No. 198

"But if ye believe not [Moses'] writings, how shall ye believe my words?" (John 5:47).

BACK TO GENESIS

June 2005

by Henry Morris*

DID JESUS TEACH RECENT CREATION?

Most everyone has been taught all through their school years that the earth, life, animals, and man have all been developing from primordial beginnings over billions of years of natural evolution. Many have tried to "baptize" this process, so to speak, by calling it "theistic" evolution or "progressive" creation saying that God may have used evolution as His process of creation.

Because of this ubiquitous indoctrination, even many evangelical Christians have felt they must conform to this evolutionary worldview, especially in relation to the so-called "deep time" that is so essential to evolutionism. One respected leader of the "Intelligent Design" movement, for example, recently wrote to me that he would prefer to believe in a "young earth," but that science had proved that the earth was very old, so he had to go with science. Two other leaders of this I.D. movement told me personally on two separate occasions that they could not even afford to *listen* to my arguments for a young earth because they were afraid they would be convinced and that this would halt their opportunities to speak to college groups and others about Intelligent Design.

So I have written this brief article to show once again that the Lord Jesus Himself believes in recent creation and the young earth. Assuming that a *Christian* is a person who believes in the deity and inerrant authority of Christ, it would seem that this fact should be sufficient to convince him.

What I will do here, therefore, is to list three key reasons for concluding that our Lord Jesus Christ believed and taught literal recent creation of all things essentially instantaneously by the omnipotent command of God, who "*spake, and it was done*" (Psalm 33:9).

1. The Bible nowhere allows for long ages.

One can search the Scriptures (see my book *Biblical Creationism* for proof) from beginning to end without finding even a hint of evolution or long ages. To Jesus, every "jot or one tittle" of Scripture was divinely inspired (Matthew 5:18) and He warned us severely against adding any other words to it (Revelation 22:18). The Bible, therefore, would certainly not leave the vital doctrine of creation open to human speculation.

2. The Bible explicitly states how and when creation took place.

Although many evangelicals have long equivocated as to the meaning of the "days" of creation, this type

^{*}Dr. Henry M. Morris is Founder and President Emeritus of ICR.

of ad hoc handling of Scripture is never justified in the context, and Christ Himself would never have interpreted them as indefinite ages of some kind. Not only is "day" (Hebrew, vom) defined in this context the first time it is used (Genesis 1:5), but the writer conclusively restricted its interpretation to the literal meaning by numbering the days ("first day," "second day," etc.) and by indicating their boundaries ("evening and morning"), both of which restrictions elsewhere in the Old Testament limit the meaning to literal days. The question seems to be even more firmly settled when God wrote with His own finger that "in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD blessed the [seventh] day, and hallowed it" (Exodus 20:11), thereby basing our calendar's sevenday week on this primeval creation week. Jesus referred to this divine example when He said that "The sabbath was made for man" (Mark 2:27) to meet our weekly need of rest from work.

3. The Lord Jesus recognized that men and women existed right from the beginning.

The current opinion is that the cosmos evolved about 16 billion years ago, the earth about 4.6 billion, primitive life perhaps two billion, and human life about one million years ago. The Lord Jesus, on the other hand (who was *there*, having Himself created all things—note John 1:1–3), taught that men and women were made essentially at the same time as the cosmos itself, when He said that "from the beginning God . . . made them male and *female*" (Mark 10:6). "*The beginning*" obviously was a reference to Genesis 1:1, and Christ was specifically citing Genesis 1:26.

On another occasion, speaking especially of Adam's son Abel, He referred to "the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world" (Luke 11:50–51), thereby acknowledging that Abel was the first prophet, martyred in the very first generation—not 4.6 billion years after the formation of the earth. Jesus also said that Satan, using Cain to slay Abel, "was a murderer from the beginning" (John 8:44).

Note also that the father of John the Baptist, prophesying when filled with the Holy Spirit, said that God's holy prophets had been predicting a coming Savior "since the world began" (Luke 1:70). Then the apostle Peter later preached that the second coming of Christ and the ultimate removal of the great Curse on the earth had even been events that "God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began" (Acts 3:21). The apostle Paul wrote that evidence of God as Creator should have been "clearly seen" (by men, of course) ever since "the creation of the world."

There can be no reasonable doubt that Jesus was what evolutionists today (both theistic and atheistic) would call a "young-earth creationist." It would seem that this should settle the question for all true Christians, who should certainly—on the authority of Christ Himself—completely reject the notion of geologic ages.

But they don't! For one thing, not all who consider themselves Christians really believe the Bible, especially its unpopular teachings. Unfortunately, many who think they are Bible-believing Christians have become adept at "wresting" the Scriptures (note II Peter 3:17), even the recorded words of Jesus and the apostles, to make them conform to the scientism of evolutionary speculation. As noted above, there is not the slightest suggestion of millions and billions of years anywhere in the Bible when it is taken simply to mean what it says. That is why we "young-earth creationists" have to keep on reemphasizing the pervasive Bible teaching of just *thousands* of years of earth and cosmic history.

But what are we supposed to do when the Bible disagrees with the majority of scientists on such matters?

