

After Eden – A Young Earth Book Review



Review By Greg Neyman
© Answers In Creation

Answers In Creation Website
www.answersincreation.org/after_eden.htm

The book *After Eden: Understanding Creation, the Curse, and the Cross*, is by Henry Morris III. The edition being reviewed is a paperback, First Printing, 2003, ISBN Number 0-89051-402-X.

The purpose of this book is to tie the doctrines of the Bible, mainly the doctrines related to salvation, to the creation account. Its purpose is to show that young earth creationism is the only proper method of understanding creation...all other forms, such as theistic evolution or progressive creationism, detract from the Gospel message. In other words, long ages creation and the salvation message of the Bible do not complement each other.

It is easy to see the need of this book from a young earth perspective. Many are leaving young earth creationism, in favor of long ages creation. This book was written in part to shore up the defenses against a real threat to the very existence of young earth creationism. Simply put...old earth creationism is a perfect fit, with both the Bible and science. As people realize this in our churches, the support base for young earth creationism will shrink even more.

You may remember the idea known as geocentricity. Several hundred years ago, the church lost the battle to science, when science proved that the earth was not the center of the universe. Eventually, young earth creationism will go the way of geocentricity. However, the church has nothing to fear. The church survived the fallout from geocentricity just fine, and we will survive just fine without young earth creationism. You can believe in an inerrant, infallible Bible, and an old earth!

The preface to this book highlights the fears of young earth creationists. Morris makes the claim that "In many churches, Christian colleges, and seminaries, the diluting down of biblical authority has been led by those who want to hybridize Scripture with the "more scientifically acceptable" view of long ages of death and struggle." The authority of the Bible is not in question, however. Your view of the creation has no bearing on your view of Biblical authority. I'm a very conservative Christian, as are many old earth believers. I hold the same view of Biblical authority as Morris does. What is happening in our churches and colleges is the replacement of young earth ideology with the irrefutable fact that the earth is old. What is threatened today is young earth creationism, not Biblical authority. Morris knows this, and tries his best to rally the troops with this book.

He blames this situation on evolutionists. On page 12, he makes the claim that they have lost two decades of debates with creationists, and thus they are turning to Christian leaders to undermine the biblical record of creation. His assertion is that the "losing evolutionists" are converting so-called Christians to a belief in Theistic Evolution.

The evolutionists are winning, not because they are evil people out to eradicate the Bible, but because they are proving that you can believe in evolution and God at the same time...there need be no conflict between the two.

Next, he takes aim at Dr. Hugh Ross, of Reasons to Believe. He takes a statement by a known naturalistic evolutionist (Eugenie Scott) who concedes that Ross is having an effect. He turns this into an endorsement of Ross by an evolutionist, however, I'm certain Scott does not endorse Ross! Ever since Ross came along, young earth creationists have been labeling him as an evolutionist, even though he is not! His [progressive creationism](#) views do not contain even the slightest bit of evolution (unlike [young earth creationist's adoption of rapid evolution](#)). This tactic of trying to mislabel Ross, so that he is painted in what they see as a negative light, is dishonest at best.

Morris uses the example of the Bereans to support his cause. Paul would not want them to be "corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ" (2 Cor 11:3). I agree, but for different reasons. During the twentieth century, young earth creationism was added to the beliefs of many churches as a doctrine, where there was no [doctrine of creation](#) in the church for the previous 1,900 years. Why? The simplicity of Christ does not require a belief in a young earth.

All we have to focus on is Christ...what we think about the creation is irrelevant. We do not need to insist upon a young earth interpretation of the Scriptures. The doctrine of creation should be eliminated, and people should be accepted in any church, no matter what their beliefs about creation are.

Do not get me wrong, however. I believe firmly in creation. What I am talking about is the method and length of time God took to create. What one believes about the length of creation is insignificant compared with his decision to follow Christ...that must be our number one priority.

Chapter 1

Two Gates

Morris opens this chapter with a quote from Martin Luther. It says "On no account must you look at the great mob, but only at the Word of God." I agree with Luther, the Word is all we need. This is meant to imply that old earth creationism adds millions of years, and death before sin, to the Bible.

If Morris truly believed these words of Luther, then he would not have written this book. The Word of God brings us to salvation in Christ, and that is all we need. To this, the young earth creationist has added their doctrine of creation...despite the fact the Bible does not claim how long creation took. If we could all focus on Christ, and not on the length of creation, the old earth/young earth debate would be a thing of the past. As long as young earth creationists insist that their view is right, they will need to be met head on with the truth.

The opening pages are devoted to Charles Templeton, a former worker for Christ who turned aside to believe in atheistic evolution. It tells how Templeton and Billy Graham discussed matters of belief in a God, and how Templeton fell away from the faith. Next, this leads into a discussion that there are two gates...Jesus is the narrow gate. The wide gate, it is claimed, is impossible to see without the aid of Scripture. He tells the story of a

lesbian, who comes to realize that conservative values are essential to prevent the disintegration of our society.

The Choice of Gates Seems to Hinge on How We View the Creation (Page 22)

He makes the claim in the heading to this section, that a man's choice of life or death (the narrow gate (Jesus) or the wide gate (the world) depends on how we view creation. He throws in another example of a Christian who became an atheist (Dan Barker). He then ties it together, with both Templeton and Barker expressing doubt about the Genesis account of creation.

Creation - Literal Reading or Interpretation? (Page 25)

Morris again reinforces the falling of these two men because of creation. He again uses Billy Graham, who said "I believe the Genesis account of creation because it's in the Bible." Let's examine Billy Graham closer. Look at the homepage for this website, and you will see a quote by Billy Graham. It reads,

I don't think that there's any conflict at all between science today and the Scriptures. I think that we have misinterpreted the Scriptures many times and we've tried to make the Scriptures say things they weren't meant to say, I think that we have made a mistake by thinking the Bible is a scientific book. The Bible is not a book of science. The Bible is a book of Redemption, and of course I accept the Creation story. I believe that God did create the universe. I believe that God created man, and whether it came by an evolutionary process and at a certain point He took this person or being and made him a living soul or not, does not change the fact that God did create man. ... whichever way God did it makes no difference as to what man is and man's relationship to God.

Billy Graham has remained faithful to God all these years. However, he does not view creation the same way that Morris and the young earth community does. He rightly sees that the "how" of creation is not nearly as important as the "why." What then is the difference between Graham and Templeton?

Templeton saw the teaching of evolutionary theory, backed by science, and concluded that the Bible and science was incompatible. It was an either/or issue for him, probably due to the influence of young earth ideas. Graham, on the other hand, realized that the "how" of creation was not important. You could accept God if you believed in evolution or not, if you believed in long ages or not. For him, creation/evolution was not an either/or issue.

Yes, young earth creationists can give examples like this, of people who choose evolution and become atheists, and there would be no end to their words. However, if you dig deeper, you find this either/or choice that young earth creationists propose...either you believe the Bible (their "young earth interpretation" of the Bible) or you don't. This either/or choice is in most of these atheists' decisions to turn from God. For this reason, young earth creationists, through their "take it or leave it" attitude, have probably contributed more to causing atheism during the twentieth century than all other factors combined. They could learn a valuable lesson from Billy Graham in the above quote.

At the top of page 26, Morris starts to play with semantics. He says, "Those who seek to fit long ages of death and struggle into the biblical narrative must use the word *interpretation* to mean something quite different from the understanding and application of God's words taken clearly and simply (literally) in God's context." What he is inferring here is that his young earth literal view is not an "interpretation," but is instead the simple truth. However, just in reading a simple sentence, like "See Jane run," one must interpret it to understand it. Yes, the fact that Jane is running is simple truth...but how fast she is running, and how long she runs, it does not say.

The same is true of the creation account. God created the heavens and the earth, that much we can agree on, but it does not say how fast, or how long, this creation event lasted. The Hebrew word "yom" is used, which can represent anywhere from 12 hours to eternity (see www.answersincreation.org/word_study_yom.htm). God uses six of these "yom" divisions of time/events. We must interpret, both young and old earth creationists, how long "yom" is. Yes, the young earth view is just as much an interpretation as the old earth view.

Next, Morris lists four options for viewing the creation account. However, these options are so mixed up in his mind that he does not present them clearly, which demonstrates his young earth bias.

1 - Accept creation as literal. This is meant to be the young earth creationists. However, you can accept the creation account as literal, and believe in an old earth, with or without evolution!

2 - Reject creation and God. This is his only clear point.

3 - Reject Genesis as history and science, but keep it as allegory. To this, he claims theistic evolution belongs. Yes, some theistic evolutionists believe this, but they can also be literalists, and thus fall into number 1 above.

4 - Interpret Genesis to include long ages of death and struggle. He does not say, but I'm certain he is alluding to Progressive Creationism. However, every progressive creationist is a literalist, and meet all the definitions given for number 1!

He admits that it is possible to interpret Scripture as something other than what says plainly, and this interpretation is the result of comparing Scripture to something that is outside the Bible. Hence, he is claiming that to get an interpretation other than six days, you must interpret Scripture with outside influence, namely science. Yes, we use science to help us understand Scripture, but this is permissible. Consider the Bereans, whom Paul told "Examine the Scriptures to see if these things are so" Acts 17:11. Could the Bereans examine the Gospels and see if this was so? No, the Gospels were not written yet. They used extra-biblical reference points (Paul's preaching and testimony), combined with the Old Testament, to determine the truth.

When a scientist examines the world, what is he looking at? He is looking at God's creation. Can we not use God's creation, the very work of His hands, to understand more fully God's creation account? You would be foolish not to! The creation itself is extra-

biblical, but it came directly from God, thus it must be truth, and valid for proving the Bible.

