that the T. rex fossil was not millions of years old which stands in a direct contradiction of contemporary secular dating systems. Not surprisingly, this discovery created an enormous amount of skepticism as it was obvious that if dinosaur fossils are at least 68 million years old, any residual tissue and organic materials should have decomposed millions of years ago, and any fossil examined for  $^{14}\text{C}$  after this time frame should be completely *carbon dead*.

Interestingly, the research group led by Dr. Schweitzer was not the first to detect such tissue (over 100 documented to date — see [icr.org](http://icr.org)). For several decades, researchers have reported detecting amino acids in dinosaur fossils,<sup>44</sup> and microscopic observations of fresh dinosaur cells and potentially even proteins.<sup>45</sup> These reports attracted a minimal amount of attention and/or curiosity from the general scientific community until Dr. Schweitzer published her findings — in color — in the prominent science journal *Science* that reaches a wide and scholarly readership.

Yet, relatively short time frames for the deterioration of organic materials in fossils is not unknown to the scientific community. As an example, in 2007, Dr. Schweitzer and her co-authors admitted that the “*present state of knowledge*” holds that there will be “*total degradation of recognizable organic materials in days or years.*”<sup>46</sup> Some protein decay models demonstrate that under certain ideal conditions, some proteins can survive for several thousand years. These models are fully consistent with proteins in a 4,000 to 6,000 year-old T. rex fossil. However, they directly contradict claims that protein can survive in a 68-million-year-old T. rex fossil.

Additionally, the discovery of the presence of soft tissue, fresh blood cells and proteins not only dissolves the underpinnings of the evolutionary timescale, but also demonstrates there never was an “*age of dinosaurs,*” never an “*age before humans,*” and never an “*age of long evolutionary progression.*” There is only one earth history. This is not a history of life crawling up from the pre-biotic ocean and/or swamp through vast ages, but a recent history; a history of God’s created world; a history revealing His creative power. It is a history that serves as a testimony that He, and not eons of time, created all things.<sup>47</sup> This discovery (which is not the first for Dr. Schweitzer or other scientists) makes an obvious statement — “*It is inconceivable that such things could be preserved for millions of years. Evidence of hemoglobin, and the still-recognizable shapes of red blood cells in ancient dinosaur bone is a powerful testimony against the whole idea of dinosaurs living millions of years ago. It speaks volumes for the Bible’s account of a recent creation.*”<sup>48</sup>

So, if dinosaur bones cannot be millions of years old, how old are they? The simple answer is — *a few thousand years old, not millions of years old!*

### (3) GENETICS<sup>49,50</sup>

The field of genetics is unique in that no other scientific field directly records a species ancestry. Fossils, geography, anatomy, and physiology are not inherited. DNA is the actual chemical that is passed on in sperm and egg. Therefore, only the field of genetics acts as a direct record of species ancestry, and by the virtue of the manner in which DNA changes each generation, DNA also records the passage of time. DNA exists in the form of a twisted ladder. Each rung of the ladder represents a chemical letter, and the *different colors* of the rungs represent the four different DNA letters (TACG). When fertilization occurs at the moment of conception, the copying process is imperfect, resulting in copying errors changing the color of one of the rungs to a different rung color. Over time, the number of color-changed rungs increases, acting like a clock (referred to as the DNA clock) that measures time since a particular DNA sequence first came to be.

By comparing the rungs of the DNA ladder among various species reveals a stunning result. If species have been in existence for millions of years, a large number of the DNA rungs should have a different color. In contrast, the vast majority of these rungs are the same and it's as if species originated in the last few thousand years. When the direct genetic record of a species origin is examined, very few genetic differences — far too few for species to have arisen over millions of years (vast ages) are observed — but just the right amount if the species originated within the last few thousand years. In other words, if species originated within the last 6,000 years, very few ticks on the DNA clock would have occurred, and this is exactly what is observed,<sup>51</sup> which supports the biblical Creation account.

### EVOLUTION

Although there are multiple definitions for secular evolutionary theory, the following two definitions are great starting points:

*“The virtually infinite variations on life are the result of the evolutionary process. All living creatures are related by descent from common ancestors. Humans and other mammals descend from shrew-like creatures that lived more than 150 million years ago; mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, and fishes share as ancestor’s aquatic worms that lived 600 million years ago; and all plants and animals derive from bacteria-like microorganisms that originated more than 3 billion years ago. Biological evolution is a process of descent with modification. Lineages of organisms change through generations; diversity arises because the lineages that descend from common ancestors diverge through time.”<sup>52</sup>*

*“Life began when earth was young. The planet was born about 4.6 billion years ago, and its crust began to solidify about 4 billion years ago. A few hundred million years later, by 3.5 billion years ago, earth was already inhabited by a diversity of organisms. Life on earth began in water and evolved there for 3 billion years before spreading onto land. Modern life, even land-dwelling life, is still tied to water”<sup>53</sup>*

