A Commentary on Genesis Chapters One and Two

Preface:

As a biblical Christian who takes God's inerrant Word most seriously, I accept literally the essential elements that were written to be taken literally of what God has revealed to us in His most precious Book, at this time focusing on these first two chapters. These deal with the manner, sequence and amount of time God chose for bringing into existence the heavens, the earth and all that exists therein. All of Genesis, and most especially these first chapters are foundational in order to really understand the true nature of God and the purpose for His creation. To assign any other meanings to His Word other than those He has most clearly expressed in this sacred text is a blasphemous affront to the truthfulness of our omniscient God.

Is it necessary for one to know the truth of these chapters in Genesis in order to be saved? No it isn't. All that is truly necessary can be found in the New Testament. That is where sufficient knowledge about our Lord and Savior Jesus is written. Those who know in their hearts who He really is, seek to be like Him through repentance, have continuous faith in His promise, and are obedient to His Lordship, are saved. That being the case, why is it important to know anything else in or about God's Word? Doesn't all the rest of it come under the category of "so what" or "who cares"?

The answer, properly dealt with, would easily fill several books, for there are many very compelling reasons, a born-again Christian should know, or at least diligently seek to know, the whole Word of God. Why? God not only wrote the Book, He promised to preserve it throughout the ages, and He wrote it all for our learning so that we could become informed and fruitful disciples! To compromise or modify any portion of it is a direct affront against Him! It is in effect casting doubt of His omniscience, as well as the accuracy, and preservation of what He Authored. If one cannot believe His every Word, how can one cling to Jesus as Savior, and obey Him as Lord and God Almighty, or convince any seriously questioning soul to believe Him? He is not omniscient and

1

almighty if there is error in God's Word, such that man must "correct" it through the "more accurate knowledge and wisdom of man through science"!

Read John 1:1-3 "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him; and without Him was not any thing made that was made." Doubting the Word (the Holy Bible) is doubting God. What kind of faith is it that collapses before the competing and only seemingly compelling "truth" of some creature who calls himself a "scientist" because he can boast of a few letters after his name? It's a faith that may not be at all a saving faith and certainly not one that ought to be evangelizing or teaching others! Let us here consider just one other reason.

As being among the faithful, if we know anything about Scripture, we know that God's Word has been under attack from the very beginning, in the Garden of Eden. Satan sought and succeeded in deceiving mankind, and has been relentless in his continuance of that effort all the way to this day. A major component of the Holy Bible is the description of the various mean by which Satan has tried, and all too often has succeeded in undermining and casting doubt regarding the inerrancy and truth about God's Word. One of Satan's major efforts is to also harass those who are saved in order to make them as fruitless as possible in guiding others toward the saving faith.

The way to salvation, and the way to lead others toward that end, is through knowledge of God's Holy Word. Where else in the world can be found the way to salvation or to any other spiritual truth? Only through Scripture can one even know of the existence of the Triune Godhead, of Jesus, of the cross, of God's grace, of His love, and of all the other truths found only in the God-authored Scripture. It doesn't take much thought to realize that a successful attack on the creditability and truth of <u>any</u> portion of the Bible can be a great victory for Satan's perverted cause. This is because, if any part of it is in error, how can one trust that there aren't errors elsewhere, errors that may have profound significance. As we move on to the end of these end times, about which Scripture reveals

more than about any other period in history, we can readily see the successful culmination of Satan's 6000 year long campaign.

We see daily that apostasy, heresy, unbelief, and all other ungodly things as they grow in strength and proliferation. One of the most persuasive and perverted means by which Satan has been so successful during the past couple of centuries has been the growth of "science" and his ability to commandeer certain portions of it for his own deceptive purposes. True science is the art of discovery of what God has left for man to find, regarding some of the less evident intricacies of His magnificent creation. In Satan's subversion of this noble pursuit he has diverted man from seeking to understand the ways of God's creation, instead into pursuit of evidence with which to discredit God's written Word. The cunningly subtle subterfuge he has employed is to turn portions of the God honoring profession, into nothing more than a tool for his use in destroying the souls of men through the development of so-called "scientific proofs" and all kinds of double talk that challenge the truth of God's Holy Word.

This part of the world of science that Satan has commandeered is made up of mostly atheists whose passion is to disprove the existence of God. Sadly there are also a number of creationists and even some who call themselves Christians who have bought into the old earth/ evolution lie by rationalizing it into being a method God used when He created. For want of a better label, I feel compelled to call their efforts pseudoscience, for it is not real science. So what is real science? Being a biblical Christian, my definition especially from a secular viewpoint may seem biased, and in one sense it is. Webster defines science as "a branch of knowledge or study dealing with a body of facts or truths systematically arranged, and showing the operation of general laws". Also it is "the systematic knowledge of physical or material world gained through observation and experimentation." Notice that science be definition involves "truths" determined through application of "general laws" What are these laws? They are the results of keen observations converted into theories postulated, and then very carefully verified by science, after which they become the fundamental laws of science as we have them today. The large majority of these laws were discovered by men who believed in the Creator

November 11, 2010 July 24, 2014 Sept 6, 2012 May 17, 2016

God. They were not all Christians, but they were what we can call theists as opposed to atheists. The following is a list of a few of these great God-acknowledging thinkers who built the foundations of modern science:

Louis Aggasiz: founder of glacial sciences

<u>Sir Francis Bacon</u>: who established the scientific method of inquiry based on experimentation and inductive reasoning?

Sir Charles Bell: was the first to extensively map the brain and nervous system

Robert Boyle: founder of "Boyles Law" for gasses.

<u>Nicholas Copernicus</u>: who set forth the first mathematically based system of planets orbiting the sun.

Georges Cuvier: founder of comparative anatomy

<u>John Dalton</u>: father of modern atomic theory

Rene' Descartes: Mathematician, scientist and philosopher called the father of modern philosophy

<u>Jean Henri Fabre</u>: chief founder of modern entomology

<u>Michael Faraday</u>: one of the greatest scientists of the nineteenth century, who revolutionized physics with his work on electricity and magnetism

James Joule: discoverer of the first law of thermodynamics

<u>William Thompson Kelvin</u>: among the first to clearly state the second law of thermodynamics

<u>Johannes Kepler</u>: Mathematician, astronomer, discoverer of the laws of planetary motion James Clerk Maxwell: formulator of the electromagnetic theory of light

Gregor Mendel: father of genetics

<u>Sir Isaac Newton</u>: inventor of the reflecting telescope, discoverer of the law of gravity, and generally regarded as the most original and influential thinker in the history of science. He was also the author of what has been acclaimed to be the most important scientific book ever written to this day. He was a biblical Christian who it's claimed to have written over a million words of biblical commentary.

Blasé Pascal: major contributor to probability studies and hydrostatics

<u>Lois Pasteur</u>: formulator of the germ theory and is also credited with the law that assesses that all life came from life.

If one is familiar with these physical laws one can appreciate their accuracy and relevance as to how "things work." Being a believer in creation did not cause a bias or was it necessarily influencing others discoveries. It was simply a matter of their recognition that the Creator God was the one who formulated these laws and made them discernable enough for man to discover them. That was what modern science was all about. However, today, a different "science: has permeated this profession. In keeping with similar labels that are popular today such as "the post industrial society", "post modernism in art" etc, we might call what exists today is, in certain aspects, a post modern science for it is no longer the modern pure science as engaged in by these fathers of science.

July 24, 2014

May 17, 2016

This science is no longer the unbiased pursuit of true knowledge, but instead a science wholly dedicated to the atheistic paranoid pursuit of proof that God does not exist, that the Bible is not an infallible truth. Because they refuse, under any circumstances, to believe that God exits, these post modern atheist "scientists" spend billions on tax funded government encouraged programs to prove false beliefs, and programs that lead nowhere toward their goal. Instead, evidences easily recognized as proof of creation are doggedly misrepresented. They capitalize on the great success and reputation of past scientific achievements, and also on the success of applied science to advance, by association, their own prestige. This way they are able to convince the inept, impressionable masses to have been convinced to have faith in their great wisdom. Their Godless wisdom demands belief in the great lies of evolution and of an old earth as absolute facts, not to be questioned. Am I making this up? Here is a quote from evolutionary biologist Richard Lewontin as it appeared in the New York Review on January 9, 1997.

"We take the side of science inspite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, inspite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so-stories, because we have a prior commitment to materialism..."

Is that the science you believe in, the science that so many, even Christians are willing to believe with so much faith, that they find it necessary to modify God's inerrant Word in order to accommodate the "more inerrant" truth of this science? Are you willing to accept their modification of God's Word so as to accommodate the "scientists" contrary assertions, the assertions of those who choose to live by the credo: "in spite of patent absurdities of some constructs, inspite of their acceptance of "unsubstantiated" stories because they have a prior commitment to materialism?" What is that prior commitment? Materialism is simply another name for atheism. In other words, no matter how absurd a construct, that a theory or belief may be, it is more acceptable to them, than the belief, that there is a Creator God! With such absolute and unyielding bias, to the point of "absurdity" can this be call science?

The quoted statement by Lewontin is not a mind set of just one man, it is a representation of all that I call post modern science, or pseudo-science. We might call it the religion of atheism, for it is a faith dedicated to the absence of a Creator God. This post modern science or pseudo-science very successfully masquerades as science to the impressionable majority because its practitioners have clothed themselves with impressive academic degrees, and awards. They are able to achieve creditability and fame, because the prince of this world provides assurances that they will receive it. These agents of his do not have the spirit of God in their hearts, and are therefore sincerely able to actually believe in the merits of their mission, which is to ultimately disprove the existence of God and of creation. Sincerity is admirable. It is what they are sincere about that is the problem

The so-called "theory of evolution" is probably the pinnacle of absurdity. It is the illustrious mother of all pseudoscience, and the highest testimony regarding how effectively Satan is capable of deceiving on a massive scale. It is the bedrock foundation of all such pseudoscience because it is the premise from which most of these "scientific" studies begin. While there exists no proof what so ever of its validity, the world of pseudoscience, and even government edicts, have elevated it from an archaic and foolish theory to a "fact" that none dare to even question. By this designation, it is now taught at

all levels of education as the one and only true way in which man and all other things came into being. Creation and a Creator are not only totally dismissed, but also prohibited from being taught as even remote possibilities.

As absurd as it may be to anyone who can actually think, and has escaped this all pervasive "brainwashing," or better expressed as "brain contaminating", while going under the once respectable name, "education", it is now accepted as a fact by a large majority of people. How could such a thing happen? Very easily. We need only to look back a few dozen years to Germany just prior to World War II for a perfect example. Skipping over the details, the "secret" was revealed by Jospef Goebbels, Hitler's propaganda minister who said, that any lie, if it is big enough, and repeated often enough, and long enough, will be believed. It will be perceived as truth to the great majority of people.