Ideas Have Consequences (Page 28)

I agree that ideas have consequences. Morris uses this to argue that if you enter into evolutionary thinking, and you exclude supernatural forces from it, you are bound to come up with a naturalistic viewpoint. I can buy that. The opposite is true also. If you have been taught for many years that the earth is young, and approach science with that bias, you are bound to come up with the idea that the earth is young! Herein lies the major problem with young earth creationism. It is passed down from generation to generation. Young children are indoctrinated, and taught how to view creation. They are taught that to challenge the young earth view is to challenge the very words of God. They are taught to be close-minded and reject all evidence to the contrary. For an excellent discussion of how they do this, read Morton's Demon (see www.answersincreation.org/mortond.htm).

Belief Systems Control Your Life (Page 29)

No problems here. He argues that we teach people the answers, without knowing the "why." Young earth creationists do the same...they teach that theirs is the correct method, without understanding the science behind their belief (if they truly knew the science, they would not be young earthers).

At the end of one paragraph, he uses Matthew 6:24, "No man can serve two masters." This verse has nothing to do with belief systems...its all about money. This verse is taken way out of context!

He finds it strange "that only the Christian camp has attempted to merge the two opposite philosophies." Of course the Christian camp is the only one to merge them...what motivation do the atheists have to merge Scripture and science! Now that would really be strange.

Education Has Shifted Focus Over the Centuries (Page 30)

He is basically saying evolution and long ages took over by the 1900's, making the Bible a disdained book of legends. I don't see this at all! There have always been those who don't believe. In our age of advanced technology and scientific enlightenment, the problem is not evolution, but young earth creationists. A few creationists viewed the two accounts (evolution and creation) as either/or, and thus they have driven a stake into the heart of Christianity. When faced with either/or choices, it was difficult for many to choose, so they abandoned the church. How different would our church be, if our church fathers in the 1800s had embraced evolution and long ages? One can only wonder.

The New Open-Minded Tolerance (Page 31)

He lumps all those who are open-minded as walking through the broad gate, a reference to the narrow gate (Jesus) and the wide gate (the world). He then wields

Templeton and Barker again, and goes on to relate how the church readily accepts long ages in today's biblical message. He is merely characterizing today's church as open-minded, intending the reader to recognize that this is a new pattern of church behavior today. He fails to further develop this idea, so he must just be planting this thought in the mind of the reader to reinforce it later.

Why Are Origins Issues So Important for Christians? (Page 33)

He wraps up this chapter by posing many questions one right after the other. He goes on to say the book will contrast two different groups of Christians. Note this is not a book about souls...it is about stopping the losses of young earth creationism to the gaining popularity of old earth creationism. He goes on to say he will "attempt" to show the damage that old earth belief systems do to the Gospel of Jesus. As you will see, his choice of the word "attempt" is appropriate, for he fails miserably.

Chapter 2 Science Falsely So Called

When I read the title to this chapter, "Science Falsely So Called," I thought it was about young earth creation science...and then I remembered I was reading a young earth book! This chapter actually argues against evolution, saying that it does not deserve to be called a science. However, if you are attempting to reach an evolutionist, and in particular, a biologist, and present him the Gospel, the worst thing you can probably do is say he is not a scientist at all! Hence again, we see the real purpose of this book. This is further proof that the author is not intending to convert evolutionists. He is merely trying to convince young earth creationists that evolution is wrong. Naturally, they already believe this! This reveals the real motive...to reinforce young earthers, and thus hopefully prevent them from converting to old earth creationism. The fact that they are losing followers weighs heavy on the minds of the young earth establishment.

This chapter features an introductory quote also, this time from Chuck Colson. While the quote serves the young earth author's purpose, he probably does not realize that Colson is an old earth believer! (see http://www.reasons.org/resources/apologetics/notable_leaders/index.shtml#colson).

Let's jump right to the heart of the matter. Morris makes the claim "Evolution is not science. Evolution is just humanism dressed up in a lab coat. Evolution itself is a philosophic belief system." Sounds like he has a grudge against evolution! So, what is science? The dictionary on my desk says

1. a branch of knowledge or study dealing with a body of facts or truths systematically arranged and showing the operation of general laws, 2. systematic knowledge of the physical or materiel world, 3. systematic knowledge of any kind, 4. any skill that reflects a precise application of facts or principles.

Is evolution a branch of knowledge or study...yes. Does it deal with a body of facts or truths...yes. At this point I just lost the YECs. However, consider the facts of evolution.

Does micro-evolution occur...even YECs say yes. Do genetic mutations occur...yes. The processes that evolution works on are well understood facts. Next, are they systematically arranged and show the operation of general laws? Yes, when understood properly, evolution is possible (although as a progressive creationist, I believe improbable). Look at the rest of the definition of science. It is "systematic knowledge of any kind." Evolutionary scientists have "skill that reflects a precise application of facts OR principles." Even if you deny evolution the word "facts", it is still a science on "principles."

Claiming that it is not a science will serve to emotionally energize your own followers, but it will only alienate those who are evolutionists. By driving this stake home, they are forcing them further and further away from the Gospel, which is the opposite of what we are supposed to do. I do not agree with evolution...but I don't go around insulting evolutionists by saying they are not scientists. Doing so defies common sense. Jesus was upset when only one sheep was lost, but YECs are happy to drive them off in droves.

On the top of page 38, Morris says, "Belief in long ages of death and struggle contrast sharply with the gospel theme of biblical history: God's perfect creation, ruined by man's sin, destroyed by Noah's flood, restored to new life in Christ." Morris is typical of YECs, claiming that old ages have a profound impact upon the Gospel message. This simply is not true. The main issue here is death before sin. To read more about death, click here.

In the paragraph about the Big Bang, he says "predictions of this theory are precisely falsified by observations of our own solar system." I assume he is going to support this statement in a later chapter. I'm unaware of any problems with the Big Bang and our solar system.

In the section on life developing naturally over millions of years, he says "Why would anyone want to compromise new life in Christ with millions of years of struggle and death until death wins? Rest assured, if you are a Christian and believe in an old earth, you do not compromise your life in Christ in any way. Again, Morris is presenting it as an either/or situation. You can have both, with no compromise of any biblical doctrines. Those of us who are committed old earth Christians provide a resounding defeat of this stupid claim.

Next, he provides an argument from Darwin against long ages. He says Darwin wrote that the fossil record did not contain the necessary progression of life to show evolution to be true. Unfortunately, this argument is as old as Darwin. Darwin did not have a complete picture of the fossil record. Today, after 150 more years of research and discovery of fossils, we have a very good record, which shows exactly what Darwin was arguing against.

Theistic Evolution (Page 40)

Morris uses the example of Gary Parker, a former evolutionist. You can read his story here (answersingenesis.org/radio/pdf/evolution2creation.pdf). He tells about a debate he had with the Bible department of his college, where he debated for creation, and the Bible department debated for evolution. Strange, though, that nobody at this college can confirm that this debate occurred (see www.theistic-evolution.com/parkerdebate.html).

It is interesting that a biologist who believed in evolution would abandon it for young earth creationism. His testimony does not say, but he probably was raised in a Christian home, and was taught a young earth, but then he strayed in college. When he finally committed his life to Christ, he "ran home" to his original teaching (after a time spent as a theistic evolutionist and progressive creationist). His other problem was probably being in a church under the influence of a strong, emotional young earth proponent, who put the pressure on him.

I've heard it said that if you are outside of any religious framework, and you examine the earth, 100% of the people would say the earth is old. The evidence from God's creation simply is not young. Insert the religious bias, and then you cannot objectively look at the evidence.

Concerning his two arguments against theistic evolution on page 42, they don't hold water. He first uses death before sin, saying it makes God the author of struggle and death. He is absolutely right...God is the author of struggle and death...so what's the problem? God created a fully functioning ecosystem, able to renew itself through death and decay. This causes no theological problems. Physical death is not important, only spiritual death is. Paul said that death could not separate us from the love of God...however, we all know what can...spiritual death.

His second argument is basically the "weak God" argument. Is a God who takes millions of years really all that powerful, all that knowledgeable? Sure He is! See the article A Weak God? for more (www.answersincreation.org/weak.htm).

The Gap Theory (Page 42)

There are only minor points of contention here. He claims there is an inconsistency, by putting Lucifer's rebellion before creation day 6. This is not a problem at all. It is not in keeping with the young earth interpretation of the Bible; however, having it prior to the end of creation is no problem theologically. The other problem is with death before sin, which is also contrary to the young earth view for the same reason as the Lucifer argument. If you are concerned about this death before sin issue, read either Death Before the Fall of Man, or Death Through Sin. Despite the ramblings of young earth creationists, the Gap Theory remains a valid choice of old earth belief.

www.answersincreation.org/death.htm

www.answersincreation.org/deathsin.htm

Progressive Creation or Analogical Days (Page 45)

On page 46, he says "...the creation of man from proto-humans that roamed the earth prior to God's intervention." He obviously has a poor understanding of progressive creationism, for this is totally wrong! Progressive creationists believe in fiat creation. Each species in the fossil record was a unique creation, and did not evolve from a previously existing species. While they do believe there were hominids prior to Adam, Adam did not descend from them. Secondly, they did not roam the earth prior to God's intervention...God was there all the time. Morris makes it sound like the earth evolved, and then God flew in from space in his spaceship, saw that life had developed, and then

he "intervened" to shape it to his liking. There is nothing of the sort in progressive creationism.