After reading the previous two definitions from well-known secular scientific sources, the following four predictable highlights should have been easily recognized:

1. If new species are formed naturally – not supernaturally – what place then, for God?
2. Evolution is the only reasonable secular explanation for diversity of life on earth
3. There is no secular explanation for the initial beginning of the universe or life
4. Nothing in secular biology makes sense except in the light of evolution

Even though the aforementioned four predictable highlights are false from a biblical viewpoint, number three is particularly egregious from the fact that secular science is lacking any evidence for Darwinian evolution. In fact, it can be confidently stated that *“Evolution violates the fundamental laws of nature and the universe.”* Let’s continue on this theme and look at some key areas that underscore the reality that evolution violates the basic laws of nature and the universe, and begin with the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Laws of Thermodynamics as they are the cornerstones of science and have also proven to be the fundamental laws of the universe:

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Law of Thermodynamics<sup>54</sup>**

The 1<sup>st</sup> Law of Thermodynamics is summarized as follows – *“Energy can neither be created nor destroyed.”* This law is known as the law of energy conservation and states that energy can be converted from one form to another, but it cannot be created or destroyed. The current evolutionary explanation for the beginning of the universe is the Big Bang theory that states – *“The universe burst into something from absolutely nothing, zero, nada. And as it got bigger, it became filled with even more stuff that came from absolutely nowhere.”<sup>55</sup>* When the 1<sup>st</sup> Law of Thermodynamics is applied to the evolutionary explanation of the universe, one must ponder the question of the origin of the material that was responsible for the sudden burst of energy, or, the Big Bang. This question formed the headline for the cover of Discover magazine, April 2002, when it asked the question *“Where Did Everything Come From?”*

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> Law of Thermodynamics<sup>56</sup>**

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Law of Thermodynamics is summarized as follows – *“Everything moves from order to disorder.”* This is known as entropy or the law of energy decay and is readily observable in everything we see around us, such as your home, car, and also includes the universe (that scientists will admit is slowly winding down). Another way to look at this law is that every system left to its own devices tends to move from order to disorder (degeneration). A classic example of the application of this law is what you see in the mirror each morning. Is your persona improving or does it continually require more time to make you presentable? In opposition to this law is the theory of evolution that necessitates billions of years of continual violations to this law. Evolution requires that the evolutionary processes be steadily and constantly on an upward road to improvement while the Second Law of Thermodynamics plainly makes the opposite obvious.

When the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Laws of Thermodynamics are applied to Creation, we find that God is the only one capable of creating energy and matter from nothing (*bara*), and the universe has been winding down since the sin and fall of Adam and Eve. Conversely, when the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Laws of Thermodynamics are applied to evolution, it is unmistakably obvious that the first law proves the universe could not have created itself, and the second law also proves that the universe is winding down. As a result, these two laws prohibit secular organic evolution and strongly support biblical Creation.

### **Law of Biogenesis<sup>57</sup>**

To understand the importance of chemistry and the theory of evolution, it is necessary to briefly revisit the secular scientific premise of the beginning of life from the renowned secular textbook, *Essential Biology*:

*“Life began when earth was young. The planet was born about 4.6 billion years ago, and its crust began to solidify about 4 billion years ago. A few hundred million years later, by 3.5 billion years ago, earth was already inhabited by a diversity of organisms. Life on earth began in water and evolved there for 3 billion years before spreading onto land. Modern life, even land-dwelling life, is still tied to water”*

The preceding definition depends on the theory that the universe and life just somehow happened. However, the field of chemistry with the benefit of modern advances immediately raises a major objection to this evolutionary theory. Up to about the sixteenth century, it was believed that life emerged spontaneously from non-living matter, which was known as spontaneous generation. Then, spontaneous generation was disproved by Redi (1688), Spallanzani (1780), Virchow (1858), and the renowned Louis Pasteur in 1860. These scientists (as well as others) conclusively proved that life only comes from preexisting life which then continues to perpetuate its own kind. Today, this fact is known as The Law of Biogenesis (or the Biogenetic Law), and clearly states that life could not have spontaneously begun in the air, on land, or in water.

Although evolutionary theory relies on the science of chemistry for the spontaneous generation of life from non-living materials, modern advances in science have proven that life could not have evolved from spontaneous generation in the early primordial oceans (or anywhere else). These facts leave just one solution for the beginning of life – Creation – that clarifies how life originally started. That clarification is found in the first chapter of Genesis.

### **THE FOSSIL RECORD<sup>58</sup>**

When evaluating the development of life on earth (either from an evolutionary or a creationist perspective), a reasonable approach would be to look at the historical record of life by an examination of fossilized remains of past forms of life found in the earth’s rock strata. Today, the discovery of 250 thousand fossilized species and a total of 250

million catalogued fossils over the past 150 years have yielded a wealth of fossils that can be used for investigative purposes.