I remember Henry Kissinger making the remark that truth is irrelevant, that the perception of truth is all that matters. Churchill once said something like this: "where ever truth is discovered, it must be buried quickly, lest it become known to the people." So it is with evolution, which has been told as fact continuously for several generations. Not only is it taught as fact at all levels of the educational system, but it's almost impossible to watch TV, read magazines, and newspapers, or see movies without being subjected to some subtle expression as to its validity, or to the absurdity of creation and other biblical truths. If you doubt this, keep it in mind and watch carefully for these sometimes very tricky indoctrinational devices.

They are most evident in children programs where, after all, can be found the most fertile ground for formation and growth of almost all long lasting beliefs. Stories about dinosaurs, and where ever else the idea of "millions of years" can be inserted, is very carefully planted. Such subtlies have even invaded the youth Bible school teaching. For instance, it is evidenced by pictures of the Ark in a cartoon form that shows it bulging with animals and a giraffe with its head sticking out well above the top. Who, even a child, can not conclude such on Ark is indeed an absurdity. Thus is planted another small

seed of doubt regarding the validity of the Ark and of Noah's flood. It goes relentlessly on and on, that big lie that has been most carefully crafted with many facets, all dedicated to discredit God's inerrant Word.

Having established the "fact" of evolution, absent of any real proof, the need therefore is to find "proofs," or at least plausible counterfeits, lest the big lie might eventually be exposed for what it is. If evolution as a starting point can be accepted as fact, all kinds of other successful challenges to the truth of Scripture can follow, such as the six days of creation and the reality of the world wide flood. Ultimately, the undermining of the truth of Scripture in every possible way is the great goal that Satan has charged his "scientists" to contrive. Evolution is nothing different that the lie Satan tells Eve in the Garden, except that it is discerning in a much greater soul. We must keep in mind, that evidences, whatever they are, have no truth in them. It is man and his pre-suppositions that cause the evidence to be interpreted to the extent possible in accordance with those suppositions. The same evidence studied by one who doesn't believe in creation interprets the evidence differently than one who believes in creation.

If anyone has even a little scientific background, and is fortunate enough to be able to unbiasedly examine the alternative conclusion drawn from available evidence, some very clear, God honoring conclusions inevitably result. Careful examination of interpretation of the geological and biological evidence that "proves" evolution is clearly loaded with circular reasoning, and falsification along with conclusions that the evidence simply doesn't substantiate, cannot be tolerated. The alternate views and conclusions offered by genuine creation-believing scientists, even those who received their credentials from the same universities, interpret the same evidence most persuasively as being wholly consistent with Scripture. How can this be? The first group is selected, empowered and guided by Satan, while the other group is selected, empowered and guided by the Holy Spirit. Who do you prefer to believe? The trouble is you will never even hear of, let alone have access to these interpretations, unless you go "underground" to find them.

The prince of this world controls almost every source of such information and does not let such "truths" see the light of day in the conventional media.

One major difficulty in perpetuating evolution it is the necessity for there having been a very long time, billions of years, before life on this formerly lifeless earth could have by itself somehow sparked and then evolved, in order to finally produce man and the other species. Of course, origins of the very existence of this lifeless earth also had to be explained before evolution could begin. The best that those adherents to evolution can come up with is the "big bang theory". That is, that at first there was nothing, and that nothing exploded spewing out the entire universe, including earth. At first glance, one might say, that this is essentially biblical. However, it isn't even close.

Now we have seen by Lewontin's confession as being believed by his fellow evolution "scientists" as the standard approach of this non-science. Satan's grand deception requires that God's Word which states that God created everything that exists, and did it in just six days, must at all costs, be discredited. Of course, as note, the whole purpose of Satan's "post modern" scientists is to discredit Scripture wherever possible. Evolution is simply the ludicrous lie, with which to ensnare the gullible, many of who even call themselves "Biblical Christians". To those who lack any significant scientific background, and who docilely decide to accept the "majority opinion" rather than refuse to think too hard, expect it as fact. To them evolution, as presented by Satan and his minions, has an air of plausibility and logic, and when ascribed to what the world assumes are real knowing experts called "scientists", who should doubt it? This lie has even permeated the "genuine" Christian community, and done so in a big way.

Oh, it's not that it's accepted in the God-less matter of fact way Satan has structured it generically, but in a rationalized form that they believe can somehow be accommodated without doing violence to the clear Word of God. What incredible power there is in such terms as "science tells us" or "science has proven." True science has provided many wonderful things that are real, and greatly beneficial to man. Capitalizing on this well-earned reputation of "true" science, Satan, the ultimate deceiving entrepreneur, has

capitalized on that reputation to cause lies and absurdities to be accepted as truth. Thus, common sense must accept the alleged truth, and some how adjust Scripture to accommodate it. The result is that God really didn't mean what He most clearly recorded regarding the six days of creation. He must have meant six long periods of time rather than six literal days. After all "proven science" can't be wrong, and we do have 2Peter 3:8 which says, "that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day."

Doesn't that give license to believe that He didn't necessarily mean a literal day in Genesis 1? Absolutely NOT!! That verse in NO WAY relates to the "days" spoken of in Genesis 1. It is simply pointing out that God exists outside of time and space! God exists in an eternal "now." That concept transcends all mortal comprehension. Peter could just as accurately have said that to the Lord a second is like eternity or a day is like a billion years, or a billion years is like a second! But he didn't! What he said was simply the way he chose to express this phenomenon of timeless existence. What God wrote is what must be believed regarding His creation. It is expressed in real time, earth time, 24hour per day time, that fourth dimension called time that He put into effect as part of creation, at the moment of creation! This is confirmed most compellingly in the fourth commandment as found in Exodus 20:8-11. "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 shall not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maid, servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made the heaven and the earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and Can it be any clearer than that? Is there even the slightest hint that the hallowed it." work week God is commanding of man is in any way different than was His work week when He created? Is there anything at all different about the "day" He "rested" after His work, than the "day" He commands man to rest? Absolutely not! Only Satan, the master of confusion, deceit and the casting of doubts is capable of "clouding" men's minds so as to prevent them from seeing God's truth.

Despite the clarity of God's Word, that incredible power of the uttering's of Satan's pseudo scientists masquerading as real scientists, has been able to sway even the minds of the most ardent and faithful believers of the inerrant Word of God. It is so powerful that when it speaks contrary to God's Word, that His Word must be re-examined, and where necessary "reinterpreted" to somehow bring about a synthesis between these "equally" inerrant truths. Any such result is of course, an ungodly compromise, and thus a blasphemous denial of the truth of God's Holy word! Again, what seems to console and satisfy the rationalists is to call upon 2Peter 3:8 and thereby negate the true definition of "day" as used in Genesis 1, and instead, call those days "ages".

This then seems to permit acceptance of the essential element of evolution, that is an "old" earth of billions of years, rather than the 6000 year old "young" earth defined in Scripture. That compromise is alone tragic enough, but it provides an essential entry point for Satan, through his "scientists" to destroy not only the credibility, but also the plausibility of the first chapters of Genesis. Accepting the "old" earth premise necessarily makes Noah's Ark and the world-wide flood also a mere myth. Thus one must compound rationalization upon rationalization of the Scripture until it has lost all of its Godly truth.

However, within the greater part of the Christian body, this process of systematic degradation of Scripture seems to be seldom addressed. There seems to be a quiet acquiescence, or a viewing so superficial that it hasn't, until recently, aroused any noticeable concern. Lately however, that is within the last fifty years or so, competent scientists who believe in the literal Genesis have become active in evaluating the available evidence, that same evidence that Satan's pseudo-scientists have used to discredit the Bible. They operate through organizations such as the Institute for Creation Research, the Creation Research Society, the Answers in Genesis ministry, and the Koininia Institute. Through these agencies, one can obtain the far more believable and biblically honoring interpretation of that evidence.

November 11, 2010

Sept 6, 2012

Until recently, the post-modern atheistic "scientists were the only scientists involved in interpreting evidence regarding the origin and age of the earth, evolution, the flood, etc. They went unchallenged for many decades. Whatever opposition there was, consisted for the most part of Bible believers poorly trained in science. These were only able to express their knowledge and faith in the Scripture. They were no match for these lettered "experts" who claimed "scientific proofs". They were no match for these minions of Satan, especially as the world drifts away from God and His Word. Today however, through these groups and individuals, creation science is growing and finally providing solid compelling interpretation of the same evidence to prove the biblical truths, and refute the old earth/evolution contrivances.

At the beginning of this "preface" I said that knowledge of Genesis was not essential to the development of a saving faith. On that basis why am I making such a big thing about this? It is because it attacks the inerrancy of God's Word! Wherever Satan is successful in causing a disbelief or compromise of any part of Scripture, then the effectual belief in the entire Scripture is in danger, and well on its way to destruction. One needn't look very far today to see the ever growing disbelief in the validity of the God authored Bible. If the believers "belief" in the inerrant truth of these first chapters of God's revealed Word is compromised, if there is any doubt as to their absolute truth, how than, when put to the test, can he or she believe in the absolute truth of any portion of Scripture?

Every word, every statement, and every precept from Genesis 1:1 through Revelation 22:21 is God authored! Jesus said in Matthew 5:18, "For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Jesus spoke these words very early in His ministry before any "laws" as they appear in the New Testament had been written. What was Jesus saying? He was declaring that every infinitesimal portion, every word, comma, period etc, of the Law is relevant and will be fulfilled. What Law was he referring to? It was the Law God gave to Moses on Mt Sinai as recorded in Exodus chapter 20, where the Ten Commandments are revealed. It was the entire Old Testament!

Jesus spoke these words very early in His ministry; before any "laws" as they appear in the New Testament had been announced. Therefore, we must now recognize that the "law" now includes all that Jesus and the New Testament prescribed.

Let's look again at the fourth commandment, as transcribed herein above. Please forgive my repetition. The point here is much too important to be allowed to pass by casually. What is the essence of this commandment? It is simply to "remember the Sabbath day and keep it holy." So why so much extra verbiage about the six days, and the example of how God Himself, rested on the seventh day? Notice, in saying this, He is pointing back to Genesis chapter 2:13 where he recaps what He had done in the first six days. In reading Exodus 20 8:11, can anyone conclude that God is speaking of anything other than seven literal days? Here God, for emphasis, in anticipation of Satan's attacks on the literal six days of creation, is restating the fact in terms that should leave no doubt as to what He meant in Genesis 1 and 2.

As God gives this commandment, He is most clearly connecting it to His six days of creation and the seventh day during which He rested. Who can doubt that in this commandment God is speaking of six literal days that man should work? Only those who want to for Satan-inspired reasons! Notice that there is no period between God's commandment to work six days and rest on the seventh. His reference, to His six days of creation work, along with His rest on the seventh, are all one sentence! Where in this is even the slightest hint that His six days of creation and one day of rest are any different than the days He speaks of in Exodus, and how man's week should be spent? There aren't any, because He is confirming that the seven days spoken of in Genesis 1 and 2 are the very same 24 hour days that we dwell in now and always have!