Morris then claims "the words of scientists supercede the words of Scripture." No, they do not! Progressive creationists use science to confirm the creation story. Consider this...in a court of law, you would want to examine 100% of the evidence prior to finding someone guilty. The same is true of God's creation. Old earth creationists use the evidences in the creation, which testify to billions of years, to shape how they interpret the creation account in Genesis. This is not taking the word of science over the Bible. Science proves that the earth is old, and it fits perfectly with the creation account in Genesis. Young earth creationists, on the other hand, have to ignore most of the evidence from science in order to reach a conclusion of a young earth. What they don't ignore, they twist to mean something totally different than what it represents. This is why they are scoffed at in the scientific community.

Morris lists several things that he claims are at odds with a literal reading of Genesis. He says they undermine the purpose and work of Christ. Millions of old-earth creationists disagree! He says "Insisting that death was a natural process long before Adam attacks the core of Christ's atonement and the biblical teaching of sin's consequences. Again, see the death before sin articles linked above. In reality, you can interpret Genesis literally, and believe in an old earth (if he truly understood Progressive Creationism, he would realize this).

The Framework Interpretation (Page 47)

Morris presents minor arguments, but nothing that is significant.

The Wedge of Intelligent Design (Page 48)

He shows his lack of understanding of Progressive Creationism once again. Morris says in the first sentence, "All the hybrid positions described so far uncritically swallow popular evolutionists' interpretation of science, and then use evolutionary interpretations to interpret Scripture." Progressive Creationism is anti-evolution, and argues vehemently against it. Morris must not have done any research for this book on the topic of progressive creationism, and it shows rather brutally.

He proceeds to criticize the ID movement, but here he shows that he has a very narrow view of the movement as well. In fact, many facets of ID are adopted within young earth creationism (and old earth creationism). He goes on to say that God cannot be pleased with ID'ers. Yet ID argues strongly for a God, and it is much more effective than the weak witness of young earth creationism, for it accepts science. As I've stated before, young earth creationism has driven millions away from the church with their take it or leave it approach. The ID movement is seeking to bring them back, by demonstrating that there must be a creator. Actually, God must be very pleased with them.

By discussing all these alternate views, Morris has painted himself in a corner, with no way out. This is what is happening to young earth creationism, and hence the need for this book, in their view. They are coming out fighting, trying to get out of the corner. It is probably too late to rescue young earth creationism, however.

Science Over God's Word (Page 50)

He says that Paul warned Timothy to avoid "profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called; which some professing have erred concerning the faith." (I Tim 6:20-21). He goes on to say that "by professing it (science) some have erred concerning the faith." And again on page 51, "But it is true that accepting evolution can be a huge stumbling block to accepting Christ." Millions of old earth creationists, both theistic and progressive, resoundingly prove the words of Morris untrue. Morris' adaptation of the words of Paul are not appropriate. While it is true that the King James uses the word science, it is the only translation that does. The Greek word "gnosis" is knowledge, and it is translated this way in every other major translation. Paul is not arguing against science. The sciences were not that well known then anyway!

Old earth creationists' use science to understand the Bible. So far, there is nothing in science that contradicts the Bible. We do not take science over God's Word. Science is merely a tool to help us interpret His Word.

On page 51, Morris admits that you do not have to believe the young earth way in order to be saved. Then he says "But it is true that accepting evolution can be a huge stumbling block to accepting Christ.

We are humans, and there are many stumbling blocks to Christ. Evolution is one of them. Denying evolution can also be a stumbling block to Christ. Young earth creationist's arguments for a young earth, based on bad science, have been the main stumbling block to Christ for the world in the latter half of the twentieth century. Their presentation of it as an either/or choice, either you believe a young earth or you don't, has driven millions from the church.

He makes a reference to Romans 1:20 to support his cause, when Romans 1:20 supports an old earth! (See www.answersincreation.org/romans120.htm).

On the final page he writes, "...when scientists step out of their domain to question the integrity and authority of the Creator's revealed Word, they have usurped their role and entered into the realm of the first rebel." Acts 17:11 charges us to examine the things of God to see if they so. To ignore science would not be in keeping with God's instruction. This statement pretty much sums up the chapter...full of emotional, bitter words, which do not ring true when you examine it free of emotion. Apparently, Morris cannot write anything without making it into an emotional argument. When emotions rule, truth takes a back seat.

His complete misunderstanding of progressive creationism leads me to believe that he didn't do any research to write this book. Young earth creationists would do wise to stay clear of such shoddy work.

Chapter 3

Moses and the Prophets

This is a rather unusual chapter, as it consists of only one page. Morris gives the story of Jesus relating how if the people will not listen to the prophets, they will not be persuaded by Jesus' words and miracles. He intends this to be a proclamation against us heretics, because we refuse to listen to the simple, straightforward young earth interpretation of Moses' words. It is meant as condemning of our wicked beliefs.

In reality, Moses and the Prophets make no declarations about the age of the universe. This short chapter is merely continuing the empty emotional words from the first few chapters. Clearly there are no facts to back up his young earth position, so the only weapon he has is emotions. This book is so transparent that it doesn't even take Superman to see through it. On to chapter four...

Chapter 4

Jots and Tittles

The Bible Insists on Supernatural Accuracy (Page 57)

Of course, I have no problem with this claim. I agree that Jesus warned against twisting the clear teaching of Scripture. It's a good thing us old earthers don't do that! We do, however, deny the "young earth interpretation" of those scriptures. Our interpretations are not against Jesus' warning, but they are totally against young earth creationism. That is one thing that makes Morris resort to such emotional arguments. He knows that we can interpret the Bible inerrantly with an old earth.

YEC objections to old earth creationism boil down to two issues...the meaning of the Hebrew word "Day" (Yom), and the Death before Sin issue. All else relates to these two. Except for these two issues, YECs and OECs look alike....therefore...

It's not about "supernatural accuracy."

The Writings Cannot Be Deconstructed (Page 58)

He opens with a story from our Lord, which inserts emotion but has no actual bearing on the topic. He goes on to claim that "Some of today's Bible scholars excel in attempting to break the Scripture!" I agree, we do have some Bible scholars today who are idiots. Of course, he is implying that old earth creationist scholars, who accept an inerrant, infallible Word, are included here. On this I disagree.

Morris mentions they convolute grammar, rewrite history, impose culture, twist nuances, invent connotations, etc. When it comes to an old earth interpretation, only two things really matter...your interpretation of the word "Yom" (Hebrew for day), and your view of Death Before Sin. If it were not for these two different interpretations, you would not be able to tell an old earth creationist from a young earth creationist. Yes, there are bad theologians who badly twist scripture...but most old earth creationists do not fit this category. Morris is all too happy to lump us all together.

Old earth creationists do not have to do any of the twisting that he claims. The word Yom can mean long ages, and there is no valid argument that says we cannot interpret it this way. Also, there is even less of an argument against death before sin.

In the bottom paragraph on page 59, he says Jesus did not give any room to wiggle when understanding the meaning of God's Word. It means what it says. What Morris is saying is that we are not free to interpret the Scriptures...they must be taken at face value. I guess all us Christians should check our brains at the door when we go to church, and accept our pastor's preaching from the Word without questions. The earth is young, and that's that...believe it or leave the church. This is the intent of what Morris is saying, but that's not Jesus' intent. The Creator blessed us with brains...I prefer to use mine.

It's not about "deconstruction."

Every Word of Scripture Is Precisely the Right Word (Page 60)

Once again, I agree that every word of Scripture is what God intended. Morris pulls a story of Jesus out of the Bible to show this point. While interesting, it only emotionally adds to his argument. There is nothing of substance here for the age of the earth (it has nothing to do with "Yom" nor death before sin...the real issues).

It's not about Scripture being precise.

Even the Tenses are Absolute (Page 61)

He is really reaching here. I agree, the tenses are what God intended. To prove his point, he says Jesus quotes from Exodus 3:6, and Jesus stresses the tense of the verb "to be". He then writes the portion from Exodus, "God *is* not the God..." It says in parenthesis, "author's emphasis". Morris admits that he italicized the "is", but he claims Jesus stressed the verb tense. Morris is the one doing the stressing, not Jesus!

He ties this in the last paragraph to the age debate. He says, "Sadly, some Christian scholars claim to believe in inerrancy and inspiration yet attempt to "interpret" the written words of God to fit the ideas of the atheist, naturalist, or evolutionist. That is illogical." It is only illogical if you believe in a young earth.

Recall from above, the only two things interpreted differently is the meaning of the word "day" and death before sin. Everything else is the same. It is quite easy, and permissible hermeneutically, to maintain long ages and death before sin. For more on these issues, see the links at the bottom of the article. These are the only issues which matter for the age of the earth debate.

It's not about "tenses."

God Does Not Hide His Revealed Words (Page 62)

I agree, God does not Hide His Words. The opening sentence says "If the words of the Bible can be "interpreted" to mean whatever we want them to mean, then the words are meaningless! I agree we cannot make it say what we desire, but I also disagree...we are each free to interpret the Bible.

As a counterstatement, I would say, "If the words of the Bible "must be interpreted" to support a young earth, then the words are meaningless." Should I just accept the young earth creationist interpretation, and "check my brain" at the door when I come into church? No. We are free to interpret the Bible, according to our own understanding and knowledge. What did all the church fathers of old do? Their volumes of commentaries are full of their own interpretations. Morris calls this wrong???

He says "Why would anyone even want to "interpret" what God says?" Obviously, we cannot understand what God is saying unless we interpret it!!!

It's not about "hidden words."

