

"Creation or Evolution?, Part 2"

- ↳ We saw last time: To be science, it has to be observable and repeatable which eliminates Evolution because it is neither. It is belief system that looks at the evidence, interprets it through a biased filter and says, "we believe it happened this way." Anytime anyone asks us to believe something or tells us what they believe, science has ceased. We saw last time, that if the first 7 chapters of Genesis aren't true and literal, then the rest of Bible cannot be trusted. We have two options: Either we believe Genesis as it is written, or we do not. It is dishonest to say that you believe the Bible and then turn around and not believe it.
-

1. Evolution is taught as a theory (I think this is a stretch because to be theory it must have at least some plausibility).

- ✓ Creation in a sense is a theory (none of us were there to see it). Further evidence that the theory of evolution is debunked as a theory: Bishop William Paley in 1818 said, "The watch, with its gears, springs, and other mechanisms could never arise by the actions of random chance alone." David Hume in 1879 said, "Living systems only have the appearance of machines. Unless it can be proven that living systems are indeed machines at the molecular level, then Paley's argument is irrelevant." Modern Microbiology has revealed that the simplest organisms not only machines but are dizzyingly complicated ones. They not only are self-modifying, but are self-programming, self-diagnostic, self-repairing, and self-reproducing. A simple single cell organism can do all of that. No machine that mankind has evented can do all those things.
-

2. Three different Hebrew words from Genesis 1

- ✓ First word is "bara," it is used 33 times in the Old Testament and is always applied to God and implies taking from nothing and making something. The Bible teaches that God did not use existing materials to create what is. The second word is "yom" which is the word for "day" in a Hebrew, very important word because there has been the argument for many years that the days of Genesis were not 24 hour consecutive days. The days of creation were 24-hour, consecutive days. Here are four reasons for this conclusion:
 - 1) "Evening and morning the first day," sounds like a regular day. One of the basic rules of correct Bible interpretation is that whatever the interpretation, it has to have been how the original hearers would have understood it. An interpretation that would have never entered the minds of the first hearers and readers is that "the first days of creation represent millions or billions of years") as an interpretation that is not correct on any level.
 - 2) God made a commandment based on these seven, 24-hour, consecutive days of creation as stated in Exodus 20:8-11. How were the Israelites to interpret this if those original days were anything other than 24-hour long and consecutive?
 - 3) In the Hebrew Bible, whenever a number is used in conjunction with the Hebrew word for day ("yom") it always refers to a 24-hour day.
 - 4) Adam and Eve were created on the 6th day according to Genesis 1. Thus, they lived through part of the sixth day and all of the seventh day and yet it tells us in Genesis 5:5 that Adam only lived 930 years. If these first days represent thousands, millions or even billions of years (as some believe they do), then how is it that Adam lived through part of the sixth and all of the seventh days and only accumulated 930 years in age??
-

3. How much time has there been? This is a very important issue for those who are interested in how we got here.

- ✓ Evolutionary thinkers believe that there has been billions of years for life to form on earth. Is the earth 4.5 to 5 billion years old or 30 billion as some would like to believe? There hard scientific evidence that speaks to the contrary. Jack Eddy of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics Research and mathematician Aram Boornazian determined through scientific research that our sun is shrinking 1/10 of 1 percent/century. This works out to about 5 feet per day. Our sun is 840,000 miles wide. If you follow the Bibles view of things and believe that the universe is only +/- 7,000 years old, no problem, shrinkage of only 6% in that time span. But if you hold to an ancient universe, you have a real problem because of the size of the sun in ancient times. 100,000 years ago, the sun would have been twice its size. 20 million yrs. ago the surface of the sun would have been touching the earth at its current orbit. The Evolutionary response is predictable yet puzzling. They say that the answer to this is that something was different in the universe and particularly in the sun, and that is why it decreased a lot less in the past. They believe this (which is not science). At the same time, they harp on the principle of static equilibrium making all of their assumptions about the universe's current state based on the extrapolated claim that everything has stayed the same for billions of years! Science demonstrates that the size of the sun in the past precludes the possibility of there being millions, much less billions, of years of age for the earth.