Before we move on, I believe that it is essential that the reader fully understand my attitude toward science which it seems I have been railing against. I love appreciate and greatly respect <u>true</u> science. My college degrees are in science. My entire sixty year career as an engineer has consisted of the application of many facets of science. It is through the application of scientific discoveries that has made it possible for civilization,

in the physical sense, to advance beyond earlier man's wildest dreams. Most of the scientific world is populated with very intelligent and dedicated people of integrity who sincerely believe in the merit of their work. Unfortunately, a large majority may not "God fearing" even though their work may have great merit in, "advancing" civilization. Today, many of these also accept evolution as opposed to creation. While others simply ignore this drama. However, their particular endeavors do not necessarily cause them to have much, if an, involvement in this issue. We could call them honest purveyors, and not perverters of science. This was their stance also. There is however, a large and growing number of "scientists" whose careers are devoted to proving evolution, and disproving the young earth, the world-wide flood, creation, and the very existence of the Creator!

It is this group that I have labeled pseudo-scientist and agents of Satan. Many are sincere and dedicated believers in their ungodly pursuits, while others are mere unscrupulous prostitutes who work unabashedly for the richly funded godless institutional masters. There work is carefully controlled and focused on one over riding goal, that is to deny the existence of our Creator God, and to cast doubt on the inerrancy of Scripture. A tiny peek into this sordid "scientific" underworld of lies manipulations and collusion was recently found in the emails exchanged between some of these "scientists". They revealed a bit of the truth regarding how they falsified scientific data in order to prove the unprovable non-existing "fact" that man-made global warming is of detrimental significance.

Have you noticed how quickly the global warming issue disappeared from media coverage? We might say that the little bit of truth that finally leaked out, exposed the big lie that had been so effectively trying to "Gore" truth to death. Were we to peek, as some I know have done, under the canopy of misinformation that covers the incestuous collusion among the FDA, the AMA and the pharmaceutical industry, and see the hidden truth, we would be even more shocked and angered. The Triune "medical" brotherhood has no desire to cure illnesses, but functions principally for the enrichment of its members. It doesn't stop there, but to go any further in this direction, would serve no

benefit in making the point of this study. Suffice it to say, that Satan's influence is everywhere, and that all scientists, sincere or otherwise, who seek to discredit God's Word, are knowingly or unknowingly serving Satan, as are those who fall for and promote their misrepresentations of God's truth.

With this as background, we will proceed to examine God's inerrant creation narrative, verses by verses.

Chapter One

"In the beginning God created the heaven and earth." – To create is to cause something to come into being out of what we would consider nothing. Only God is capable of this. Verse 1 is a summary statement of what God spent these first six 24-hour days doing. What substances He created are indentified in the next verse. However, what about this "beginning"? Is there anyway to determine when this was, given that God is eternal, and as we say, exists outside of time and space? We can't if we try to make that determination going forward from this incomprehensible thing we erroneously call "eternity past," but which is in fact an eternal "now", where He was the "I AM, that I AM". However, because of its importance, God, through His most precious Scripture has allowed us to know when it happened by going backward from the present to that first day of creation.

God did not make it easy, but He did provide what was needed to make possible that determination wholly from Scripture. While most Bible scholars have used both secular as well as biblical history from which to draw their conclusion, at least one, Dr. Floyd Nolan Jones, in his "The Chronology of the Old Testament" (copywrite 1993) has done so strictly through biblical evidence. His undeniable faith in Scripture, his great perseverance and inspired use of every bit of relevant Scriptural evidence, is extremely impressive and informative, as well as fascinating reading. His conclusions are that the birth of Adam occurred in 4004 BC.

"Coincidentally", that James Usher (1581-1656), the much maligned Archbishop of Armagh, Ireland, using both secular and biblical history in his efforts, had also reached

the same conclusion. Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1747) whom most scientists regard as the greatest scientific mind that ever lived, Einstein, not withstanding, closely concurred with that assessment. Few know, because secular historians hate to admit it, and therefore try to hide the fact, that Newton was a true biblical Christian believer and Bible scholar who wrote over a million words of biblical commentary. It would seem that Newton lived at the time before Satan began to realize what an incredibly potent tool "science" could be, if he could but harness its professionals to serve him in his nefarious goals. In this, he seems to have been eminently successful, even among some real Christians.

Some scholars claim that the total time back to creation cannot be determined from Scripture because there is evidence that there were persons within the historical chronology who were omitted. This they claim causes the time to have been longer than 6,000 years, and perhaps as long as 10,000 years. I know of two such omissions, but each occurs in what is a "closed loop," that is known from Scripture the dates at either end of those segments. Therefore what may have been omitted within that time frame has no effect of the chronological process. A pains-taking, spirit-guided study of Scripture such as that achieved by Floyd Nolan Jones, leaves no doubt, at least in my mind, that creation indeed did occur about 6,000 years ago. Throughout Scripture, God provides dates pertaining to various events, or gives the number of years, often to the very day between events. What would their relevance be if they did not serve as a means through which to accurately reveal the whole time extent of His divine plan?

Of course, being able to determine the amount of time that has passed since the birth of Adam, does not bring us to the date of creation, unless we accept God's clearly spoken Word that it occurred only six days earlier. We'll get to that point as we dig into what follows. When did God create the angels? If we refer to Job 38:4-7, we find God asking Job where he was when God created the earth. "When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy", as they witnessed the process of creation. The morning star is simply another name for angels who are here called the sons of God. This verse seems to establish the fact that angels were created very early during the six day creating process some "time" soon after God created man, or else how could they

have "witnessed" any part of creation. That allowed them to be witnesses to essentially the whole of creation. Scripture tells us that angels are messengers, ministering spirits, guardian protectors of man, and escorts to heaven. Satan's rebellion some like, Michael became warriors to fight the fallen angels where and as necessary. They are known to have carried out earthly missions such as the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and how one angel, one night, killed 186,000 Assyrians who threatened Jerusalem. In the eternal kingdom, they will be subservient to man. It is evident that they were created in anticipation of the creation of man. They, as well as the cherubim and seraphim, were all created on the day complete in number, maturity, and all with the knowledge that they would need initially to serve God and then man. They, like man, were created with free will. That is why one cherub and one third of the angels were able to turn from God, and are thereby classified as "fallen angels." Jesus suffered and died, in payment for the sins of every fallen man and woman who would repent and believe on Him as their Lord and Savior. The angels who stayed in heaven remain sinless, but those who fell cannot repent and return, but are doomed to eternal hell as is every unrepentant human who will have ever lived.

"And the earth was without form and void, and darkness was on the face of the deep..."

Here we have what appears to be the substance, that is the material that verse one speaks of having been created for the purpose of making the earth, and its habitation. The basic components of what He created, man has through God's permitted will, recognized and organized into what is called the Periodic Table of Elements. All matter consists of some combination of these elements. The verse speaks of the earth being without form, and void. How could it be otherwise until He put His divine order to it? First, He had to create the elements, and that these were simply a formless pile of "stuff." Just as the potter first obtains a pile of clay from which he will form the pot, so God, now having created the "stuff," began to form it into the earth and all that exists on the earth. Notice here we are dealing only with the creation of the materials that make up the earth and its immediate environs, not the whole of the universe. Apparently, two components, hydrogen and oxygen, were the first elements to be formed into molecules, thus creating

water. All other were suspended in a matrix of water, and were completely static, and in darkness. We'll get to what I believe to be the meaning of "void", later.

"...and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Again "water" is of God having first combined two of the elements into water, the most basic and plentiful of earthly molecules. "Moved," suggests that the time for action had arrived when the Potter would begin to mold this matter into that for which He had created it. The word "moved" is from the Hebrew word "rachaph" which means "to brood, by implication, to be relaxed, flutter, move, shake." This is the only place in all of Scripture that this word is used. Let's muse for a moment of this response by the Holy Spirit, that is that he chose to "brood" over this momentous event, and over the "stuff" of that initial portion of creation. The spirit brooded. To brood is also "to dwell on a subject, or to meditate".

It is also indicative of what a chicken does as it incubates its eggs in order to bring life into them, and to protect them. Even with our woefully inadequate intellect and vocabulary through which to understand and articulate that understanding of the workings of God, this God-given analogy is beautiful and wonderfully expressive of the Holy Spirit's role in these early moments of creation. Since we already know of the triune nature of the Godhead, Elohiym, we can understand that He (They collectively) created that which exists as described in verse two. And then it was the Holy Spirit aspect of God that is revealed as the One who would deal with, and officiate (like a hen) over the next aspect of putting order (facilitating, hatching) to the created "stuff" (the egg).

Many good scholars try to make this verse 2 into something, seems highly contrived. They invoke Ezekiel 28, Jeremiah 4:23 and Isaiah 24:1 as evidence that there was an eon's long gap between verse 1 and 2. They claim that this doesn't totally negate the above interpretation, but rather suggests that the substance spoken of is the residue of an earlier creation that went array because of what Satan and his fallen angels had done previously. Studying the referenced verses, there doesn't seem to be anything worthy of such a conclusion. Because Jeremiah speaks of the earth being "without form and void,"

the advocates of a "Gap" theory feel confident that this confirms their thesis. However, the Hebrew word for "form," "tohaw" can also mean "waste, desolation, desert, empty place and wilderness." Jeremiah was getting a glimpse of the Tribulation, not a previous earth. He speaks of birds having fled, whole cities fleeing, horsemen, bowmen etc. To some this suggests that there was a previous man-inhabited earth.

If there had been some previous earth system, had there been such a thing, God would have evidenced it in a far-clearer manner. Furthermore, where would Jesus have been in all of this? Did He die for the people on that earth as well? Certainly there had to have been sin, or there wouldn't have been death. To support such a concept, it seems that one must conclude that God "created" once before, and His efforts failed, so He gave it a second "try," the one in which we live. The proponents of the "gap" theory seem to have created their own god, the god who failed and had to try again. That is <u>not</u> my Omnieverything God who cannot make mistakes. How can this be anything but purely unsupportable conjecture in that Scripture indicates nothing worthy of supporting such a time gap?

The idea of a gap is an unfortunate contrivance, and is the result of not understanding what "form and void" were. Notice every verse, after verse, begins with "And," all the way to the end of the chapter. This by itself indicates an uninterrupted sequential continuity, just the way one would express any related series of events occurring one after the other in some generally uniform succession, in this case, during 24-hour days! However, for one who is intrigued by the possibility that there is more to it than what is here reported, one should as with every Bible interpretation, become a "Berian" and study the Scripture to see just what is true.