Men Change the Word of God (Page 63)

Yes, some men change the word of God. The Mormons, Jehovah Witnesses, and others come to mind. However, the age of the earth issue has nothing to do with changing the word of God. The only issues are the length of "day" and death before sin. You don't have to change the Word of God to interpret "day" as long ages, nor to prove that there was death before sin. Therefore...

It's not about changing the Word.

The Logic and Philosophy of the World Robs Us of Truth (Page 64)

Again, this leads to the "we are not free to interpret the Bible" issue. The passages he quotes do nothing to argue against us using our brains to read God's Word. Yes, there are those that carry the Bible too far, and make it say things that it doesn't, but that has nothing to do with the age of the earth issue. The only thing that matters is the length of days and death before sin.

It's not about the world robbing us of truth.

The Bible Demands Obedience to God (Page 65)

I wholeheartedly agree. It does not, however, demand obedience to young earth creationism. It does not say "Believe in a young earth and be saved." We old earth creationists know that we must obey God, therefore...

It's not about obedience to God.

God's Written Word is God's Supernatural Record (Page 66)

Once again...I agree! He sums it up with "One of two positions must follow: either the Bible is what it claims to be -- the written revelation of truth from God the Creator --" or not. I agree...the Bible is the supernatural written Word of God.

This chapter is full of nice points that we all agree with. They all have nothing to do with the age of the earth! We only differ on two points...how long is a day of creation, and is there death before sin. Everything else is just emotional rhetoric from the author.

For more on the Hebrew word for Yom, see [Word Study: Yom](#).

For more on death before sin, see [Death Before the Fall](#), and [Death Through Sin](#).

Chapter 5

According To Your Faith

Morris sets out to explain to his readers the nature of faith, and how it ties to the creation debate. Many of the issues here are OK and do not need to be addressed. He does continue his use of picture stories, and uses many examples from Jesus' life to tie the reader up into an emotional argument which contains little in the way of hard evidence.

Faith Believes When Experience is Contrary to God's Word (Page 72)

Morris has set his course firmly on planting the idea that if it is contrary to God's Word, we must accept God's word without question. I do agree with this, but Morris carries it further. Naturally, he sees old earth creationism as contrary to God's Word, thus when we see old earth evidence, we should ignore it, and focus firmly on a young earth. This "blind acceptance" is exactly what Glenn Morton describes in his article Morton's Demon. (see www.answersincreation.org/mortond.htm). The young earth mind blocks out all evidence contrary to his position. Morton's story is an interesting one. He was at the Institute for Creation Research, and wrote articles in defense of young earth creationism. He finally came to the realization the earth is old, and left ICR.

The Bible, however, does not say "Believe in a young earth and be saved." The Bible does not make any claim as to how we should interpret the "days" of creation. Accepting an old earth is not contrary to God's Word, as Morris would have people believe. It is contrary to a young earth interpretation of the same Word of God.

Despite this, Morris keeps hammering away at young earth creationists, encouraging them to have blind acceptance of the young earth viewpoint. He uses the words of Jesus, to Jairus..."just believe." This chapter continues this theme of "just believe" throughout the following pages. Young earth creationists don't need to think about it...just believe. If they did think about it, they would conclude the earth is old...Morris recognizes this and encourages people just to accept it on faith. A very interesting approach used by Morris in this chapter!

Faith Believes In Spite of What the Crowd Says (Page 73)

Not much here of substance. At the end, he concludes, "According to their faith, it happened. Is that the measure by which God judges us or works in our lives? Does the level (amount, quality, depth, firmness) of our faith affect the way God reveals himself to us?"

With this paragraph, he is hammering home his point to the young earther, admonishing them that if they don't have faith (in young earth creationism), then God may judge you by this. It is a veiled threat to young earth believers not to stray from the path.

Faith Is Based on the Word of God (Page 74)

I have no issues with this statement. Naturally, Morris turns it against old earthers. He says "Why would anyone who claims to submit to the authority of God's Word

question the words of God?" Old earth believers do not question the words of God...we question young earth interpretations of the words of God. We trust God...we just don't trust you!

Faith Does Not Let Science Supersede God's Word (Page 75)

I agree with this heading completely! He goes on to say "Science involves discovering information and predicting effects that can be tested." Many geologic processes have been observed and tested, which testify to vast ages for the earth's rock formations. For example, depositional rates for sedimentary rocks can be described mathematically, and reproduced in a lab. However, let's examine the young earth model for deposition during the Flood, which they call science, and see if it can be duplicated.

The Grand Canyon has a rock layer called the Coconino Sandstone. It is roughly 315 feet thick. Young earth creationists Steven Austin and Andrew Snelling have argued that this sandstone was deposited during the Flood. They must do so, because the sandstone is thought by most other geologists to be of desert origin. Obviously, you cannot have a wind-blown, desert-deposited sandstone right in the middle of Noah's Flood!

They argue for this water deposition in several documents, both in print and on the web. A web document can be viewed at answersingenesis.org/home/area/magazines/docs/v15n1_grandcanyon.asp.

They propose that the volume of sand deposited in this formation, which is roughly 315 feet thick and covers an area of 200,000 square miles (or 447 miles long and 447 miles wide) is about 10,000 cubic miles by their estimates (using these same numbers they give yields a volume of 11,931 cubic miles). They claim that the sand was brought in from the north, over the period of **several days**, by ocean currents, which, in their own words, *"The maximum current velocity would have been almost 5.5 feet per second (165 cm or 1.65 metres per second) or 3.75 miles per hour. Beyond that velocity experimental and observational evidence has shown that flat sand beds only would be formed."* And, in the next paragraph, *"Now to have transported in such deep water the volume of sand that now makes up the Coconino Sandstone these current velocities would have to have been sustained in the one direction perhaps for days."* **Please note, they propose the formation of this 315 foot thick sandstone in only a few days.**

There are numerous problems with their theory. First, how do you erode the material at that speed? The material for the sandstone has to be eroded from its present position, and transported hundreds of miles. The erosion rate would be so slow that you probably would only end up eroding a handful of sand from bedrock in a few days. Even if the sand was just lying there, ready to be moved, it would still fall far short of being able to move that much sand. Why? They cannot exceed 5.5 feet per second, or else they won't get the cross-bedding that is evident in the Coconino Sandstone. There are individual layers within the Coconino, known as cross-beds. Each bed forms as a unit, as the water (or wind) advances sediment over the edge of the advancing sand front. They must do this numerous times, over and over, to build up the 315 foot thickness.

The authors are actually proposing that a 30 foot tall sand wave can be moved over 400 miles in less than a week, with a current of only 5.5 feet per second. In a matter of a few days, a single sand wave, under ideal conditions, would be lucky if it were to manage a

move greater than 100 feet...400 miles isn't possible. And they have to move at least 10 of these sand waves!

Imagine this...at milepost 0, the water starts moving. The first water current carries thousands of grains over the edge of the sand wave, and continues going, leaving the advancing sand wave far behind, until that first current is 5 days away, or 400 miles away...but the sand wave is 399 miles behind, as it slowly advances. And somehow, the authors expect the average reader to believe this model!!! (This is where "faith" comes in, according to Morris).

Second, it is obvious that young-earth creationists come up with these theories, and they are posted to the web or published, and they don't consider the impact to each other's theories. In an article by John Baumgardner and Daniel Barnette, "Patterns of Ocean Circulation Over the Continents During Noah's Flood,"¹, these creation scientists have developed a model for creating ocean circulation to cause the erosion needed to deposit all these layers of rock, and they say that the ocean currents are 70 meters per second! If you accept the Coconino Sandstone as being laid down by the Flood during a current of 5.5 feet per second, you in essence deny that the erosion forces proposed by Baumgardner and Barnette took place. But, if you deny this, you don't have the sand to deposit in the Coconino formation!

Of course, if you accept the Baumgardner and Barnette theory, then you eliminate the theory of the floating forests being used to make the coal deposits we see today! (see www.answersincreation.org/floating.htm). We are at least proving one erosion theory...if you closely examine young-earth theories, they erode!

Third, a rate of 5.5 feet per second equates to 3.75 miles per hour (about as fast as you can walk). Remember, the authors' state that the sand moved into place in a **few days**. Since the formation is 447 miles across, at 3.75 miles per hour, it would take the water itself 119.2 hours (about 5 days) to reach the other end of this sand formation. How is water at this rate going to deposit sand 447 miles away in "a few days," when after only five days the water itself barely reaches the other side?

The authors conclude "Consequently, this enormous volume of sand would have to have been transported a considerable distance, perhaps at least 200 or 300 miles (320 or 480 kilometres). At the current velocities envisaged sand could be transported that distance in a matter of a few days!" How can they conclude this!!! In a matter of a few days they can barely get the water there, much less move the sand too!!! Morris, the author of our After Eden book, would say, "Just believe it on faith."

Even if this was feasible, what about the other 16 layers of sedimentary rock? Look at the cutaway on the Answers in Genesis article, showing the layers of rock in the Grand Canyon. The Flood model must deposit those as well! With only 375 days maximum of water upon the earth during the flood, these rock layers must average 22 days of deposition per layer! The young earth model cannot begin to accomplish this, nor can it ever be tested.

According to Morris on page 77, "In short, to be considered science or scientific, a piece of knowledge must be testable, reproducible, and falsifiable. I just falsified the entire young earth model for depositing rock layers during the Flood of Noah. It can be discarded as bad science.

To see the full rebuttal on the Coconino Sandstone, see www.answersincreation.org/coconino.htm.

Faith is Supernatural and Outside Testable Science (Page 78)

I agree. However, it has nothing to do with our discussion of the age of the earth, as both young and old earth creationists accept supernatural events in the creation.