Because the aforementioned number of fossils has been recovered and catalogued, an evolutionist should be looking for an innumerable number of *transitional fossils* (fossils of organisms that have traits from both ancestral and descendant species) showing a link between different groups that should also have been recovered from the earth's rock strata. From an evolutionary viewpoint, if species are evolving upward and changing into higher forms of species, then fossils that display the characteristics of two species (and the in-between transitional form) should also be present in the fossil record. Therefore, the fossil record should display the following characteristics from an evolutionary viewpoint:

- Gradual appearance of complex forms
- Slow change of simple forms into more complex forms
- Transitional life forms linking lower to more complex forms of life

Conversely, from a creationist viewpoint, transitional fossils should *not* be found in the fossil record as God created the various species fully formed from the moment of Creation as outlined in Genesis. Therefore, the fossil record should display the following characteristics from a creationist viewpoint:

- Sudden appearance of complex forms and with complete characteristics
- A lack of transitional fossils

Not surprisingly, and from a biblical perspective, when the fossil record is examined, there is a sudden appearance of *most major groups of animals* in the geological Cambrian Period<sup>59</sup> and is referred to in geology as the "*Cambrian Explosion*." The Cambrian Period was a geological era that lasted from approximately 541 to 485.4 million years ago (using secular timetables of vast ages). This was a recognized problem by Charles Darwin in the 1800s and persists as an embarrassing enigma today as evidenced by the following two quotes by Charles Darwin:

*"The complete lack of fossil intermediates in the geological record is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory"*<sup>60</sup>

*"Why, if species have descended from other species by fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms?"*<sup>61</sup>

The Cambrian Explosion is a complete evolutionary enigma for a number of important reasons.<sup>62</sup> First, a rapid diversification of animal life that resulted in the appearance of nearly all major animal groups in the fossil record, meaning that incredibly complex animal life appeared suddenly and without any sign of preceding evolutionary ancestors. Second, many creatures that appeared in the Cambrian layers have living counterparts today that show no sign of evolution—a paradox evolutionists label *living*

*fossils*. Third, tube worms (another living fossil) have been found in rocks just below the Cambrian, and their fossils yielded soft, pliable tissue. The fact that their tissue, along with many other examples, is still soft and undecayed indicates they were buried only thousands of years ago in the global Flood account in Genesis.

The sudden appearance of complex life forms in the Cambrian Period and a lack of transitional fossils in the fossil record are two revelations that should not be surprising from a creationist viewpoint, but are fatal to the theory of evolution. In response to this fact, the late renowned evolutionary paleontologist and biologist, Stephen J. Gould of Harvard, proposed another theory called *"Punctuated Equilibrium"* that postulates new species suddenly appeared from cosmic bursts that left no trace of transitional fossils. The following quotes gives new meaning to the absence of transitional fossils in the fossil record:

*"The absence of fossil evidence for intermediary stages between major transitions has been a persistent and nagging problem for gradualist accounts of evolution, and is the trade secret of paleontology"*<sup>63</sup>

Stephen J. Gould, *Evolutionist*, Harvard

*"Still, if evolution is gradual, there should be a fossilized record of small, incremental changes on the way to a new species. But in many cases, scientists have been unable to find most of these intermediate forms. Darwin himself was shaken by their absence. His conclusion was that the fossil record was lacked these transitional stages, because it was so incomplete. That is certainly true in many cases, because the chances of each of those critical changing forms having been preserved as fossils are small. But in 1972, evolutionary scientists Stephen Jay Gould and Niles Eldredge proposed another explanation, which they called 'punctuated equilibrium.' That is, species are generally stable, changing little for millions of years. This leisurely pace is 'punctuated' by a rapid burst of change that results in a new species and that leaves few fossils behind"*<sup>64</sup>

Southern Oregon PBS Evolution Library

At his point, it should be stated that secular science fully supports the alleged viewpoint of transitional fossils in the fossil record. This support can be found in museum exhibitions around the world and in various secular printed media formats as demonstrated by the following quote:

*"A fossil that shows an intermediate state between an ancestral trait and that of its later descendants is said to bear a transitional feature. The fossil record includes many examples of transitional features, providing an abundance of evidence for evolutionary change over time"*<sup>65</sup>

A recent secular magazine *LiveScience* article describes what it claims are 12 specific transitional fossils.<sup>66</sup> Although the article asserts that the fossil record *"is full of them,"* the reality is that it does not contain a ***single universally accepted transitional form*** as every

transitional fossil candidate has both proponents and doubters, even among evolutionary biologists and paleontologists. Let's look at two of these alleged transitional fossils:

### **Archaeopteryx**

The popular alleged transitional fossil Archaeopteryx has been heralded for over 160 years as a transitional fossil between birds and dinosaurs. That is, until recently where evolutionary scientists are now placing Archaeopteryx in the imaginary feathered dinosaur category.<sup>67</sup> However, a closer look at the fossil's anatomy reveals that the feathers are completely aerodynamic and indicative of flight, it possessed a skeletal anatomy like a bird and walked like a modern bird, not a theropod dinosaur.<sup>68</sup> From a noteworthy perspective, the renowned evolutionary ornithologist and world expert on birds, Alan Feduccia, considers Archaeopteryx a perching bird and has famously stated *"Paleontologists have tried to turn Archaeopteryx into an earth-bound, feathered dinosaur. But it's not. It is a bird, a perching bird. And no amount of 'paleobabble' is going to change that."*<sup>69</sup> Archaeopteryx is not a transitional fossil or feathered dinosaur as it flew like a bird and walked like a bird. Archaeopteryx is simply an extinct type of bird created by Jesus in the beginning.

### **Lucy**

Most people consider our alleged ape ancestry as established science, with secular science asserting Lucy as the main link between apes and humans. However, the story that we evolved from the same animal ancestors as today's ape's conflicts with both science and the Bible. Those with a firm view of Scripture need only to read Genesis 2:5 to settle the issue — *"There was no man to till the ground."* Therefore, there were no humans before Adam, and Adam came not from an animal but from dust as found in Genesis 2:7.<sup>70</sup>

Lucy is the nickname that discoverer Donald Johanson's team gave to a partial skeleton of assembled bone fragments extracted from a large, mixed bone bed in 1974 and was quickly touted as a major discovery as follows:

*"She's a landmark discovery 50 years ago and today, and her impact on science, and also the public's understanding of science, has not changed in its scope and significance but it has evolved over the last 50 years," Dr. Emma Finestone, associate curator and the Robert J. and Linnet E. Fritz Endowed Chair of Human Origins at the Cleveland Museum of Natural History, told AARP Experience Counts. "Fifty years ago, Lucy was the oldest and most complete hominin ever known, so she pushed back the timeline of our ancient family tree. Fifty years ago, the perspective was that human evolution was this nice neat linear transition from chimpanzees to humans. ... There are those classic evolution illustrations that show that," Finestone said. "And Lucy was the turning point that helped us understand that our evolutionary history isn't one of missing links from a chimpanzee to a human progression."*<sup>71</sup>

However, many people are unaware that before naming the new species, Johanson and his colleague attributed the total fossil assemblage to two different creatures. They

reported, “*The collection suggests that Homo and Australopithecus coexisted.*”<sup>72</sup> In other words, the fossils consisted of a mixture of ape and human bones. But in 1978–1979, Johanson and a new partner reassigned the entire collection, including the human-shaped bones and fragments, to a single new species they named *Australopithecus afarensis*. This enabled them to portray australopiths as ancestors of modern humans.<sup>73</sup> To this day, evolutionary researchers who assume Lucy and her kind came from a single species confidently speculate about the apelike skull and human-like walking ability. Others, however, recognize that the fossil collection includes both human and ape pieces, just as Johanson first acknowledged.<sup>74</sup>

What kind of primate do the non-human parts labeled *A. afarensis* belong to? Well, in 2015 a team identified one of Lucy’s vertebrae as from a baboon—a 40-year-long oversight.<sup>75</sup> Other non-human bones found in Lucy’s layers show ape qualities, including an adult male and female skull with a spine insertion angle consistent with knuckle-walking apes.<sup>76</sup> This angle is a diagnostic feature, distinguishing apes from humans. Foot design is another such feature. Apes’ big toes are angled for grasping, whereas our big toes point forward for running. One composite foot from the same locality that Johanson originally attributed to *Homo* bears classic features of modern human feet.<sup>77</sup>

So, what conclusions do these fossil details yield? First, some clearly human fossils got lumped into a collection of bones attributed to Lucy’s species. Second, clearly ape fossils got lumped into that same collection. The concept of Lucy as our ancestor is merely a myth—long on imagination and short on good science. While the world may reject Genesis, these fossils fit God’s Creation of creatures according to their kinds.

## THE GLOBAL FLOOD

Not surprisingly, the modern view of Noah, the Ark and the global Flood has been a major target of atheists and *compromising Christians* along with being represented in the secular media, many churches, and various seminaries as a cute fairy tale, or placed in the category of a joke. However, can the biblical account of the global Flood be classified as historically accurate, particularly when secular science confidently declares there is no evidence to support that a global Flood ever happened as follows:

*“The Genesis flood narrative (chapters 6–9 of the Book of Genesis) is a Hebrew flood myth. It tells of God’s decision to return the universe to its pre-creation state of watery chaos and remake it through the microcosm of Noah’s Ark. A global flood as described in this myth is inconsistent with the physical findings of geology, archeology, paleontology, and the global distribution of species. A branch of creationism known as flood geology is a pseudoscientific attempt to argue that such a global flood actually occurred. Some Christians have preferred to interpret the narrative as describing a local flood instead of a global event. Still others prefer to interpret the narrative as allegorical rather than historical.”<sup>78</sup>*