Some support the gap theory as a way to harmonize the old earth / evolution idea, but that, is biblically and logically without merit for many reasons. One is that this glob of "stuff" without form couldn't contain the fossil records of sickness and death we find here today, if these pre-date the Genesis creation story regarding Adam's sin. However, let us for a moment, concede that there was a former creation that existed for billions of

years in order to form a fossil record. Then we can say that what we have now, is in fact that "old earth" that God, sometime later, simply reconstructed, in six days. And what God did in six, twenty-four hour days was but a "correcting" of His earlier "mistake that He simply failed to mention. However, if we do, we are forced to throw out the first eight chapters of Genesis, because they are not at all compatible with such a premise. Within that purging, we must also conclude that Adam's sin was not the sin that commenced the fall of man and of entropy. This of course has always been Satan's goal, to cause dissention, confusion, and denial of the truth of Scripture. Again, there's much more to be said about this, "gap" theory before it can be completely dismissed. However I believe that the above is enough for our present purpose.

God divided the light from the darkness on the first day, "and the evening and morning were the first day." As we know, the Jewish day, even now, begins at sundown. This is where that custom began. The Hebrew word used here for evening is "erev", which also can mean "obscuration, dusk, night, and sundown." In terms of our own culture, we come home from work "at the end of the day." In that sense if that's the end of the day, then it's not that strange to also call that time the beginning of the next day. That seems to be the way God figured, so who are we to argue? The Hebrew word "boger (pronounced boker) is the word used to designate "morning or dawn, break of day". Both of these words are used throughout the Old Testament to convey exactly what they do here. They never represent greater "periods" of time.

Together they define a 24-hour day and <u>no</u> other period of time. How much clearer could God have described a 24-hour day? Had He even referred to this period of time just as a "day", which is "yowm" in Hebrew, it still was enough to identify it as 24 hours. However, one desperate to find some escape route from God's clear truth, might have been able to consider it slightly less precise, had the context allowed, which it doesn't. It could in no way be construed to mean eons of time. With His use of erev and boger, and their each expressing specific, consistent, and limited parts of a simple "day", this possibility is precluded. Over and over again, for each of the six events, God repeats the

fact that the evening and morning together amounted to a day, a simple day, and the same amount of time it takes for the earth to rotate on its axis, but once.

Here the loophole seeker will say, "Ah, hah! Scripture admits that there wasn't any sun, with which to form such a day until day four. And by the way, this was <u>after</u> the grass and trees were said to exist." True. Until He made the sun, all light came from God Himself, just as it will forever in the New Jerusalem that God will create on the new earth at the end of the millennium, as we are told about in Revelation 21:23, 24. "And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honor into it."

If God has chosen Himself to be the permanent celestial light on the new and eternal Jerusalem that He will create exclusively for Himself and His family of angels but always accessible through the 12 gates that will never be closed is there any reason to exclude Him from having been the Light referred to here? Furthermore, He continued the evening and the morning definitions of a day for the third, fourth, fifth and sixth day as well, after He had created the sun, and turned over to it the job of providing the light that bathed the earth on each day. The early lack of the sun in no way precludes the fact that these first two days were what God said they were, simply 24-hour days. To use the absence of the sun as the reason it could not be, is saying that God's power or foresight is too limited for those to have been 24 hour days without the sun as the source of light. Why should we not believe that God could have cast His Holy Light in the same time sequence during those first two 24-hour days, just as He would on the third day, commission the sun to continue on the same way?

In verse 16, God made two great lights, the greater (the sun) to rule over the day, and the lesser (the moon) to rule over the night. He defined the "day" to be the morning and evening which is exactly consistent with what the sun provides as the earth makes one 24-hour rotation within its light. How can one make a long day/age out of this? Regarding the vegetation, couldn't it be, that because in this case there was no specific

creation involved, therefore, the grass, herbs and trees required but a day of His special energizing light in order to get what He had already created, growing normally? Accepting the old earth / evolution idea, one would have to conclude that God not only "put the cart before the horse" regarding the vegetation / sun sequence, but also that He couldn't do all of this in a normal day, that instead eons were needed to establish this growth.

As will become more and more clear, the old earth premise is blatantly false and exists only to discredit every aspect of the biblical six days of creation. Trying to "harmonize" creation with an old earth as many try to do, is impossible. Yet many do it to their own satisfaction through their inadequately thought out reasoning, and their faith in the false "truth" of science, rather than in the genuine truth as given to us by our Creator. For those who take God's Word seriously in this matter, God always says what He means and means what He says. There are no exceptions, regardless of what the world of "science" so persuadingly claims. One must "get off the fence" regarding this issue, for no two divergent beliefs such as these can both be true. However, in order to get off on God's side of the fence, you need to read 1Corinthians 1:19-25 and 2: 4-5.

Read them over and over again, until you understand and believe them, and their full God-intended application, which includes every word in Scripture, including Genesis 1 and 2! Read these in the context of Matthew 7:15, 24:11 24:24 and many other New Testament verses that assures us that there will be many false prophets and teachers who will seek to undermine God's Word. These verses are describing for you those "scientists" who offer "proof" of an old earth, and of evolution. Any statement that says it took even one minute more than the six 24-hour days that God claimed it did, is calling God a liar! They speak of an old earth as truth, because an old earth is essential to "explain" evolution. Even when they weave into it some form of admission of creation, they are deceiving; they are applying worldly wisdom, that is man's wisdom, which is both foolish and untrue. Why? Because God said so! (1Corinthians 1:20)

Getting back to Scripture, notice also in Verse 3 we are told that He said on the first day, "Let there be light." Here He was allowing His Light to become the light of the world in the physical sense. On the second day, we are told that, He said, "Let there be firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters." Then in verse 7, it says that God made the firmament. The firmament is the space, and all that is in it, defined by the visible arch in the sky, (raqyra). That is, the stretched out or expanded inner heaven, not the outer heavens where the celestial bodies now exist. He made this inner heaven, that is the atmospheric air and vapor out of the "stuff". The waters below were what would next become the lakes, rivers, etc. as well as the great subterranean oceans from which the "fountains of the deep" would burst out to cause the wide-world flood.

Notice also that God didn't, at this time, say the second day was good. Why did God initially omit calling the second day good? Because until the dry ground was put in place on the third day (verse 9) the waters "underneath the firmament" were yet a formless mass. The forming of the "dry land" is the global earth. This would give these waters form and place as noted above. Prior to this global formation, God could not say it was good. Once these pieces were put in place on the third day, God twice said it was good. Later, in verse 31, at the end of the sixth day, God said that everything He had made was very good. Of course the then completed creation was good! God could not, would not make anything not good! Neither would He deceive us as to how He did what He did! There was no pain, no suffering, no death, and no fossils evidencing death, and no evolution or old earth! Everything God made was good. His perfect nature could not do otherwise!

The third day was a busy and particularly fruitful day. As already noted, it was so good that twice He called it good. He said, "Let the waters and let dry land appear." These He didn't have to make, but only to shape and arrange, because both were purely "stuff" that He had already created as described in verse 2. Then we are told in verse 11, that He said "...let the earth bring forth grass..." All He had to do then was to simply arrange it into His divine order. In verse 12 He confirmed that it was the earth that brought forth

the grass and herbs and the trees. The earth "yielded." It could only "yield" that which God had first created and put there.

It seems right then to conclude that they were somehow already in the "stuff" of verse 2, and only lacked God's forming and arranging activity and His energizing light to grow and to then produce seed for their perpetuation. We must further note that verse 5 of chapter 2 again confirms the essence of this when it says, "and every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew..." God seemed to have dealt with this vegetation in some way beyond the usual "let there be" because He hadn't yet caused rain, and there was as yet no man to till the soil. Most likely, there was a high groundwater table that supplied all that was needed. The trees and the herbs were made fully formed and capable of providing seeds, each of their own kind.

On the fourth day, we have a very interesting departure from the meaning of the previous "let there be" and "God made," statements. The stuff of verse 2 did not include the sun, moon or stars, only the earth. These "let" and "made" are extraterrestrial and all have to do with light and energy from an extraordinary inexhaustible source. These bodies were not "created" in the same sense of verse one, but as Scripture says, simply "made" from God's pure already existing infinite energy. It's been well established that energy can be converted into matter and vice versa. For a better understanding of where this thought is coming from, see item "h" in the "End Notes" at the end of this commentary where "point source energy" is discussed. Admittedly, this is conjecture related to one of the ever changing theories that this area of "science" sometimes stumbles upon that seems to offer something that doesn't in itself violate Scripture, but might inadvertently add to our knowledge of God's ways. Given the great precision of God's Word, it seems worthy of considering, due to its plausibility.

In examining verse 14 we find that God placed these "...lights in the firmament of the heavens to divide the day from night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years..." Here, right in the middle of the six day period, God is talking about the earth now being under the influence of the sun, and that it is the controlling force

causing not only the 24-hour day, but also, the seasons, and years. The seasons and years refer to longer repetitive periods of time. These were all increments of time defined by 24-hour days, as established through God's work on the fourth day. These time periods, as described, are exactly what exist today, and came into existence on that fourth day! In order to accommodate the old earth mantra, are we now to consider this "day" that is associated with seasons and years as having a different length of time than any of the other creation days?

In order to construe creation to have taken millions of year, in accordance with the old earth idea, one must most certainly throw out of Scripture this verse 14, and essentially all of the rest of Genesis 1 and 2! Each of the six days of creation is painstakingly defined by an <u>erev</u> and <u>boger</u>, thus indicating that this was a real, conventional day and not a longer period of time. Each of these two words occurs more than 100 times in the Pentateuch (the five books of Moses). And they <u>always</u> have these same literal meanings, that is the termination of the <u>daily</u> period of light and termination of the <u>daily</u> period of darkness respectively. This is precisely what the earth's rate of rotation provides.

If a day was a longer period, say two million years, then the "erev," or evening must have been one very long night of one million years followed by a "boger", would be daylight period of one million years. Therefore erev and boger are forced to mean long ages as well, if there would be "harmonization" between "science" and Scripture. God set up a 24-hour night/day sequence before He assigned it to the sun in accordance with the physical laws as we know them, and as He first formulated them at creation. Also "day" modified by a numeral, such as "third day" is a grammatical construction occurring over 100 times, always clearly meaning the same thing, a 24-hour day! There is no ambiguity here! What justification is there to refuse to believe this clearly stated biblical fact of a literal six-day creation? To do so is a denial of the omnipotence, and the omniscience of God, and His ability to have done what he said He did! It is also the assertion of a new "duty", that through what he calls "science", man must correct God's portrayal of how the universe and life began.