Morris throws in more stories of Jesus, building upon the emotional content of the chapter without adding substance.

Faith Has Its Foundation in Creation (Page 79)

I can agree with this statement. Morris uses Romans 1:19-23 to argue that God is angry with anyone who mars His Glory and majesty. This passage is talking about idol worship, and has nothing to do with creation.

The last sentence of this section says, "Maybe it is not possible to find faith if we ignore the universal language of creation." He is insinuating that old earth creationists have not found faith because we twist creation to our own desires. Earlier, he said that we were Christians...now he doubts it. It is merely another planting of a false seed in the young earth mind, to indicate that old earth believers really don't have faith. The message is if a young earther slips into old earth belief, they don't have enough faith...so don't do it.

Faith Believes in the Supernatural Power and Authority of God (Page 81)

I have no problems with this statement. However, he goes on to say that hybrid theologies (old earth belief) "undermine the core foundation of our faith." After 81 pages, I have read nothing that provides any valid proof that this statement is true.

On the whole, this chapter is an admonishment to the young earth camp to trust young earth creation, and don't abandon the path. It is very telling of the thoughts behind young earth creationist leadership at the Institute for Creation Research (and Answers in Genesis). They are very alarmed at their losses, and are desperately seeking to turn the tide. I know that young earth creationism is in decline, but this tell-tale chapter really speaks volumes about the seriousness of their situation.

¹ icr.org/index.php?module=research&action=index&page=researchp_jb_patternsofcirculation

Chapter 6

Written With the Finger of God

Morris starts out with an experiment. He says walk into a shopping mall, and tell someone "Hi. I believe God created people and the whole universe in six days a few thousand years ago." He says they will laugh at you. Then he says "Those who stood up for Jesus Christ and the authority of God's Word in the 1st century were crucified upside-down, burned at the stake, boiled in oil, and tossed to the lions. He compares this to today..."What happens to Christians who stand up for Jesus Christ and the authority of God's Word in the 21st century? People laugh at them.

I'm sorry, but you can hardly compare getting laughed at with being martyred! Not only that, by making the statement in the shopping mall, you are not standing up for Jesus...you are standing up for young earth creationism. These two scenarios are not equal.

Suppose on the other hand, I decide to "stand up for Jesus and the authority of God's Word." I go into a mall, and say, "I believe God created the universe 13.7 billion years ago with the Big Bang, and He created the world 4.5 billion years ago." I'm much more likely to get a response like, "Really, tell me more," than the young earth creationist is.

Morris says that God warned us about rejection due to the creation account (2 Peter 3:5). Since I accept God's creation account and God's judgment on mankind's sin, this applies to my encounters with people as well. No problems here.

On page 86, he argues that the "mind" came before the "matter." First there was God, then God created. We old earth creationists agree...even the theistic evolutionists. Morris is still showing his lack of understanding old earth belief systems.

"In the Beginning" Means in the Beginning (Page 87)

Hey...that's just what us old earthers believe too! What's the point?

"Create" Means Create! (Page 88)

Hey...that's just what us old earthers believe too! Morris argues that God could have used other words to indicate "things that grow" (as in evolution), or to happen (by accident). But He didn't. As humans, we cannot understand why God wrote the way He did. We cannot speculate about what might have been.

When it comes to "create," if God used evolution to bring about a creature, and God started and guided the evolution process, then there is no problems saying "God created it." When God created, the Bible says, "And God said, "Let there be"", and then the Bible says, "and it was so." Between the command "Let there be" and the final product, we have no indication of how much time there was (or wasn't).

Morris says that "in no passage anywhere is there a hint of a time of unknown ages." All ages are known to God, and thanks to geology and astronomy, we understand these vast ages. They are not unknown.

A discussion of time may be appropriate here. What is time? Or, more importantly, what is time to God? Since man did not exist until at the very end of Day Six, the length of the six days of creation is from God's perspective, not man's. God, being eternal, is outside of time. To him, a second is like a million years, and vice versa. God put the events of creation into days so that we could better understand it, but that does not mean they were twenty-four hour days. The length of the days is not given in the Bible.

Day Means "Day" (Page 91)

Alas, here is where we differ. The word for day in Scripture is used to represent anywhere from 12 hours to eternity. In the end, we can interpret it as long ages, without breaking any Scriptural rules, and despite the fact that YECs hate it.

Again, he hammers home the idea that if we don't accept it then you are not taking God at his word...a further admonishment for young earth believers to stay true. You can take God at his Word....day means "day." But "day" can be long ages...so that is taking God at His word also.

Morris rambles on for several pages about day, without giving any valid reason why you cannot interpret it as long ages. His arguments are generic, and not specific. The first thing of importance comes on page 94, where he uses Exodus 20:11, where God wrote the fourth commandment, referring to the six days of creation, and the seventh day of rest. If one interprets it as long ages, God is merely referring to these long ages...it makes no difference. He says "Disconnecting the fourth commandment from the creation week takes some serious hermeneutical gymnastics!" I'm not disconnecting them at all...God is referring to six long creation days, and a seventh day of rest, which is still ongoing today. Together, these seven days set the perfect pattern for our week.

Morris then calls on the example of Jesus working on the Sabbath. This refers to our work week, and we get the pattern from creation...so, what's the point? It adds Jesus into his argument, which brings the young earth reader further into the emotional web he is weaving. The story does not help his cause.

To this, he tells a story about how a scientist would answer "How long did it take for the earth to form." His fabricated answer, in short is, "I don't know, but if you want to know, find a reliable observer." Then he refers to the record of Genesis. I agree, but this same record that he uses, I use to equal billions of years. Who is right? Since science states with 100% certainty that the universe is old, I win. It's not that I care to win, though. How one feels about the creation is not important. What is important is how one feels about Jesus Christ. But, as long as young earth creationists keep spreading their false science, they must be confronted.

He does not address several of the arguments young earth creationists use to argue for a 24-hour day. He does mention the ordinal argument. Young earth creationists say that anytime the word day is modified with a numeral (i.e. six days) or with an ordinal (i.e. first day) then it always means 24 hours. I have two problems with this.

First, in Zechariah 14:7-9, the "one day" refers to a period of time when the Lord shall be king over the earth. In other places, some say that Isaiah and Hosea have numbers with the word day which are figurative (see <http://www.ibri.org/40genday.htm>). Thus, this denies the ordinal argument.

Second, there is no ordinal rule. In other words, young earth creationists noticed that the times in the Bible that "day" was used with a number, it referred to a 24-hour day, so they claimed this was a rule for interpreting the word day. Does such a rule exist in Hebrew? I cannot find it. It apparently was created by a young earth creationist scholar in order to prove their point.

Why Do So Many Object to God's Written Words? (Page 97)

Here Morris goes ever so slightly into different methods of reading scripture, i.e. "dynamic equivalence," "literary framework", etc. I cannot speak for all old earth creationists, because all do not believe in inerrancy and infallible scriptures, which I do. As such, myself, and progressive creationists, have no problems with God's words...we accept them 100%, just like young earth creationists do.

The main argument here, however, is that Morris is saying so-called experts need more "humility before the living Word of the living God." This section is an admonishment of the academic community that has "compromised" in his eyes. This all goes back to his previous claim about faith...just accept it. Now Morris wants the more learned at colleges and universities to "check their brains at the door"...no thinking is required to understand the Scriptures. Isn't it amazing that Morris claims that YECs have such a profound understanding of Scripture, that we should all just forget about thinking and trust them! Using this logic, all YECs must be the equivalent of Einstein!

I for one am not that smart. I will always struggle to fully understand the Bible. Yes, it is written in simple to understand language, but there is so much there, that not even in a lifetime will I be able to understand it all.

Why Did God Create Anyway? (Page 99)

Morris gives a two page dissertation on why God created. The "why" of God's creation has absolutely nothing to do with the length of God's creation. It is merely more emotional fluff for the young earth reader.

Morris gives a very limited discussion of the word "Yom." To read more, see Word Study: Yom (www.answersincreation.org/word_study_yom.htm).

Chapter 7 God Saw That It Was Good

This is Morris chapter against death before sin. He starts out by saying that death and struggle are "dramatically contrary" to the meaning of the word "day." Day is a measurement of time, and does not imply anything at all about death and struggle! He dips to an emotional argument in the very first sentence. The emotional barbs keep coming in the first paragraph, one after the other.

He then goes on to discuss "good" and "very good," which God used to describe His creation. Morris does not understand how creation can be good and very good with millions of years of death and suffering. It's really quite simple, as you will see.

What is "Good"? (Page 104)

Morris starts out with a definition of "good." He shows that it means "good," and says "Why would one ever want to make the word mean anything else?" Old earth creationists do not make it mean anything else...we also think good means "good." However, "good" is a relative term, depending on who is using it. As a military man, I see a rifle, an instrument of death, and I say, "That's good." Good means different things to different people. To young earth creationists, "good" is a tool to be used to argue their position. It is one of the few tools they have, but in the end, it fails to make a convincing argument.

On distinction here..."good" is not the same thing as "perfect." YECs will claim that creation is perfect...I agree, but my perspective is different...a fully functioning ecosystem full of death is perfect.

Ages of Death and Struggle Defy the Revealed Character of God (Page 105)

No they don't...they defy the young earth creationist definition of God's character...there's a huge difference. He dips to emotions to prove his point, with the story of Darwin, and his struggle to believe in a good God. We are all free to make our own decisions, as Darwin did. Darwin chose poorly.

One interesting note about this section...the entire thing is about Darwin's choice. Morris doesn't even attempt to discuss the "revealed character of God." How can the reader decide if the paragraph heading is correct if the paragraph doesn't discuss it?