However, if the Genesis Flood really occurred as also stated in 2 Peter 3:6 – “*the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished,*” it should have left an abundance of evidence as we read in Genesis 7 that:

- All the high hills and mountains under the whole heaven were covered, not just a localized flood as speculated by secular science<sup>79</sup>
- Global geologic evidences that give testimony to catastrophic Flood forces
- Numerous descriptions of a global Flood in accounts from other ancient cultures

So, what evidence of a global Flood would we look for? Wouldn't we expect to find billions of buried fossilized plants and animals that were deposited rapidly by water in rock layers all over the earth, and shouldn't we also find altered layers of rock that show testimony of rapidly moving floodwaters? Not surprisingly, that's exactly what we find based on the description of the global Flood as described in Genesis 7-8. As a result, let's look at seven main geologic evidences that graphically testify to the Genesis global Flood and that have also been disregarded by secular science and other similar non-believers:

**(#1): Fossils of sea creatures high above sea level due to the ocean waters having flooded over the mountains**

We find fossils of *sea creatures* in rock layers that cover all the continents. For example, marine fossils are found in most of the rock layers in the walls of the Grand Canyon, including the topmost layer known as the Kaibab Limestone,<sup>80</sup> located 7,000 to 8,000-feet above sea level. Fossilized shellfish (ammonites) are even found in the limestone beds of the Himalaya Mountains of Nepal and other high mountains as well.<sup>81</sup> All geologists agree that ocean waters must have buried these marine fossils in the Himalayan limestone beds.

**(#2): Rapid burial of plants and animals**

We find extensive fossil graveyards and exquisitely preserved fossils in massive global graveyards that indicates rapid burial on a massive scale. For example, billions of Nautiloid fossils (along with other marine creatures) are found in a layer within the Redwall Limestone of the Grand Canyon<sup>82</sup> that continues for 180 miles across northern Arizona and into southern Nevada covering an area of at least 10,500 square miles. This layer was clearly deposited catastrophically by an enormous flow of sediment (mostly lime sand and silt). Although there are many examples of these mass graveyards around the world, several notable examples are:

- Hundreds of thousands of marine creatures are buried with amphibians, spiders, scorpions, millipedes, insects, and reptiles in fossil graveyards in Montceau-les-Mines, France<sup>83</sup>
- At Fossil Bluff on the north coast of Tasmania, many thousands of marine creatures were buried together in a broken state. This fossil bed continues across Europe to the Middle East as well as into the Midwest of the USA, forming a global-scale fossil graveyard<sup>84</sup>

- The immense chalk and coal beds of Europe and the United States testify of catastrophic destruction and burial

Not surprisingly, these large-scale fossil graveyards also indicate the apparent speed of burial as many creatures were buried and fossilized under catastrophic flood conditions so that they were exquisitely preserved. This is evidenced by fine details such as fins and eye sockets that have been preserved, and in some cases, minute detail. Also, these fossil graveyards often consist of *mixtures* of marine and land-dwelling creatures indicating the waters of this global cataclysm swept over both the oceans and the continents.

### **(#3): Rapidly deposited sediment layers spread across vast areas**

Rock layers can be traced all the way across continents, even between continents, and physical features in those strata indicate they were deposited rapidly. For example, the chalk beds of England (the White Cliffs of Dover) can be traced westward across England and appear again in Northern Ireland. In the eastward direction from Dover, the same chalk beds can be traced across France, the Netherlands, Germany, Poland, southern Scandinavia and other parts of Europe to Turkey, then to Israel, Egypt and Kazakhstan.<sup>85</sup>

In the Grand Canyon, inclined (sloping) layers within the Coconino Sandstone are testimony to 10,000 cubic miles of sand being deposited within days by huge water currents (and also covering 200,000 square miles eastward across adjoining states).<sup>86</sup> The Tapeats Sandstone and Redwall Limestone can also be traced across the entire United States and up into Canada, and even across the Atlantic Ocean to England.

### **(#4): Sediment transported long distances**

The sediments in widespread, rapidly deposited rock layers were eroded from distant sources and carried long distances by fast-moving water. For example, the sand in the Coconino Sandstone<sup>87</sup> of the Grand Canyon in Arizona was eroded and transported from the northern portion of what is now the United States and Canada. Furthermore, water current indicators (such as ripple marks called Varves) preserved in rock layers show that water currents were steadily flowing from northeast to southwest across all of North and South America, which, of course, is only possible over weeks during a global Flood.