To persist in believing that a day was not necessarily a day, when it has been so clearly articulated, is to suggest that God made a mistake here, or that God is a liar, or that God was not the Author of these chapters. Yet He allows us to believe that they are rightly included in the sacred Cannon! Did God "slip up, lie, or did He speak Godly truth? Take your pick, because these are the only choices one has. Is it that man's wisdom claiming an old earth "truth," or is God's claim of six literal days, truth? Those who claim that an old earth is more accurate than what the Bible clearly states, are alleging to know a better truth now, because "science" has shown us that it couldn't have happened as God told us it did. Is this Book "God-Authored" or not? Is it "infallible" or not? These questions are not unlike the one posed regarding Jesus.

Was He a fool, a liar, or God? Could God have authored a book "contrary" to His infallible nature? Or, having authored an inerrant Book of information for ancient man, allowed it to be so corrupted with the passage of time so as to be no longer reliable and in need of "science" to "correct" it? Your answer to this question may reveal a great deal about your faith regarding God Himself. If you choose to, and I pray that you do, ponder this question. I also pray that you consider who the people are that claim proof that God's Word provides an insufficient, or faulty, or necessarily corrected explanation of what Genesis tells us.

In doing this, I pray that you will reconsider the first thirteen pages of this tome where I have attempted to unmask and reveal who they really are. I realize and apologize for how repetitive I am being regarding this matter. However, if we can't believe in the inerrancy of the first few pages of God's Word, of what trustworthiness and value is the rest of Scripture? To instill doubt in your heart is exactly what Satan seeks to achieve! If atheists the agnostics who claim to be scientists, know more and better truths than the creation story as presented in our Holy Bible, then we should no longer accept the truth of any of it. If Genesis is in error, then there is no reason to trust any other part of Scripture, including that relating to our Savior!

In John 14:6 Jesus said "I am the way, the truth and the life..." Jesus said that He is the Truth! Did He mean only most of the time or all of the time? Jesus is the Son of God and Son of Man. Before Jesus, the Man born of woman, the Son of God is the One, as part of the Godhead, who created. Jesus, the Son of Man in the flesh, was not involved in the creation. However, <u>His Spirit is</u> the Spirit now is the eternal Son of God. On this basis, while Jesus the Man was not a participant, His Spirit was, and therefore the act of creation has wrongly been imputed to Jesus.

This is made clear later in the Epistle of John, when he says, "the Word was made flesh and dwelled among us". He is pointing out that <u>later</u> He was made flesh through His indwelling as the Spirit of Jesus the Son of Man. It appears that in these passages in John, it was the Son of God who did the creating, the One who created the heavens and the earth!

Who is man to challenge the clear statement made by the Creator Himself? How can anyone who thinks God blew it when He claimed to have created in six literal days, be absolutely certain of the truth of anything else He may have put in the Book? Remember that few, if any of the "scientists" who even admit creation, are not willing to forfeit the old earth dogma. Believing in creation is by itself, a long way from being a redeemed Christian, or even being conversant with, or trusting in the Bible! Would you invite any of these "scientists" to be Bible teachers for your children?

There is no way, other than God's stated way, <u>if</u> one looks deeply into the issue. The trouble is that very few do. To, try in any way, to "harmonize," "synthesize", "synchronize", "compromise" "ecumenicalize", "rationalize", or any other "wise" meld an old earth belief with God's clear statement of a young earth is a serious affront to God! Oh, the idea that these "eminent scientists" have "proven" the old earth theory, may sound good, if one doesn't think too deeply about it. That's how Satan works! Like all of his lies, they are always seductively attractive and contain a veneer of truth on the surface so as to put one off guard. (After all, these guys are a lot smarter than I am, so

they must know.) But just look under that plausible veneer that Satan puts in place, and things get ugly quickly.

By holding to the universally respected mystique of science to make this credible, Satan is in his glory when people accept his "science" over Scripture, or somehow try to accommodate some of both, which in effect, amounts to the same thing. The process he often employs is somewhat like that Hegelian strategy, so successfully applied politically, especially by communism, is in evidence here. The strategy is to take the thesis, the literal 6 days of creation, and the antithesis that is the anti-god old earth / evolution theory, (now legalized as fact) and then debate them for awhile. Most often the result of such debates is a synthesis, that is some in-between compromise. This synthesis then replaces the 6-days thesis, and a new debate may ensue. This is then between this "new" thesis and the original antithesis. That's one way in which the old-world creation theory could have been "created". We now see this clearly manifested in many widely held unbiblical beliefs such as the old earth/creation travesty that some of the "scientists" have embraced. Those who have realized the impossibility of evolution absent an original Planner, then simply rationalize that evolution over eons of time is how the Planner did it. One can't have it both ways. God's Word cannot, must not, be compromised, and yet that is to what many of even the so called "church" have chosen to embrace.

How could the compromising of God's Word become so wide-spread within the church? There are many reasons one could consider. However, let us consider but one, which could turn out to be far more significant than it might seem. Mark Twain made a most astute observation about our society. He noted that "We all do no end of feeling, and mistake it for thinking." If we "think" about this observation objectively, we realize how true it is, but it wasn't always that way. Good examples of this are everywhere. Most of us have a strong opinion about many things. We rest on those opinions, seldom applying serious thought or investigation regarding the issue. Example: I am comfortable my religion. I am as good as anyone else, and better than most, so I'll have no problem getting into heaven. This must be derived 100% from feeling because serious thinking should cause some investigation to verify that "feeling." For nearly 100 years, our

educational system has been structured to produce "parrots" that "feel, and repeat" but seldom actually think. This was not by accident.

John Dewey, rightly known as the father of modern education (1859-1952) expressed his agenda, and the primary basis that has dominated modern education in America by the following quote, "you can't make socialists out of individualists. Children who know how to think for themselves spoil the harmony of the collective system."

He learned his educational indoctrination technique while studying in Communist Russia! These techniques became standard procedures, in teachers colleges and are still used in our schools. GODLESS/MARXIST SOCIALISM/COMMUNISIM BY WHATEVER NAME IT IS CALLED, HAS BEEN THE HIDDEN BEDROCK FOUNDATION OF AMERICAN EDUCATION FOR SEVERAL GENERATIONS. My grammar school and high school teachers in the 1930's were elderly and educated before Dewey's program had contaminated teacher's colleges. My college and graduate courses were nearly all on the physical science and their application in engineering. Therefore I was blessed by not having succumbed to the terminal "Dewey viruses." It should not be a surprise to anyone who may have escaped, or grown out of the system, to see how this all relates to our subject, and to the disintegration of our once great social, political, economic and moral structure. We are now, for all practical purposes, a socialist society having a socialist government, and very close to when we will have been marginalized as a nation, in preparation for the mergence with the rest of the world into the New World Order, or one world government, ready for deliverance to Antichrist, exactly as Scripture tell us will happen.

Before we leave the creation of the heavens, let us consider a few aspects of it as it relates to the "big bang" theory that is claimed to have brought all celestial bodies into existence. It took Hubbles "red shift" observation to "seem" to offer the first "concrete" evidence of an expanding universe (see item "g" in "End Notes at the end of this commentary.) This led to the alleged credibility of the "big bang theory", which is based on the idea that if the universe is as they claim, expanding, it must have started expanding from some point

of origin. They claim this to be compelling evidence of billions of years, simply because the stars are already so far away that their light could not have gone from where they are to here in any less time. Putting aside the idea that light might have been moving faster back then (see item "f" in "End Notes" at the end of this commentary) Let us ponder the following:

- If the universe as observed is expanding outward in all directions as viewed from various points on the earth, doesn't that suggest that the earth is the <u>center</u> of the universe and therefore where it all started? If not, then observations aimed in the various directions from here should produce varying results. That is, in at least one direction it seems as though in one direction we should see ourselves "going with the flow", and not seeing this "expansion" occurring. There probably is some "scientific explanation" for this, but I have not run across it yet. In the same vain, if the big bang occurred close to where the earth was formed, the light from of the forming stars would have began shining as the stars formed and receded into outer space leaving their streaks of continuous light that wouldn't take any time to get here because they began here.
- If it's expanding, why haven't the constellations such as the big dipper, appear to have grown smaller? Can it be that they are enlarging in exact proportion to the shrinking image effect that their movement away from us would project? That would be quite a "coincidence".
- Why is the North Star such a valuable reference point for earthly navigation? It's because it has remained precisely in the same place in the sky relative to the earth, since it first began to be so used thousands of years ago. How can that be? Shouldn't it have moved in some way so as to have it appear to be in a different relative location rather than standing still, if it is part of an expanding universe? It seems that this would be the case, unless of course the earth was the point from where it began? If the stars are moving away from the earth, then that star and all of the others should have been getting smaller in appearance. By now, if they

came into being "billions" of years ago, it should no longer be visible to the naked eye.

• The big bang requires that the galaxies, having been all formed at once, had to have moved out with great force from some single point of origin, at velocities of billions of light years per second in order to keep them from annihilating each other. But isn't the speed of light considered to be a constant, the absolute limiting speed anything can attain? If hyper-speed existed at the moment of the big bang, why can it not also apply to the moment of creation when the celestial bodies may have been created where they are now, at which time they began sending out this hypervelocity light so that their light reached here very shortly after creation?

The idea of a long expanding universe gave "science" the millions of years "time" it needed to make evolution seem plausible. It also seemed to make credible their other principal "proofs" of an old earth, the fossil records. These could now be used to better estimate the millions of years age of the earth. However, for "science" to "prove" its old earth idea, the fossils had to be in undisturbed soil layers. This demanded an eons long uniformitarian history absent any world wide catastrophe. That is, there could not have been a world wide flood, or any cataclysmic event, such that it raised mountains and reshaped continents, because this would that have obliterated these hundreds of millions of years old fossils layers.

With this, <u>if</u> you buy the old earth, you have to pay for it by striking Genesis chapter 7, out of God's inerrant Word. Does any one begin to see here how a little leaven can infect the whole loaf? Evolutionary geologists have coined the term "plate tectonics" to explain the rise of mountains, and shifting the continents. The rate of such movement, according to them, is slow and therefore millions of years were required to cause the present conditions. Biblical creation scientists agree with the plate tectonics idea, but they see it clearly as being much more rapid in the beginning and shortly after the flood. That makes it far more consistent and logical, from the biblical perspective.

Now let us look at some of the very succinct and perfectly structured phrases God uses as He continues to tell us what happened during the remainder of six days. Having already told us that He had created all of the "stuff" He needed, and that it was "piled up" without form or void, the Word continues on to tell us what He did with it, how He called it to take on "form", and also how He dealt with the "void."

On the fifth day, we read of the second creative act. Now it gets real interesting, especially because of the continued precision with which God expresses Himself. Verse 21 tells us that God "created" the creatures of the waters and of the air. The "stuff" He created, as mentioned in 1:2 was all He needed to <u>make</u> all these creatures as physical bodies. But now, He created, that is He instilled life into them. Think about it this way. What is different about any animal or man, one moment after death, as compared with one moment before death? Every aspect, every cell, every molecule of the body is physically there <u>exactly</u> the same under both circumstances. The only difference is that the God-created life that <u>was</u>, now <u>isn't</u>. Reverse this when thinking about verse 21. All creatures were like cadavers, complete in every way, except for what we call that "spark" of life, that energizing faculty. That is what He "created" and instilled in the bodies that He had made out of the "stuff", or what was then water and water soaked "dust."