Evolutionary Ages Defy the Revelation of God's Plan and Purpose (Page 106)

This section is a tirade against evolutionists, who have "convinced many, including Christian leaders, that death has always existed and that death has positive value." No, evolutionists have not convinced me of this...the fossil record has.

Once again, the author fails to discuss what is in the paragraph title. God's plan and purpose are not mentioned. Again, Morris uses only emotional arguments.

Eons of Evolutionary Struggle Nullify Christ's Death (Page 107)

Jesus came to conquer death...I agree. He says that if there were long ages of death, and God called it very good, then "Jesus winds up opposing God's plan." How can Jesus be against death, when death is part of God's plan all along?

This entire chapter boils down to what type of death was brought on by Adam's sin. Before we look at it, let me be clear that we will receive new bodies, and we will overcome physical death. However, that is not the purpose of Jesus death. Paul said that nothing, not even death, can separate us from the love of Christ. He is right...physical death will not separate us from God.

What happens when you die? The body stops living. Does your spirit die? No, it does not. It continues on, either in heaven or hell. It is eternal...that's the way God designed us. Therefore, if the words of Paul are right, physical death is not important...God is there with us after death. What is important, however, is spiritual death. Failure to accept salvation will separate you from God...physical death will not. In the grand scheme of things, physical death means nothing.

Want proof? Genesis 2:17 says,

but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.

Using a common, literal interpretation, when Adam ate the fruit, he should have died physically that day. Did Adam die the same day he ate the fruit? No, he did not. There are only two possibilities. First, God lied to Adam. We know that God cannot lie, so this

is not the case. The only possible alternative left is that God did not mean physical death, but spiritual. When Adam ate the fruit, he sinned, which caused separation between him and God, or spiritual death. Based on this verse alone, it is conclusive that the Fall of Man did not bring physical death into the world.

Is it a tragedy if you die...sure it is. Does it make any difference spiritually? No...you are just changing locations. Just make sure you have Jesus first! Christ's death gives us spiritual rebirth, and the promise of a new body later.

God's Gospel Message is Founded and Framed in His Good Creation (Page 108)

Morris uses a poem by a cartoonist to prove this point. Part of it is that our world was once a perfect place. That's not what the Bible says! The Garden of Eden was once a perfect place. The world is not addressed as perfect...only the Garden.

If the world were perfect (free of death and decay), then why did God create a special place called Eden, and place man there? If the whole world were perfect, there was no need for Eden! God had foreknowledge of man's fall, and created Eden to show man a glimpse of heaven. He would one day restore this perfection in heaven. Outside the gates of Eden, the world was different. It was also perfect, but in a different sense. It had a perfectly functioning ecosystem, able to self-renew. This was just as God planned it.

Morris questions how death and struggle could be part of God's plan. They have always been part of God's plan. God knew man would rebel. God's plan all along was for Jesus to die on the cross, and save us from our sins. Yes, we will have new bodies in heaven, but this is not the issue...our bodies do not indicate our position with Christ...only our spiritual life does. Remember that physical death does not separate us from God. Therefore, physical death is not the issue...spiritual death is.

The last half page of this section is a God of the Gaps type argument. Our world is so intricately designed by God. I agree, but this intricate design has nothing to do with spiritual or physical death.

Our Present World (Page 110)

He contrasts the differences with pre-curse (Garden of Eden) and post curse (the world after Adam's sin). First, we cannot converse with God, one on one, the way Adam and Eve did. No problems here.

Next is the level of work performed. Adam did work in the Garden, but afterwards his work is increased, as he toils with the ground. No problems here.

He then mentions man's dominion over the animals. He says, "Both the dominion mandate and man's dominion were corrupted by man's sin." He goes on to say "Everything in the creation is no longer *very good*." Funny, when I read my Bible, it doesn't say that. The curse on the serpent was only on the serpent. The curse on Eve said her pain in childbirth would be greatly increased, and she would desire for her husband, and he will rule over you. The curse on Adam said he would toil with the ground, and thorns and thistles it would bring forth...he would eat the plants of the field, obtaining them through sweating, until you die. There is nothing here that addresses man's dominion over the animals, nor is there any indication God changed his mind about the creation being "very good."

Next, he continues to show his ignorance of "progressive creationism." He says PCs have two problems. First, "if God periodically punctuates His world with the creation of new life, the ecological relationship declared "good" on one "day" would be disrupted the next. However, if God creates polar bears, and then creates grizzly bears two million years later...it's still the same day of creation...Day Six. Nor do I see how the creation of the next new life could somehow be construed to be "disrupting." Morris appears to be confused, and he makes me confused too, since this claim makes absolutely no sense.

Second, he says if death and struggle were part of life outside Eden, then why would Jesus heal lepers, because the leprosy bacterium would be something that God created, and it was doing its job. Most of Christ's miracles were healing people. What Morris is saying is that Christ should have come down, not helped out anyone with miracles, and still somehow convince people that He was the Messiah.

Bacteria are a normal part of God's creation. As we all know, bacteria are some of the fastest mutating organisms there is. They constantly change. They can spread rapidly. One bacterium at the time of Adam and Eve could easily account for all that we have today. They are also required for human life, both inside and outside the Garden of Eden.

You may be wondering how I know there was bacteria in the Garden. Adam and Eve were normal human beings. In His wisdom, God created our digestive system to function with the aid of bacteria. Right now, as you read this, millions of bacteria are at work in your colon, breaking down foods. Since Adam and Eve obviously ate food in the Garden, they would have required bacteria to digest it. The same goes for the animals. Bacteria are a requirement for life.

Next, he goes into a discussion of death, where he claims physical death was introduced at the curse. God did tell Adam He would die. As Morris points out, Adam had access to the Tree of Life in the Garden, and he was free to eat from it. Thus, if he had not disobeyed God, he could have lived forever, barring any accidents. Adam's sin meant he could no longer access the Tree of Life. God banned Adam from the Garden, so that he could not eat from the Tree (Genesis 3:22). In that respect, Adam's death did bring physical death...not because God changed man's physical makeup, but because he no longer had access to the Tree of Life.

Morris then says the creatures of creation suffered from man's sin. I agree. They were not all addressed in the curse to Adam, but they suffer from mankind, because mankind's attitude toward them changed...in other words, mankind is now relating to the creatures with a sinful nature. Man still has dominion over them...this causes them to suffer even more. Morris claims progressive creationists cannot rejoice when God restores the animal kingdom, as seen in Isaiah 11:6-9. Why not? I'm looking forward to the time when the animals will be peaceful with one another. My attitude alone disproves Morris' misleading statements about progressive creationists.

God's Good Design for Eating Food (Page 114)

Next Morris discusses God's design for food. Adam and Eve probably were vegetarians, but this has nothing to do with conditions outside of the Garden of Eden. We all know the Garden was a special location, where God interacted with man. The normal rules for the rest of the world were different in the Garden. If they were the same

as the rest of the world, then why have a separate Garden...anywhere in the world would have sufficed.

Naturally, Morris goes to the argument that all animals were created to only eat plants. Morris gives a sharp admonishment to fellow young earthers, obviously meant to make them tow the line (the paragraph in italics). He then launches an assault upon carnivorous teeth, claiming that scientists would say that there no such things as carnivorous teeth. Which scientists? Certainly this would be the young earth position. However, the teeth of animals such as T-Rex appear specifically designed for tearing flesh. Indeed, feeding sites have been found of T-rex and their youth, with gnaw marks on the bones of their prey. Since the rock layers where these come from could not have been accounted for by the Flood, that settles it (see www.answersincreation.org/stratigraphy.htm). There was carnivorous activity before Adam. For more on dinosaurs, see Dinosaur Evidence for an Old Earth (www.answersincreation.org/poop.htm).

He mentions less than a dozen animals which have sharp teeth, and presently eat plants also. He ignores the thousands of others. (This is the “grasping straws” argument. Sure, you can find a few evidences (straws) that support young earth creationism, but to do so, you must ignore the fifty foot tall haystack of old earth evidences.) An animal with sharp teeth that eats plants today has nothing to do with animals prior to Adam. I'll even allow that these same animals ate some plants back then. The question isn't whether they eat plants...it's whether they eat meat. They do. There is no indication in the Bible that animals prior to Adam did not eat meat. The animals in the Garden were the exception, but not the rule. None of the verses exclusively claim this.

Morris falsely paints a picture of the prey-predator relationship. He claims that predator populations are controlled by prey populations. He is only 50% correct. They are co-dependent. He is saying that a predator, which kills a deer, has not affected the deer population! The predator-prey relationship is 50-50.

He mentions that since many animals with sharp teeth eat plants, post-Eden life brought a change in behavior, not anatomy. This young earth idea has changed over the years. Te author's father, Henry Morris, claimed that these carnivorous teeth developed within a few hundred year after animals started eating each other. As I state in my article on teeth, however, I've never seen a T-Rex with molar teeth. According to Morris' father, it must have existed! (see www.answersincreation.org/teeth.htm).

To control pre-Fall animal populations, Morris mentions "territoriality." No problems here. However, this is useless in the young earth system. The time between Adam's creation, and the Fall, would ensure that the animals never had enough time to overfill the earth prior to their eating each other. As such, this is an empty, needless argument from a young earth perspective.

Donning Biblical Glasses (Page 118)

Morris appeals to the emotions here, with the claim that God's creation is beautiful. I agree...but this will not convince non-Christians. This is a "God of the Gaps" argument that is based on the esoteric beauty of creation, and not based on fact. Of course, since this book is written for the young earth creationist, and not the non-Christian, they will be edified by this section.