### **(#5): Rapid and no erosion between strata**

In many places around the world there is visible evidence of rapid erosion, or even of no erosion at the boundaries between sedimentary rock layers. Flat, knife-edge boundaries between rock layers indicate rapid continuous deposition of one layer after another with no time for long periods of erosion. For example, there is no evidence of millions of years of erosion (using alleged evolutionary timescales) in the flat boundary between two well-known layers of the Grand Canyon, the Coconino Sandstone and the Hermit Formation.<sup>88</sup> Another impressive example of flat boundaries at the Grand Canyon is the Redwall Limestone and the strata beneath it. Remember that alleged slow evolutionary geologic processes would require hundreds of millions of years to deposit successive sediment

layers and would show remnants of slow weathering and erosion which is not seen in these or many other similar examples.

**(#6): Rock layers folded, not fractured**

Rocks do not normally bend as they will break loose or fracture because they are hard and brittle.<sup>89</sup> But in many locations, we find whole sequences of strata that were bent without fracturing indicating that the rock layers were rapidly deposited and folded while still wet and pliable before final hardening. Yet, this folding could only have occurred after the visible strata layers had been deposited while they remained wet, soft and pliable and then folded by earth movements (uplifting).

**(#7): Ancient accounts**

A common human trait is the passing of information from one generation to the next, typically involving past events. Several examples worth mentioning are America defeating its enemies in World War II, the first American astronauts (Apollo 11) to successfully land and walk on the moon, the significance of 911 and even the biblical account of the global Flood and Noah's Ark. Not surprisingly, recent archaeological discoveries have underscored the fact that the biblical global Flood is also mentioned in numerous other cultures on earth as evidenced by a study completed by Dr. John Morris of the Institute for Creation Research.<sup>90</sup>

The study indicates that there are more than 200 accounts of a global Flood from nearly every ancient culture on earth, and the similarities with the biblical account are astounding as a comparison of the common details are more than similar as follows:

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| ○ Was there a favored family                 | 88% |
| ○ Were they forewarned                       | 66% |
| ○ Was the flood due to the wickedness of man | 66% |
| ○ Was the catastrophe only a flood           | 95% |
| ○ Was the flood global                       | 95% |
| ○ Did the survivors land on a mountain       | 57% |
| ○ Were birds sent out                        | 35% |

The obvious conclusion is straightforward and applicable. A common belief points towards a root event that happened in history, and the previous study by Dr. Morris demonstrates the biblical global Flood account must be one of the most well-known events in human history as similar details have been preserved by so many ancient civilizations on earth. In addition to the fact that there are numerous historical accounts of a global Flood from many ancient civilizations,<sup>91</sup> it should also not be surprising that modern archaeology has discovered ancient artifacts that detail a globe-covering catastrophe with parallel details to the biblical account that is not just found among the Israelites (who came on the scene some 700 years after the floodwaters receded).

So, let's look at three famous extra-biblical historical Flood accounts from archaeological discoveries and notice the *similarities* to the biblical account:

- *Epic of Gilgamesh:*

The Epic of Gilgamesh is likely the most famous extra-biblical account of the global Flood and is contained on twelve large tablets written in the Sumerian cuneiform language. The tablets were discovered in 1853 while excavations were underway at the library of the ancient Assyrian capital of Ninevah that date back to around 650 B.C. Linguistic experts believe that the account was composed well before 2,200 B.C. and was compiled from material that was much older than that date<sup>92</sup> as the Sumerian cuneiform writing has been estimated to go as far back as 3,300 B.C.<sup>93</sup> For an overview of the similarities between the Gilgamesh flood account and the biblical flood account, go to <https://www.gotquestions.org/Gilgamesh-flood.html><sup>96</sup>

- *Babylonian Ark Tablet:*

The Babylonian Ark Tablet (also called the Ark Tablet) was introduced to the public in 1872 after being excavated at Nineveh in present-day Iraq. The circular tablet is inscribed in cuneiform, is dated to around 1900-1700 B.C., and is a Babylonian account of a flood in which the god Enki instructs Atrahasis (the Babylonian Noah) on how to build an ark.<sup>94</sup> Following is a summary of the highlights of the tablet:

- A god instructed a man to build a giant boat about two-thirds the size of a soccer field
- The boat was to be reinforced with wooden ribs (see Genesis 6:14)
- The boat was to be covered with bitumen (see Genesis 6:14)
- The animals were to board the boat two-by-two (see Genesis 7:9)
- The purpose of all of these things was to survive a devastating flood (see Genesis 6:17)

- *Atra-hasis Epic:*

This is an eighteenth-century B.C. Akkadian epic, is named after its human hero, and can be dated by its scribal identification to the reign of Hammurabi. The Atra-Hasis story also exists in a later fragmentary Assyrian version, the first one having been discovered in the library of Ashurbanipal and is inscribed in Akkadian, the language of ancient Babylon.<sup>95</sup> The epic offers many details that are similar to the Bible's Creation and Flood accounts. Specifically, the epic recounts:

- A great flood (see Genesis 6-8)
- A hero instructed to build a boat for him and the animals to survive (see Genesis 7:1-2)
- Specifically, that animals entered two-by-two (see Genesis 7:2-9)