In verse 21, the word, "living" (life) occurs for the first time. The Hebrew word is "niphesh" which also can mean "soul". Animals were energized, that is given life and a form of soul. Animal life ends completely, every bit of it returning to the dust from which it was made. Animals have no spirits, only souls. Their "souls" die as do their bodies, because they have no spirit to cause them to be eternal. Plants don't have life or soul or consciousness in the biblical sense, as do animals and man. We find proof of this in verse 30 where God says He grew the plants as food for the animals. If plants were living things in the biblical sense, then their being eaten would have constituted death. However there was no death until after sin. The term "after their kind" is stated ten times in this first chapter. The point is that one "kind" cannot give birth to another "kind." Here is another biblical truth that must be abandoned if evolution is given any credibility.

Evolution requires that all life evolved from a single life form and then, after eons of time evolved into various kinds.

On the sixth day God did the same thing to the land animals He had made. However, in this case, He expresses it a little differently by "bringing forth" or making them simultaneously living creatures, that is creatures which He also energized with life the same way He had the water creatures. Finally we come to the entry of human life on the sixth day. In verse 26, God said, "...Let us make man in our image, after our likeness..." Here, of course, we notice the plurality of the singular God. Notice also that God chose to make man out of the dust of the earth, as He did all living things. God is saying these things to, and within the Triune Godhead. What did He mean, by saying, in His image and likeness?

He is speaking only of the physical body. However, given that the Triune God is pure spirit, absent any physical form, how can the body have the likeness of God? Perhaps we can look at it this way. Jesus, walked the earth as the Son of Mary was both God and Man. However, as He said, "...Before Abraham was, I AM". (John 8:58) He was referring to His eternal pre-incarnate godliness as the Son within the Triune Godhead. He was referring to the Son of God before He also became the Son of Man. Prior to becoming the Son of Man, the Son of God appeared many times as a Theophany. One of the unmistakable evidences of this is given us in Genesis 18:2 where He and the two angels, each appearing in the likeness of man, came to Abraham's tent on the way to destroy Sodom. There are recorded several appearances of the Son of God as a Theophany, and also of angels who also were always in the likeness of man.

From that, might we not conclude that perhaps the likeness of what became man, had somehow always been intrinsic, but not yet physically manifest, in that portion of the Godhead that Scripture calls the Son? How else could man, be made in God's likeness unless that likeness was already in God? Then in verse 27, it says, *God created man in His own image....*" By this act of creation, man became a living being containing Godlike spiritual qualities. It means that man was uniquely endowed with a soul <u>and</u> a spirit.

These, along with His body became the eternal components of his triune being. Man is body, soul and spirit. Man as <u>created</u>, became eternal in all three aspects. The soul/spirit likeness of God would include the capacity of moral consciousness, the ability to think abstractly, to understand beauty and have emotions, to have the capacity to love and worship, and to speak and write so as to articulate and convey these things, all of which are within the essence of God. Thus we find in verse 26, God <u>made</u> man, such as in the cadaver analogy from the stuff of the earth. Then in verse 27 God, <u>created</u> man whereby He gave life, that is the soul and spirit to him! How beautifully precise are the words of our Lord as we see Him describing how He first <u>made</u> out of dust, and then <u>created</u> life within that stuff!

Had man not sinned, his triunity would have remained eternal and spiritually linked to God. However, sin brought eventual death to the flesh, while the soul-spirit remained eternal, although no longer intimately connected with the Spirit of God. Sin broke that Spirit-to-spirit connection. Jesus came to restore that connection, that oneness with God, which includes the replacement of the corruptible the incorruptible flesh. Jesus, in John 14:27 and Paul, in Philippians 4:7 speak of this as the peace of God, and the peace that passes all understanding. We totally miss the significance of this unless we understand its deeper meaning. God-given peace in the Greek is "eirene" which also translates to "set at one again." Its God's peace that sets us at one again with Him!

This is the most comforting, most exciting and precious word in all of Scripture when considered in the context in which it is given. Every born-again Christian has received that "peace." However, while we yet live in this flesh, we only have it fully in a "positional" sense. Oh, we may occasionally, feel pangs of its manifestation, especially when we are engaged in deep and serious communications with God in our prayers. But this peace, I believe, will not become wholly experiential <u>until</u> we have left this earth and take on our glorified eternal state. For many of us there is still too much residual sin and earthliness in our natures, which must be dealt with. These tend to quench the sanctifying efforts of the indwelling Holy Spirit and our actual appreciation of that peace.

We are told in verse 31 that all of creation that God had achieved by the end of the sixth day was very good. This, by itself should be sufficient to refute any form of old earth theory. If everything He made was very good at the end of the sixth day, how can a serious spirit-guided study of these words, and what surrounds them, reconcile this with the old earth fossil record of sickness and death that has to have occurred prior to Adam having sinned? To do so inexorably launches one on a path that must, at every turn, chip away at God's Word until it can no longer be recognized, let alone believed.

This is simply a sophisticated variation on the theme that Satan used on Eve. This was the "yea, hath God said" tactic for engendering doubt as to what Scripture really tells us. Through the serpent, he needed only to cast a tiny bit of doubt regarding God's Word in order to manipulate her. Currently we can see that in addition to his cadre of fallen angles and the demons, he has engaged the services, of a large body of agents from some of the fields of science in order to formulate the bigger lie, the old earth lie that is deceiving billions of unfortunate souls. With evolution having effectively become the state religion by legal mandate, so also must the old earth premise be mandated as truth. For without it, the fallacy of evolution would have to be discarded, by even the most rebellious person.

CHAPTER 2

Much of this chapter is a summary recap of chapter one. Nevertheless, there are also a number of other items of interest that are well worth examining.

It begins by telling us that God's work of creation was finished. "...and all the hosts of them." This is a little phrase that is easy to miss, but obviously it wouldn't be there unless it had significance. The word "hosts" in Hebrew is "tsaka". As written, it is plural and defined as "an army or servants organized for worship, or for war-soldiers waiting upon war." Some claim that the hosts are the stars. While Deuteronomy 4:19 and Nehemiah 9:6 and Jeremiah 33:22 might be so interpreted, 1Kings 22:19, 2Chronicles 18:18, and Luke 2:13 make it clear that it means angels. This is the case because

Scripture sometimes refers to angels as stars such as in Revelation 1:20. Literal stars would not fit that definition of hosts. Because angels were not mentioned in the list of things created in Chapter 1, here God is simply completing the inventory by acknowledging that angles had also been created.

Nevertheless, God had finished His work during the previous six days, and it was now over with. His work of creation and making all things were finished. Four times it is stated that God had finished, and three times it is emphasized that this included <u>all</u> of His works. Why such a repetition? It is so as to make us realize that there is no longer any continuance of God creating or making. This had been a process of innovation and integration. It was finished and completed at the end of the sixth day! What has gone on in the cosmos since then is not creating or making in the manner performed in Chapter 1. It soon became a matter of conservation and disintegration in accordance with the God ordained laws of thermodynamics.

By a strict and appropriate definition of "creation," God ended all of His creation work at the end of the sixth day. There has been no further creation since that day, nor will there be, until He creates the new heaven and earth at the end of millennium. There are some who claim exception to this absolute end of all creative effort. However God said it was the end, and so it was! Any situations that seem to be exceptions are not creation, but forms of adaptation or modification within the structure of what was completed in those first six days.

Let us focus for a moment on this seventh day, that day on which God rested. This is the Hebrew word "Sabbath", meaning also to "repose, desist from exertion." "Sabbath" is a more intense form of "Sabath." There is a great deal of Scripture devoted to this day of rest. As presented, it seems that anyone who seriously attempts to harmonize the six days of creation with the old earth / evolution belief should have great difficulty with this seventh day. If the six days were long periods of time, wouldn't the seventh be also?

Did God rest for eons? Notice it says God ended the work and rested, that is He didn't do any more creating. It was not resting, or continuing to rest for eons, as would be the case if this day was an old earth day. As dealt with earlier, going to Exodus 31:13-17, we read of God again speaking of the Sabbath and the six days. The people were told to work for six days just as He did, and then rest on the seventh, just as He did. Is there anything in these verses to suggest that God's six days of creation were any longer than those He gave to man to work? Not the slightest. Yet without even the slightest yot or tittle to support the old earth idea, many believers have been deceived into accepting the lie that the six days of creation referred to in Genesis One, were eons longer, and not the same 24-hours days!

Verses 4-8 more or less re-describe, with added details what God was doing during the creation week. This continues through verse 9 as well, except here, the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil are mentioned. Only the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil were forbidden to Adam and Eve. The tree of life was not forbidden to them until after the fall. While they were evicted from the Garden of Eden, the tree of life remained there. In order to keep them from sneaking back and eating of this tree, which would give them eternal life, and perhaps also to protect it from Satan, God placed cherubim at the entrance to the garden (Genesis 3:22-24). We will again find that tree of life flourishing and functioning in the New Jerusalem, the final eternal home of God, the saints and the angels. (Revelation 22:2).

Verse 10-14 provides us with some very provocative information that can be difficult to fully appreciate. Verse 10 tells us how the vegetation in the Garden of Eden was irrigated. The river, which must have been sizable, in order to supply the four rivers outside of Eden, seems to have been the source of irrigation. It probably provided a high water table within the Garden, and it was that which nourished the plant roots. Because it had never rained, where did the water come from? There are two possibilities that quickly come to mind. The first is artesian springs rising from the waters of the deep that would one day erupt big time as "...all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened." (Genesis 7:11) Highly pressurized subterranean

oceans of the deep were the source of most of the downpour that flooded the earth. Perhaps the river of Eden was fed by one or more of the smaller, less pressurized ones. The other possibility is wetting of the soil through condensation from the super-saturated atmosphere that then may have prevailed. With a large enough watershed area, and only a few degrees of temperature differential, the condensation could have served as the water source. Obviously, there were also some topographic variation, or else water could not have flowed out of such a watershed, or from anywhere else.

July 24, 2014

May 17, 2016

What, if anything, can we glean out of the names of the four rivers and the places mentioned? Havilah is the name of one of Cush's sons and also of Shem's grandson through Joktan. Hiddekel is a name found on Assyrian monuments, and is thought to be a reference to the Tigris River. Some writers suggest that the Gihon is the Nile and Pishon is the Ganges. It is very doubtful that any of these named rivers or places that existed in the antediluvian age are the same as existed after the flood for the reasons already given. Remember, that this first portion of Scripture may have been written, or orally handed down by Adam, and so they were surely real rivers during the pre-flood times. Because we recognize some of these names and places as having present day meaning, hardly qualifies them to share such an identity.