What Does the Character of God Demand? (Page 119)

Most of this section I agree with Morris, as my view of an old earth does not conflict with the character of God. Morris cannot equate the character of God to include death and suffering. He uses verses about God's character, like he knows the number of hairs on our heads (Matt 10:29-30), God can do nothing but perfect works (Ps. 18:30), but he fails to get around to any verses that show how an old earth position is contrary to God's character.

What Does the "Good" in Creation Teach Us? (Page 121)

Here he mentions that Jesus is the Creator. He lists six verses to back up this claim. This obviously poses no old earth problems. The overload is merely Morris trying to build to an emotional appeal. He then says "The One who hung on the cross for our sins is the One who spoke the heavens and the earth into existence." I agree. After several more statements like this, he hits home with the claim "Can He be love and also consciously perform that which randomly kills, maims, and tortures?"

Next, he goes on to claim that the creation record reveals the nature of God. He lists six more passages. Of course, I have no problems with these passages either. He makes no claims at the end of these about the age of the earth. All we have in this section is a building of emotional arguments, which fails to call anything about old earth creationism into question. It is meant to convict the young earth reader. It probably does a good job.

Everything God Did Was Good (Page 123)

I agree...that's exactly what us old earth believers think.

Morris failed to present any information in this chapter that would argue against an old earth belief system. He heaped many emotional arguments in, no doubt encouraging the young earth believer. Morris stays true to his purpose...to prevent young earth creationists from abandoning a belief in a young

Chapter 8 One Man's Disobedience

This chapter largely addresses the Fall of Man. There is not much here that Morris says that is contrary to an old earth, as old earth creationists can agree with most of what he says.

The Good Creation Declares God's Glory (Page 126)

All old earth creationists can agree with this section.

History Is Changed By Rebellion (Page 127)

Some old earth creationists may have a problem with his interpretation that Lucifer's fall was after Day Six of creation. Specifically, Gap Theorists, which he alludes to, when he says "Satan's fall could not have occurred between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 nor at any time during the creation week. This should present no problem for the Gap theory, however. Nowhere in the creation account is the creation of angels addressed. No doubt the Gap Theorist could say that the "very good" comment about the creation refers to the creation events described. Since angelic creation is not addressed, it doesn't apply here. I leave this for those who are Gap theorists to decide for themselves.

Satan's Lie Fathers the Rebellion (Page 128)

Satan Devises a War Strategy To Compromise Man (Page 129)

No problems here for old earth believers.

Eve is Deceived and Capitulates (Page 131)

There is no problem with the first few pages. His answer to Satan's lie is to have simple faith, just believe the words of God, and to this, he adds things like believing the simple words, such as "eat, fruit, six, days, death, and sin." This obviously is referring to old earth creationists, who in his view do not believe the six day part, or the death part. As an old earth creationist, however, I can state that we accept these words without any problems...what we don't accept is the young earth interpretation of these words. "Simple faith" in the young earth interpretation of these words is not required by God. I have just as much faith in the Words of God as Morris does...it is our interpretation that differs.

He really hits below the belt on page 133. He says, "Like Christians who follow her example today, Eve decided that her intelligence could sit in judgment of God's Word. Using the tools of science, her brain and her senses, Eve began examining the evidence for herself." He continues on page 134, with "Like too many Christians today, Eve found the temptation to be wise in her own eyes irresistible and thus subjugated God's words to her knowledge and wisdom." Since Morris so eagerly judges my actions and the actions of other old earth creationists, basically calling them sin, we have no need of Christ's judgment seat...Morris does it for Christ! Is Morris so lofty, so arrogant, that he presumes that God will judge us for the sin of "examining the Scriptures" and coming to a different conclusion as he does? God charges us to examine the Scriptures....where's the sin in doing that, which Morris accuses us of? The only thing we are guilty of is reaching a different interpretation than Morris. No sin is present...we use the same Words of God, inerrant, infallible in their original writings. Here we see Morris' real feelings...any conclusion that the earth is old is sinful. Earlier in the book, he calls us Christians...even here, he calls us Christians...but now he sits in judgment of us. I had no idea that young earth creationists "sit at the right hand of God."

Adam's Rebellion Is Deliberate, Wicked, and Inexcusable (Page 135)
Rejection of Personal Responsibility and Guilt (Page 136)
Human Susceptibility to Deception is Confirmed (Page 137)

No problems in the sections for old earth creationism. I agree that humans are susceptible to deception, including young earth creationists, who are blinded by their presupposition that the earth is young. Satan has used their overzealous attitude to drive millions away from the church. When people are presented with an either/or option (either you accept God's Word as saying the earth is young, or you don't), they are forced to decide between the Bible and hard scientific evidence. Many choose to depart the church. There is no need for this...old earth creationists have harmonized the Scriptures with science, while maintaining their infallibility and inerrancy. Young earth creationists, having been taught a young earth for many years, refuse to face up to reality, and block out any evidence to the contrary (see this article which explains how they do this (www.answersincreation.org/mortond.htm)).

Creation is not the issue...Jesus Christ, whose death on the cross for our salvation, is the most important, in fact, the only important issue. What one thinks of creation is irrelevant. Young earth creationists should stop their either/or attitude, and strive to reach those who have been driven from the church by their actions.

Chapter 9

Cursed Is The Ground

In this chapter Morris examines the curse of creation itself.

Where Do Death, Pain, and Suffering Come From? (Page 139)

My first response to this question would be, "From reading young earth creationist material." However, I'm sure that's not what the author is talking about...however true that may be. My only point of contention in this section is Morris' claim that death extended to the animal kingdom as a result of Adam's sin. I'm assuming then, that since Morris believed they were eternal, that they were allowed to eat from the Tree of Life along with Adam and Eve. If Adam and Eve had to eat of the Tree of Life (which they were permitted to do) to live forever, then it only stands to reason the animals did too.

Cursed Is the Ground For Your Sake (Page 140)

The Bible says that the ground will yield thorns and thistles. Many young earth creationists, including Morris' father, Henry Morris, claim that there were no thorns or thistles prior to the curse. However, they must have existed...otherwise God would be creating new plants after his creation period ended. We both agree that creation ended at the end of Day Six. To get around this, they may claim the plants mutated, with a dormant feature that God programmed into them now becoming dominant. Nice slight-of-hand trick, but now plants are "evolving."

In the middle of page 141, he attacks evolution with the claim that "The Bible teaches, and science confirms, that time and chance destroy order." Evolutionist research now claims that order increases with time, but we still have the "Bible teaches" part. This comes from the creation being corrupt and subject to change via entropy and the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Being a "young earth" interpretation, this presents no problems from an old earth perspective. Overall, I'll leave this one to the Theistic Evolutionists to iron out, although I see no problems.

The only other important issue is God replacing the old earth with a new earth. He says if the old earth of death and decay is "very good," then why would God need to replace it. God says there will be a new earth, and science confirms that our present world cannot last forever, therefore there is no need to doubt God. One could turn this around...since science shows that our world cannot continue indefinitely (the sun will not last forever), then God's creation was not perfect as young earth creationists say.

What Is Death (Page 142)

The first part of this looks promising. He addresses Genesis 2:17, where God tells Adam that "in the day that you eat of the tree you shall die." Morris admits that a simple reading looks like they should have dropped dead right there. I fully expected for him to come back to this and explain it away somehow, but he did not. He moved onto other facets of death, and never came back to it. It just goes to show that the young earth creationists do not have a valid answer for this straightforward verse. Aside from this, nothing else is important for this review.

Physical Death is the Result of God's Judgment (Page 145)

In a discussion about long life spans, he makes the claim that "the scientific mystery today is not how did the patriarchs live so long, but why do we die so young?" Funny, I've never seen this so-called scientific mystery before!

Yes, physical death is a result of God's judgment, but we have a different view. Man was eternal in the Garden, with access to the Tree of Life. What changed after the Fall is that man no longer had access to the Tree of Life. Nothing physical, either genetically or otherwise, changed with man's sin. It was the Tree that made him eternal, not his physical makeup.

What Is Life? (Page 145)

No problems with this section.

Do Plants Have Biblical Life? (Page 147)

Two points of contention here. First, he claims that plants do not have biblical life, or *chayah nephesh*, using the terms he uses in Hebrew for when God created animal life. We are talking here about young earth interpretations of life, and thus they have this "chayah nephesh" rule created to support their position. It may or may not be a valid point on their part.

Second, Dr. Hugh Ross of Reasons to Believe has argued that plants did experience death, and this shows there was death before the Fall. Young earth creationists accept that there was plant death, but say it's not the same due to their rule mentioned above. What do I say? Who cares? I don't need plant death to show there was death before the fall...the fossil record does an adequate job of that.

A more important issue, which Morris brings up, is the statement "An apple left uneaten on Eden's ground would decay." It is a young earth admission that decay is a part of the creation, even in Eden. In order to decay, you need microorganisms, which break down the apple. With microorganisms in the Garden, Adam and Eve were sure to have consumed, and killed some, that were on the plants that they ate. Hence, you have death of an organism, not a plant, proving that there was death of a "chayah nephesh" creation in the Garden, and thus, death before the Fall. Thank you, Mr. Morris, for confirming this for us.

Creation Is Subject to the Bondage of Decay (Page 148)

Morris says "The decay of uneaten fruit or of leaves falling in autumn would be part of the biogeochemical recycling system that God could easily call very good." This could easily include dead animals, which also contributed to the recycling system. There is no reason this could not be "very good." There is no need for elevating animals to the status of humans...humans are special creations, in the image of God...animals are animals, not worthy of the same status we enjoy. The pre-fall death of an animal is insignificant in the big picture.