We are to believe the Bible—that's what! When the teachings of men conflict with the Word of God, it would be wise to go with God.

Furthermore, there are now thousands of scientists (fully credentialed with post-graduate degrees from accredited universities) who have become convinced believers in recent creation. No doubt we are still a minority, but it is a growing minority. There are several hundred such scientists in the Creation Research Society, not to mention those on our ICR faculty as well as those associated with numerous other creationist organizations around the world.

There is also a rapidly growing body of scientific data that not only shows the impossibility of macroevolution but also much that repudiates the socalled evidences of "billions of years." Creationist geologists have been developing an abundance of evidence of global catastrophism instead of uniformitarianism in earth history—thus confirming the Biblical record of the great Flood as the major explanation for the fossilbearing rocks in the earth's crust, instead of having to invent imaginary long ages of evolution to account for them.

It is possible now even to amass a list of dozens of worldwide natural processes (e.g., accumulation of salt in the sea) which, even on uniformist assumptions, will yield ages much too brief for evolution. Thus, even without referring to the Bible at all, it is possible to make an impressive case for recent creation. One cannot determine the *exact* age of the earth by science, of course, and these various processes may yield various values, but all prove too small for evolutionism to be possible.

With the supposed exception of radiometric dating, that is. The decay of uranium into lead, rubidium into strontium, and a few other such processes can be made to show extremely long ages, so radioactive decay processes have been considered by evolutionists to be firm proof of the billions of years.

But Christians need to remember that such calculations, like all the others, are based on the arbitrary assumption of uniformitarianism, which not only is unprovable but contrary to the Bible. The apostle Peter calls it "willing ignorance" (note II Peter 3:3–6) when this assumption ignores the world-changing impact of special creation of all things in the beginning and the worldwide geologic impact of the global Deluge in the days of Noah.

Furthermore, the forthcoming publications of the ICR/CRS RATE Initiative will show strong scientific evidence that even these radioactive decay processes really provide convincing arguments that the earth is thousands of years old—not billions!

Therefore, we plead once again with our Christian theistic evolutionists, progressive creationists, gap creationists, and intelligent design minimalists to come back to the Bible for their view of the world and its history. We should most certainly believe the words of our Lord Jesus Christ on this vital subject. "And why call ye me, Lord, Lord," He might well say, "and [believe] not the things which I say?" (Luke 6:46).

IS IT BIBLICALLY PROPER TO SEEK EVIDENCE FOR CREATION? by John D. Morris, Ph.D.

The Institute for Creation Research has become known for its attention to research. It's important to recognize that we don't try to "prove the Bible." The Bible doesn't need our help. Whether or not there is evidence, the Bible is true! In our research we assume the Bible, and conduct our investigations in that framework. We interpret all historical data within the model of true history given in Scripture.

For instance, we do a lot of research in Grand Canyon, a huge scar in the earth gouged out by moving water. We go there with the firm conviction that the worldrestructuring flood of Noah's day covered Arizona, and that its processes and aftereffects would have left their mark. We interpret the data in that light.

This is not a naïve stance. Everyone has a perspective. Evolutionary naturalism has become such a worldview and is unquestioningly used by its adherents in their interpretation of data. We feel that of the two broad viewpoints of history, creation is the better choice. The Bible and its teachings have proven to be trustworthy, and a solid foundation for our faith. It handles the data better, with no inconsistencies or contradictions.

Since the Bible is the inerrant Word of God, there is no need to fear putting it to the test (I Thessalonians 5:21). Francis Schaeffer used to declare the Bible to be "true Truth." It is absolutely accurate in all matters on which it touches, and the worldview it presents is applicable in all areas. Research can fill in the gaps in our knowledge, for the Bible doesn't give all the details. Furthermore, in the Dominion Mandate of Genesis 1:28, we (i.e., all representatives of mankind) are commanded to study creation, in order to use it wisely for man's good and God's glory. The Creator instructed Adam to "subdue [the earth]: and have dominion over [it]." Furthermore, He is pleased when we learn more of Him through research into what He has done and give Him the glory. Research can answer questions which might have arisen in the minds of Christians, remove obstacles to salvation in the path of non-Christians, and show the superiority of the Biblical way of thinking. It can and should do all these things.

Nevertheless, some Christians think otherwise. They feel that the Bible is beyond such investigation, and doesn't even need to be supported. They are offended that we attempt to demonstrate its accuracy, and chastise us for trying. While this may sound "spiritual," it differs from Christ's example.

After His resurrection, He appeared to His disciples in the upper room, but Thomas was not present (John 20:24). When told by the others that they had seen the risen Lord. Thomas insisted that he needed to see the evidence. "Except I shall see in His hands the print of the nails ... I will not believe" (v.25). A few days later He again appeared. This time Thomas was present. Did Jesus upbraid him for his need for evidence? Not at all. He graciously invited Thomas to come and see the scars. The evidence was there, and his faith was well placed. Throughout Scripture we find God revealing Himself and validating the truth with evidence. Still, He requires faith, but that faith is a reasonable faith, based soundly on demonstrable fact. 🛵