Ham, Shem and Japheth lived for around 100 years before the flood. Shem lived for over 500 years after the flood. He, as well as Noah, who lived for 350 years after the flood, were certainly familiar with these rivers and places from their past. Therefore they, or their descendents, most likely recalled them, and so chose to name postdiluvian places after them. The flood, and the world-wide massive upheavals that accompanied it, make it extremely unlikely that any of the original topographic features survived. It became effectively, a whole new earth with miles deep oceans and miles high mountains along with multiple continents. The new topography, the advent of a dramatically different atmosphere, and the resulting water cycle, caused new rivers, hills valleys and plains which were named after formerly existing places.

Next we read of the one restriction that God placed on Adam and later on Eve, regarding the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Could Adam have known what it would mean to disobey God in this matter? Could he have fully appreciated what it meant when he was told that by one act of disobedience he would surely die, and what death really meant? Could he have known that if he sinned, his legacy to all mankind would be pain and suffering and death? Could he have known that his sin would commence a cascade of every known kind of evil, of suffering, and of convulsions that would permanently affect the entire earth, as well as commence thermodynamic processes that would wind down the entire universe? It seems unlikely. If he did, one would think that he would have been much more contemplative in his action.

After that, we are given the details regarding the manner in which Eve had been <u>made</u>, and then <u>created</u> on the sixth day. God put Adam in a deep sleep before He performed the operation on his side. Why a deep sleep? Pain and suffering would not enter the world until after Adam sinned, so the operation could not have been painful even if he had not been in a deep sleep. It seems evident that there was another reason. Perhaps it was to conceal from Adam the details of how God did what He did. The word "rib" is a translation of the Hebrew word "tsela". This can mean "rib" but also the side curvature of the body. It needn't have been a rib, but only a small portion of his side, perhaps including only some DNA from the bone, flesh or blood.

In doing what He did, certainly made accurate Adam's statement that followed regarding who Eve was. Certainly God had reason for using this method of creating Eve. He obviously didn't need any part of Adam if He had chosen otherwise. The way God choose to create Eve, could be viewed as much mystical as physical. Here was the first Adam obtaining a wife for himself as a result of being pierced in the side. Didn't the last Adam, Christ Jesus experience a similar piercing of His side as part of what He went through in obtaining His bride? God often uses such similtudes when making a prediction through symbolism. Jesus identified two more of these when He related Himself to the bronze serpent on a pole in the wilderness, and then to Jonah's three days and nights in the belly of the earth.

As we come to the end of this chapter, in verse 23 we find Adam coining the word "woman." Up to this point, the word in Hebrew used exclusively for man was "adam" which is the masculine form of the word "adamah" meaning "ground or earth". This is because man was made from the ground to which was added God's breath of life, symbolized by the "ah". Here the Hebrew word for "man" is "ish" and the word for women is "isha" The Hebrew name for "woman" simply became the word for "man" with an "a" inserted to cause it to be spoken using a comparatively larger expulsion of air as in "ha". Notice also that Adam, or "Adamah" already had an ah" in his name. So what, you ask? So, go to Genesis 17:5 and 15. Here God inserted an "ha" to Abram making it Abraham and substituted the "i" in Sari for an "ha" making it Sarah. Again, so what?

Can't we see some kind of mystical pattern suggested here? Consider the "ha", or the "ah" as requiring an extra amount of air in order to pronounce the name in which it is placed. These involve breath, which in Greek is "pneuma", and in the Hebrew "ruwach". Both of these words can also be translated as "spirit". Now we get it! These all seem to be examples of God, imputing through their names, His Spirit, as a form of special blessing for each of these unique souls! Isn't that precious, how our loving God expresses His love for His own in such subtle and surprising ways! Is it stretching things too far in this observation? Perhaps, however Scripture is full of these little nuggets begging to be found explored and appreciated, if we but dig lovingly and seriously into His Word. How can anyone not be upset to the point of actually being sick when the perfection of His message is so blatantly challenged by man's lowly and grossly inferior wisdom?

Even though as we read of Adam speaking, and coining the word "woman", and the naming of the animals, as well as having conversations with God, we can easily fail to appreciate this additional incredible gift given to Adam, coincident to his creation. He was given the ability to speak, that is to orally communicate thoughts! In his created

mind, was a fully operative language, and designed to distinctively form set of sounds that were able to communicate thoughts. Immediately upon creation, he was able to communicate with God, and later with Eve, and she with him. This was not the mere utterances of grunt, groans and screams of an evolutionary pre-man, that Satan's old earth /evolution "scientists" would have us believe. This was a complete and perfect man, completely, in possession of every faculty that God ever intended man to have, and he was instantly that man on the sixth day of all creation!

Adam was also given the ability to convert his thoughts into a written form as well. Most likely his and Eve's children and their children on down the line were "homeschooled" in the written language as well as the spoken word. This language was the "old" Hebrew. It is commonly believed that the ability to write and read came sometime later and that man somehow, on his own developed the ability to put thoughts down in a written form after the flood. Muse about this. Even with a God-given spoken word, from which to formulate a written equivalent, absent any prototype and authoritative structure to make it official, it would at best have been very primitive and of, limited use. Here is one place where the idea of "evolution" might make sense, in that the primitive draft of the language would take generations to evolve into a fully functional, structured language. For this to have happened, the problem is far worse and more complex than can be described here. Bottom line: God gave the written word as well as the spoken word to Adam as part of His creative act. This gave Adam and each of his descendents on down to John's completion of the Book of Revelation, the ability to accurately record, by writing on something, and record the God-authored truths we have today in Scripture.

That remained the world's only spoken or written language until the time of the tower of Babel about 160 years after the flood, when God removed that language from the minds of all but one group of the people and replaced it with a variety of languages that form the basis of today's many other languages. Only one segment of the population retained that first God-given language. This was the Shemite line through which our Lord Christ Jesus would come. The others were not reduced to grunts, but woke up one morning with each family speaking and understanding a totally different language at the complete exclusion

of all of the others. I suppose that many of those who still refuse to believe in the six literal days of creation and the world-wide flood, will find the Babel story equally absurd.

At last, we come to verse 24. Its message regarding the sanctity of marriage is of profound importance to all who accept the faith and seek to live by His Word. What at first seems strange, is where in Scripture God chose to place it. Neither Adam nor Eve had parents to leave. God must have discussed this matter with them in much greater detail than what we have been provided, that is if they had any idea what this was all about. It seems more likely that this marriage message was placed there more for our learning than theirs. God considered this to be such an important precept that "He couldn't wait" to give it to us. And so He placed it where, and when the human race began, so that every generation would know it.

Where this message regarding the institution of marriage is first placed in Scripture, along with how many times the essence, the ramifications, and the importance of it are mentioned, make it essential to appreciate. Furthermore, because of how often it appears as analogies regarding many other of the most holy precepts, we must treat it with utmost seriousness. It begs to be studied and understood most seriously.

We find in Ephesians 5, and Colossians 3, very clear instructions regarding how Christian husbands and wives should relate to each other. The final verse in this chapter speaks of their unabashed nakedness. There are several interpretations of what this may mean. It is given in the context of marriage and the two being of one flesh, God is telling us that nakedness between a married couple, in the privacy of their own domain, was no cause for shame.

One final comment, and this takes us back to verse 2 in chapter one, where it speaks of the earth being without form or void. What is meant by "void" in this context? The Hebrew word is "bohuw" and simply means empty. This void may have to do with the initial lack or scarcity of life, that is, the yet underutilized reproductive capacity that God gave to man and animals. Just as He created but one man and one woman, isn't it likely

that He did the same regarding the first animals? In verse 28 of chapter one, God tells Adam and Eve to "...be fruitful and multiply...". That is, "fill the earth's void with many lives." The created earth at the beginning was void of life. God gave man and animals the power to multiply and the impetus to do so. That void was ordered filled through this verse.

This ends what I consider a nearly "bare bones" commentary on these two chapters. Every verse in all of Scripture is rich with insights the deeper one chooses to probe. We have merely "dipped our toes" in the edge of a sea of God's eternal truths. Instead of wading deeper, this commentary has devoted much effort in trying to defend that which should need no defense, that is, the inerrancy of God's Word as we have it in the original language in which He authored and preserved it. That any defense is needed is because the "lie" and twisted truth that Satan and his professional human agents have insinuated even into what use to be the "true" church. This has even caused many of the "elect" to embrace the compromising of God's Word. Unfortunately, our zeal and great desire to refute these lies should exceed our ability to articulate as convincingly as we want to, that which must be understood. Nevertheless, if this effort succeeds in convincing even one soul to reconsider his or her compromised position on this matter, we should all be grateful and feel exceedingly blessed. Although what follows has already been included in the bigger study called "Interpreting the Chronology of the end times", it is repeated here because of its significance as relates to the proof of a doomed earth.

END NOTES:

The following are a few points to ponder regarding the fundamental issues of an old vs. young earth. As we know, "science" demands an "old" earth, a multi-million year's scenario, in order to accommodate the necessary time requirements for evolution to have taken place. However, even a superficial understanding of the vast complexity of a single cell, along with a little probability theory math applied by an objective mind, can easily reveal that even septillions of years, or an eternity of years would not be long enough for life to have begun and "evolved". Nevertheless, here are but a few items of possible interest regarding this issue that are not popular among evolutionists. In Strobels' "The

Case for a Creator" there are several others that also effectively refute the false science of evolution and an old earth. The following is a short list of similar items some of which came from lectures by Dr. Missler and others whose names I don't recall. I'm sure that there are many more, because evolution is but one of the many devices Satan is using to undermine the credibility and accuracy of the Holy Bible as an attack on Christianity for the purpose of collecting as many souls as possible away from salvation. The whole old earth evolution theory is ludicrous to any "thinking" mind that hasn't been seduced by the big lie. The so-called "scientists" who promote this travesty are those who have given their souls to Satan in exchange for power, prestige and wealth. Remember, government has declared evolution to be truth, and that any other belief is false and not allowed to be even mentioned positively in schools or anywhere else under its control. When a truth must be mandated, one can be sure that there is something evidently wrong with it!

- a. The laws of thermodynamics, all admit is easily proven to be infallible. Over simplified, it states that, heat flows from hot substances to colder ones. If the earth is billions of years old, temperatures throughout the universe would all be approaching equilibrium. There would be no stars or concentrations of heat anywhere, and life supporting energy would have ceased to have existed long ago. Even millions of years would have caused severe and compelling evidence of such a cooling down. None exists. Therefore the earth cannot be even millions of years old. By the way, evolution itself violates the laws of thermodynamics, in that it claims self-organization rather than continuous disorder. No one who understands these God-given laws, and is not in Satan's camp questions their efficacy. The old earth/evolution advocates just ignore them.
- b. NASA "scientists" expected that the only side of the moon we ever see, the side that is exposed to the sun, and its destructive rays, absent a filtering atmosphere, would have caused the surface rock layers to turn to dust at the rate of a few ten thousands of an inch per year. The millions of year's theory required that there be a dust layer hundreds of feet thick.