## CONCLUSION

This discussion has summarized the importance of trust, faith and complete belief when applied to the Bible, particularly the gospel account and the Genesis account of Creation

that is found in Scripture. Unfortunately, many people either reject the gospel account in the Bible and the Genesis Creation account or find Scripture hard to believe even though they claim to believe in the authority and inerrancy of the Bible. This dilemma is best explained as outlined in Romans 1:18-22 — *“(18) For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of people who suppress the truth by their unrighteousness, (19) because what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has made it plain to them. (20) For since the creation of the world his invisible attributes—his eternal power and divine nature have been clearly seen, because they are understood through what has been made. So, people are without excuse. (21) For although they knew God, they did not glorify him as God or give him thanks, but they became futile in their thoughts and their senseless hearts were darkened. (22) Although they claimed to be wise, they became fools.”*

However, the real question is “What is the best explanation for your purpose in life?” If the Bible is true (and the evidence from science and Scripture indicate that it is), then each person should be concerned with their future destiny and specifically, where you will spend eternity. The Bible clearly says — *“All have sinned and come short of the Glory of God”* — Romans 3:23, and those without a personal acceptance of God will spend eternity in a lake of fire (Revelation 20:15). Nevertheless, God has provided an alternate choice, and that choice is a free gift that only needs to be accepted by you — *“For God so loved the world, that He gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life”* — John 3:16, and *“For whosoever shall call upon the name of the LORD shall be saved”* — Romans 10:13. This is God’s message to you, so have you accepted his free gift of eternal life?

## RESOURCES

1. Webster's New World Dictionary and Thesaurus  
Second Edition  
Hungry Minds Inc., 2002
2. MacArthur Study Bible  
Dr. John MacArthur  
Word Publishing, 1997
3. Dr. Steven Boyd  
Hebraist  
Hebrew Union College  
Is Genesis History, DVD
4. Refuting Compromise  
Jonathan D. Sarfati, Ph.D.  
Master Books, 2004
5. Ibid.

6. Exegetical Fallacies, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition  
D.A. Carson  
Baker Book House, 1996
7. Ibid.
8. Refuting Compromise  
Jonathan D. Sarfati, Ph.D.  
Master Books, 2004
9. The Days of Creation: A Semantic Approach  
J. Stambaugh  
TJ, 1991
10. Dr. Andrew Steinmann  
Associate Professor of Theology and Hebrew  
Concordia University, Illinois
11. Refuting Compromise  
Jonathan D. Sarfati, Ph.D.  
Master Books, 2004
12. Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament  
J. Barr  
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968
13. <https://answersingenesis.org/days-of-creation/24-hours-plain-as-day/>
14. Douglas F. Kelly, Ph.D.  
Richard Jordan Professor of Theology, Reformed Theological Seminary  
Is Genesis History, Volume 3, Bible & Stars
15. <https://www.space.com/24054-how-old-is-the-universe.html>
16. <https://www.ips-planetarium.org/page/age>
17. <https://www.discovermagazine.com/when-did-homo-sapiens-first-appear-41557>
18. The Battle for The Beginning  
Dr. John MacArthur  
Nelson Books, 2001
19. Millions of Years – Where Did the Idea Come From?  
aig.org  
Dr. Terry Mortenson
20. Ibid.
21. [https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/evolution/library/02/4/l\\_024\\_01.html](https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/evolution/library/02/4/l_024_01.html)
22. <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Charles-Lyell>
23. Millions of Years – Where Did the Idea Come From?  
aig.org  
Dr. Terry Mortenson
24. Ibid.
25. <https://www.britannica.com/science/uniformitarianism>

26. <https://www.icr.org/article/deep-space-objects-are-young>
27. Rethinking Radiometric Dating  
Dr. Vernon R. Cupps  
icr.org, 2019
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid.
30. Humanist Manifesto I  
R.W. Sellers and R. Bragg  
E.H. Wilson, Chicago, 1933
31. Humanist Manifesto II  
P. Kurtz and E.H. Wilson  
American Humanist Association, 1973
32. Humanist Manifesto III, Humanism and its Aspirations  
Committee  
American Humanist Association, 2003
33. A Secular Humanist Declaration  
P. Kurtz and E.H. Wilson  
Council for Secular Humanism, 1980
34. A Religion for a New Age  
J. Dunphy  
The Humanist, Jan.-Feb.
35. Humanist Manifesto 2000: A Call for New Planetary Humanism  
P. Kurtz  
Council for Secular Humanism, 2000
36. Rethinking Radiometric Dating  
Dr. Vernon R. Cupps  
icr.org, 2019
37. Ibid.
38. The Deep Time Deception  
Michael J. Oard  
Creation Book Publishers, 2019
39. Thousands..Not Billions  
Dr. Don DeYoung  
Master Books, 2005
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid.
43. The Real Jurassic Park  
M. Schweitzer and I. Staedter  
June 1997

44. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, vol 69, Abelson
45. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, vol 60
46. Proceedings of the Royal Society B, vol 274, Schweitzer
47. Echoes of the Jurassic, Kevin Anderson  
CRS Books, Chino Valley, AZ
48. Ibid.
49. New Genetic-Clock Research Challenges Millions of Years  
Nathaniel T. Jeanson, Ph.D.  
Acts & Facts 43, no. 4, 2014
50. <http://www.icr.org/article/new-genetic-clock-research-challenges>
51. Replacing Darwin: The New Origin of Species  
Nathaniel T. Jeanson, Ph.D.  
Master Books: New Leaf Publishing, 2017
52. <https://www.britannica.com/science/evolution-scientific-theory>
53. Essential Biology  
Campbell, Reece, Simon, 2004
54. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/First\\_law\\_of\\_thermodynamics](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/First_law_of_thermodynamics)
55. Discover magazine  
April, 2002
56. <https://www.icr.org/article/86>
57. <https://www.biologyonline.com/dictionary/law-of-biogenesis>
58. Darwins Doubt  
Stephen C. Meyer, Ph.D.  
Harper One Books, 2013
59. <https://ucmp.berkeley.edu/cambrian/cambrian.php>
60. Fossils Reveal Truth About Darwin's Theory  
Lloyd, R.  
February 11, 2009
61. On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition  
Charles Darwin  
P.F. Collier & Son, 1902
62. <https://www.icr.org/content/fossils-still-say-no-cambrian-explosion>
63. Evolution's Erratic Pace  
Gould, S. J.  
Natural History, 1977
64. [https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/evolution/library/03/5/1\\_035\\_01.html](https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/evolution/library/03/5/1_035_01.html)
65. <https://evolution.berkeley.edu/lines-of-evidence/transitional-features/>
66. Live Science  
Fossils Reveal Truth About Darwin's Theory  
Lloyd, R., 2009

67. Are Birds Cousins to Reptiles  
J.S. Johnson  
Acts & Facts, 50, 2021
68. Archaeopteryx, Myth of a Transitional Fossil  
Tim Clarey, Ph.D.  
Act & Facts, Research Edition, 2025
69. Was Archaeopteryx Bird or Dinosaur  
Alan Feduccia, Ph.D.  
Down To Earth, 1993
70. Busting the Myth About Lucy  
Brian Thomas, Ph.D.  
Acts & Facts, 54, Research Edition, 2025
71. [www.aarp.org](http://www.aarp.org)  
50 Years On: How the “Lucy” Skeleton Discovery Reshaped Science  
Jeff Tomik, 2024
72. Busting the Myth About Lucy  
Brian Thomas, Ph.D.  
Acts & Facts, 54, Research Edition, 2025
73. Ibid.
74. Ibid.
75. Ibid.
76. Ibid.
77. Ibid.
78. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Genesis\\_flood\\_narrative](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Genesis_flood_narrative)
79. <https://ncse.ngo/yes-noahs-flood-may-have-happened-not-over-whole-earth>
80. Kaibab Formation, Grand Canyon Geology  
S.S. Beus and M. Morales  
Oxford University Press, 2003
81. Exploring Earth: An Introduction to Physical Geology  
The Rise and Fall of Mountain Ranges  
J.P. Davidson, W.E. Reed, P.M. Davis  
Prentice Hall, 1997
82. Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Creationism  
Steven Austin  
Creation Science Fellowship, 2003
83. The Fossils of Montceau-les-Mines  
Daniel Heyler and Cecile M. Poplin  
Scientific American, 1988

84. Tasmania's Fossil Bluff  
Andrew Snelling, Ph.D.  
Ex Nihilo, 1985
85. The Nature of the Stratigraphical Record  
D.V. Ager  
Macmillan, 1973
86. Permian System of Colorado Plateau  
D.L. Baars  
American Association of Petroleum Geologists Bulletin 46, 1962
87. Ibid.
88. The Supai Group of Grand Canyon  
E.D. McKee  
U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper, 1982
89. Physics of Deformation, Elements of Structural Geology  
E.S. Hills  
Methuen & Co, 1970
90. [www.icr.org](http://www.icr.org)  
John D. Morris, Ph.D., 2001
91. [www.answersingenesis.org/the-flood/flood-legends](http://www.answersingenesis.org/the-flood/flood-legends)
92. <https://www.biblicalarchaeology.org/daily/the-epic-of-gilgamesh/>
93. Flood Stories of the Ancient Near East  
O'Brien
94. Answers In Genesis: Babylonian Ark Tablet  
Dr. Tim Chaffey  
2024
95. <https://cojs.org/atrahasis-epic-the-flood-story-18th-century-bce/>
96. <https://www.gotquestions.org/Gilgamesh-flood.html>