This was of considerable concern to NASA when Neil Armstrong stepped out of the space craft. Instead, he stepped out onto rock covered with dust accumulation representative of only a few thousand years, based on their own calculations. What "science" considered fact, just dissolved into a "shrug-of-the-shoulder's mystery, or perhaps some contrived explanation.

- c. The earth magnetic field has been determined to have a half-life of about 1400 years. Based on this criterion, and measurements taken over the last 100 years, calculations indicate that the earth cannot be more than 10,000 years old! I don't know what the "rationalized" answer for this is, or if it is also, simply ignored.
- d. Approximately 300 million cubic yards of sediment are deposited into the Gulf of Mexico by the Mississippi river each year. An analysis of the numbers derived from taking the estimated present accumulated volume, plus the rate of accumulation, and dividing the total weight of the annual deposits, the age of the delta is calculated to be about 4,000 years. (Or essentially when the Genesis flood occurred!) No evolutionist would ever bother with such "trivia".
- e. The concentration of the various minerals that make up the salinity of the oceans is far less than would be expected, if these elements and compounds were being added at the present rate for millions of years. The fact that nitrate and uranium do not breakdown or recycle, and are found in far too limited amounts in the ocean, strongly suggests an age of only a few thousand years. What does this prove? Not much, except that something exists that is measurable, like moon dust, and when measured, speaks of a young earth.

f. The speed, of light is decreasing. It has been measured over 164 times and in 16 different ways, and each succeeding measurement, without exception, has indicated a lesser speed than the preceding measurement. As a percentage of the average speed, as it is at present, these changes are miniscule. However, they cannot be dismissed, given this consistent decrease, even in the short length of time during which they have been measured. Putting the data in a mathematical context, it was found that a graphical representation of this slow down followed a cosecant-squared curve with better than a 99% correlation. If this curve is extrapolated backwards in time, it indicates that the speed of light when Christ walked the earth would have been 10% to 30% faster than it is now. In the days of Solomon it would have been twice as fast, and in Abraham's day four times as fast

At the time of creation it could have been millions of times faster! Think about what such a condition at the time of creation does to the old earth theory which is based on the premise that the speed of light is and always has been a constant at 186,000 miles/sec. It means that light seen coming from distant stars would have reached earth much, much more quickly, and in complete harmony with what Scripture tells us! If these projections are anywhere close to true, even the hardest of hearts, capable of being softened, would have to reconsider their beliefs in the old earth/ evolution lies. However, those professional agents of Satan must continue to promote their lies wherever such truth can remain hidden or ignored.

In this context, the June 2005 issue of Scientific American contained an article in which it mentions something that seems to be of serious concern in some portions of the scientific community. The article suggests that there are other physical constants that appear to be not quite as "constant" as they have been believed to be. The very foundation of science, as we know it, rests on the immutability of these physical constants. The article

concludes that if in fact they are not really immutable, then our whole reality may be but a shadow of some greater reality! To the biblically literate Christian this is not news.

Our God-given Text Book has always claimed a greater reality than the one we live in, that is the one in which we, see, feel, taste, hear and smell. In 2Coritnthians 4:18, God informed us through Paul, "While we look not at the things, which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things that are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal." What science may now be fearfully concluding, based on their recent findings is exactly what God, through Paul told us 2000 years ago. The greater reality, that is the only true reality, is the spiritual reality of the things we cannot determine with any of our five physical senses. It will be interesting to see what science does, if anything, with this discovery. "Science", by definition deals only with the natural, thereby totally rejecting the existence of anything supernatural. Yet in this article they seem to be concluding that there is a "greater" reality, other than the natural reality we live in. Is this anything less than admission of the supernatural?

g. In 1929 Edwin Hubble observed that distant objects exhibited more of the red portion of the light spectrum than is normal. Thus it was considered as evidence that these objects were speeding away at high velocities—and thereby producing this so-called red shift. This is considered the first observed basis for believing in an expanding space paradigm. This led to the big bang theory. From this observation we get Hubbles Law, which is expressed as an equation regarding the expanding universe. In recent years, with the advent of quantum physics, it has been observed that this "red shift" is a digital phenomenon, and therefore cannot be caused by any spectral differentiation related to the speed of receding objects.

Some believe that this may be evidence of a change in the property of space, an atomic effect rather than a recessional velocity effect. If that's true, then perhaps these celestial bodies are not moving at all. This can lead to the conclusion that God created them right where they are. Of course no "scientist" in his right mind would believe that! However this digital revelation must, at the very least, cause a great deal of confusion and concern regarding the size of the universe and whether it is, or ever was actually expanding. It should bring into question the very foundation of the billions of year's age axiom so dear to "scientists" who are dedicated to proving the absence of God and of creation.

h. This "scientific" observation doesn't necessarily have anything to do with an old or young earth. It has to do with what is called the "aether hypothesis", a scientific theory that goes back hundreds of years. Rather than there being such a thing as a vacuum, that is absolutely empty space, it was believed that aether occupies all space not occupied by something else. There was no real definition of what this aether was. It was simply a substance that was required in order to satisfy a number of theories. "Science" has gone back and forth between the vacuum and aether concepts. That is because it seems that either way, there are scientific problems that the presence of aether, either solves, or makes worse. Finally, when Torricelli, in inventing the barometer, proved the existence, or rather the nothingness of a vacuum, the issue seemed reconciled. There was no aether.

However, in more recent times, an entirely new phenomena has been observed, that has a very interesting biblical connotation. It is called "zero point" energy. When the temperature in a "vacuum" chamber is lowered to absolute zero, it has been observed that there remains a residual amount of thermal energy, which cannot be removed. They call this "zero point energy. Therefore a vacuum is now "known" to be a vast reservoir of

seething energy out of which particles are being formed and annihilated constantly. This seems to answer the question: why doesn't the electron in an atom simply radiate its energy away and spiral into the nucleus.

It presumably acquires its perpetual power from the background zero point energy. Check this out! It is estimated that this energy exists through out the universe and amounts to something like 1.071X10 to the one hundred and eighteenth power of kilowatts per cubic meter! That is a lot of energy! Could this possibly be considered as representing the intrinsic power of our omnipresent God? Note Hebrews 1:1-3 where it speaks of Jesus "...upholding all things by the Word of His Power..." Could the apparent discovery of this incredible omnipresent energy in any way be revealing one of the great mysteries regarding our Creator God? Could this be the energy source from which God "made" or put together the stars of the universe? Might it also be the "power", the so called "strong force", that holds in place the protons in the nucleus of every atom? Hebrews 1:3 tells us that Jesus upholds (bears carries) all things "by the word of His power". Might it be that this "zero point" energy is somehow associated with that power?

i. What are the odds of just one molecule of hemoglobin occurring by random chance? (evolution) One molecule of hemoglobin contains a chain of 574 combinations of elements in but one specific arrangement from an alphabet of 20 amino acids. The probability of this occurring by random chance is one out of 1 X 10 to the 650th power of possible permutation! If there was just one misplaced, or substituted, or added, or eliminated element in this chain, it would not be hemoglobin, it would be death. Science admits that anything having a chance less that 1 X10 to 50th power is impossible and absurd. Even if it could happen, who would be there to do something with it? If it did exist, millions of other components would have to have also formed simultaneously so as to "accidentally" combine with it in a very intricate way in order to form just

one cell. Then what would one cell do by itself waiting for another such "magical transformation to occur? How long would its "shelf life" have to be as it waited? We're talking about absurdity compounded to an infinite power! Evolution cannot deal with such things, so it ignores them.

Will these observations, and a myriad of others, that effectively demolish the case for evolution ever become sufficiently accepted so as to cause a reevaluation of "science's" faulty faith in an old earth and its companion absurdity? Absolutely not, not in the sense that creation could ever replace evolution in "scientific" endeavors. Because Scripture shows us that we are living during a time very close to the end portion of the end times. Revelation tells us that in the end time, Satan will finally have his way, that his "leach" will be removed for awhile. There will be no grand revival, no great increase in Christian faith, this side of the rapture. Except for the always present remnant, the world will grow more and more wicked, and seek, as it already does, to distance itself from God as far as possible. Truth can never be destroyed. However, wherever it is found, it will be hunted down and securely hidden, as long as Satan, the father of all lies, remains the prince of this earth.

Redeemed Christians are called to be witnesses for Christ and not as agents of social change. Through living lives that express true Christian faith and obedience, our highest calling is to serve God through worship and obedience, by teaching His word to all whom He draws to us. However, we must know His Word before we can be affective in this pursuit. When a seeker asks many of today's biblically "challenged" evangelists, a Scripture related question that he can't answer, the response is all too often, "Don't worry about that, just believe in Jesus and you will be saved." The last part of this answer is only the first step toward salvation. However, how many such non-answers to his questions will the seeker accept, before he walks away from the evangelist or Bible teacher, and from any further involvement with the Christian faith? Why do polls show that at least 80% of young people brought up in "Christian " families abandon the faith soon after leaving home? The answer to each question is strongly related to the fact that

their mentors or parents fail to provide them with a solid grounding in the Scriptural truths.

How can they, when they themselves don't know these truths, or just know them only a little bit better than parrots know what their "speaking" means. There is a big difference between believing and knowing, between comprehending and apprehending, between grateful loving obedience and reluctant adherence to rules, and between knowledge and wisdom. These refinements don't come from hearing a once a week sermon. They come from serious persistent, single-minded prayer and study of God's Word as well as a disciplined moment by moment application of the result. It is just that simple. We are called to know Scripture, and we must know it well, if we are to be His effective servants. In 2 Timothy 3:16 we are told that "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." Notice it says ALL Scripture. All Scripture is given to us, and that it is profitable. Profitable how? It is profitable for:

- Doctrine What is right? We must be solid in our knowledge of doctrine.
- Reproof What is not right? We must recognize false doctrine.
- Correction How to get it right. We must be able to accept correction when Scripture shows us to be in error.
- Instruction How to stay right. We must continue in the Word always seeking better understanding.

Finally, profitable for whom? It is profitable in perfecting our walk, in being effective witness and teachers to others, and for the glory of God!

Is this how you deal with God's Instruction Manual? If you do, you should have no problem understanding and believing, without exception, equivocation or compromise of what God has told us regarding the manner and duration of His creation efforts, or anything else Scripture tell us. If you have doubts or concerns regarding any portion of Scripture, it's your inadequacy, not His or His Word. It is at the very least, a sign that you need more Spirit-led study of His Word. If you are a saved soul, the on-going sanctification process you are going through, should eventually cause those doubts to disappear.