In the middle of page 149, he argues against evolution, saying that change through time is ultimately a downward regressive corruption. It always tends towards disorder. Evolutionists will debate this now, as models now show that the process of mutations will yield increasing complexity. Evolutionary theory has come a long way!

For further discussions on the Second Law of Thermodynamics and Entropy, and on how they are misused by young earth creationists, see <http://www.talkorigins.org/faqs/thermo.html>.

Morris says on the bottom of page 150, "...the second law could play a directive role in God's very good creation, its negative effects only manifest after the ground was cursed following Adam's sin." Isn't it interesting that Morris divides the second law, using part of it before the Fall (because he must explain plant death), and only applying its negative effects after the Fall. Either God created the Second Law or He didn't. It's not an issue of picking and choosing the features of the law that benefits you. Scientific laws are laws, put in place by God. It stretches the imagination to say God only created half the law, and then the other half after the Fall.

Again, he argues against evolution, with the claim mutations lead to disorder. Some research now shows the opposite, that the spontaneous production of order from disorder is the expected consequence of basic laws. For more, see <http://www.entropy.com/thermoevolution10.html>.

He briefly refers to comets, and how they burn up. Of course, new comets emerge, coming from the Kuiper-Oort region just outside our solar system. He mentions stars that age and explode...but he doesn't mention that new stars form today.

He makes the blind claim that we must ignore the second law in order for our progressive creation to work. Nothing could be further from the truth. He continues to show his lack of understanding of progressive creationism, and the second law.

The Creator Must Now Conquer Death (Page 152)

There is nothing significant in this section for the age of the earth debate. Morris slips into some emotional arguments which are typical of the book. He effectively uses leading questions, such as "Why would people want to deny the Creator's words?" and builds upon it with question after question. The young earth reader will no doubt be convinced with this piling on of emotions, but we need not concern ourselves with such amateur tactics. As old earth creationists, our arguments are built on facts, not emotions.

Chapter 10 Being Overflowed With Water

This chapter concerns itself with the Flood, which Morris contends is global, but which we know from a lack of geological data that a global flood is impossible. Morris argues that a local flood is not Biblical. Progressive creationists accept a local flood, and accept the flood account as the inerrant and infallible Word of God. God's Word is not in conflict with a local flood. Of course, old earth creationists vary in their acceptance of inerrancy, and in their interpretations of the Word, from literal to allegory, thus I cannot speak for all old earth creationists.

In the opening statements, he discusses time. Time is what makes the evolutionary thought process capable. For some reason, young earth creationists do not like time. I personally like time. Since no bad information is in this argument against an old earth, we shall move on.

Geologic Strata and Fossils as Proof of Long Ages (Page 157)

Only minor issues here. Of course they are used as proof of long ages. It is impossible to interpret them as anything but long. It is only when you come with a young earth bias that you consider them young. YECs call them young, even before examining them to see if they really are young...this is science in reverse. Science makes observations, and then reaches a conclusion. YEC scientists have already reached the conclusion, before examining the evidence. No wonder their science is so full of holes and easily disproved.

Morris does not mention it, but many accuse old earthers of circular reasoning. In other words, we date the rocks using the index fossils, and we date the fossils using the rocks. This is a complete misunderstanding of how we date rocks. For more, see this article.

I'm surprised Morris does not attack this principle very much. He doesn't even offer any evidence against it. Rather strange then that he should even bring it up.

Genesis Clearly Teaches a Worldwide Flood (Page 159)

Yes, a straightforward reading of the text supports this...it's just the physical evidence for the flood that is lacking. YECs have no proof that a worldwide flood ever happened in the geologic record. Every time they try and use a geologic feature as evidence for the Flood, they are shown to be "blowing smoke."

There is no need to provide a point-by-point rebuttal, as these issues are well documented by Dr. Hugh Ross, myself, and other old earth creationists. Just like the interpretation of "day" can be long ages, the interpretation of "whole earth" can be shown to be the known earth, without damaging inerrancy or the infallibility of God's Word. What we end up with is young earth "experts" in Hebrew who say the earth is young, and old earth "experts" in Hebrew who say the earth is old. It's still the same Bible...the results of the Flood are still the same from man's perspective, and it's still an inerrant, infallible Word.

To be brief, I'll only discuss a few issues. First, if it was local, why didn't God just have Noah move away while He flooded the region? Noah, during his boat-building, provided a proclamation against the people. He could preach repentance. Also, the people could merely have followed Noah, thereby escaping the Flood. Finally, I don't know why God chose this method...we will have to ask Him later. He could have simply had them all drop dead, or send a plague of some type, or some other equally devastating catastrophe.

Evolutionary Science Cannot Accept the Genesis Account (Page 161)

Actually, it does...every day! Conservative Theistic Evolutionists have no problem with the teachings of a flood which wiped out mankind. What differs is only the size of the flood...the actual results of the flood are the same. Of course, the statement rings true for non-Christian evolutionists.

Morris claims that they cannot accept it because it would eliminate the long ages needed for evolution to work. Not so...just ask the theistic evolutionists. You can have long ages with the Flood account.

He really sticks his foot in his mouth on page 162. He claims, "If the Flood as recorded in Genesis actually occurred, the entire surface of the earth would show the record of the colossal scouring and restructuring." It does not...there isn't a shred of evidence from geology that a worldwide flood occurred only 4,300 years ago. He doesn't even present any evidence to support this claim. Instead, he rambles on about a myriad of topics, but never discusses specifics. I will address this at the end of this page.

If the Genesis Flood is True, What Should We Expect to Find? (Page 164)

While this is interesting, he presents no evidence for a young earth. That is because each of the points he lists is also expected with an old earth interpretation. He lists "Many large graveyards of fossil deposits." I don't know what his definition of "many" is. Yes, there are fossil graveyards, but they are not significant in number. Over 99 percent of all fossils are found as individuals, not in any graveyards. Of course, the most

well-known of these are of the dinosaurs, but even with them, the numbers found in graveyards do not represent the majority of dinosaur fossils.

One example does need addressing. He says "The distinctive presence of every kind of animal, with clear differences between the types." With this, he is alluding to the fact there are no transitional fossils...each fossil organism in the rock record is distinct, and cannot be shown to have developed into another organism. This presents no problems for progressive creationists, but theistic evolutionists would disagree with this. In fact, the transition for several organisms is well documented. For more, see Transitional Fossils (www.answersincreation.org/transitional_fossils.htm).

The Message From Scripture and the Evidence Left Behind (Page 165)

In summary, the language of the Bible, in a simple, straightforward reading, does indicate a worldwide flood. Morris claims that "The geological and paleontological evidence is exactly what one would expect to find as the products of the flood of Genesis." When one considers the points he made in the previous section, this is true. But the points he made do not discuss specifics. They are so generic as to support either position, old or young earth.

When you look at God's own creation, made with His own hands, there is no evidence of a worldwide flood. When you examine the specific claims of young earth creationists, they are all full of holes and consist of poor scientific work. To see the topics which are disproved, click the links below. I've put the Flood articles at the top of the list. (If the links do not work in this PDF file, see the original webpage.)

Disproved Young Earth Flood Claims

[Chalk and Noah's Flood](#)

[Coconino Sandstone](#)

[Floating Forest Theory](#)

[Grand Canyon: Monument to Catastrophe](#)

[Studies In Flood Geology - A Book Review](#)

[Bottled Lies](#)

[Buried Birth](#)

[Clarkia Fossil Beds](#)

[The Fossil Record](#)

[Dinosaur Extinction](#)

[Human Fossils](#)

[Noah's Ark Does Not Prove a Young Earth](#)

[Canyon Deception](#)

[Yellowstone Petrified Forests](#)

[Insect Fossil Bed](#)

[Joggins Fossil Cliffs](#)

[Polystrate Fossils](#)

[Redwood Hoax?](#)

Other Young Earth Claims and Old Earth Evidences

[Aboriginal Dinosaurs?](#)
[AiG is Taking Dinosaurs Where???](#)
[The Answers Book](#)
[Ark Study Flawed](#)
[Australian Burning Mountain](#)
[Black Holes](#)
[Choking Claims](#)
[Dating Techniques](#)
[Eroding Continents](#)
[Evolution and Murder?](#)
[Flinders Fossil](#)
[Fossil Pollen](#)
[Greenland Aircraft Claims](#)
[Islands That Deceive](#)
[Ken Ham's Misconceptions about Opals](#)
[Limestone Caves](#)
[Living Fossils](#)
[Mudspring Surprise?](#)
[Paleontology Pioneers](#)
[Petrified Deception](#)
[Radiohalos](#)
[Re-Dating Human Fossils](#)
[Refuting Compromise](#)
[Self-Righteousness](#)
[Sulfuric Acid Cave Formation](#)
[T-Rex Blood Cells](#)
[T-Rex Soft Tissue](#)
[The Truth about Plastic Deformation](#)
[Ancient Ice Ages](#)
[Ar39 - Ar40 Dating](#)
[Biblical Creationism Book Review](#)
[Bill of Goods](#)
[Blind Leading the Blind](#)
[Chopping a Title Hides the Truth](#)
[Compromise](#)
[Earth's Magnetic Field](#)
[Grand Canyon Dating Project](#)
[Is the Earth's Magnetic Field Young?](#)
[Lead Isotope Dates](#)
[Living Fossils](#)
[More Petrified Claims](#)
[Mount Saint Helens Dacite Dating](#)
[RATE Deception](#)
[RATE Project--The Truth](#)

[The Truth About Ice Cores](#)
[The Truth About Thrust Faults](#)
[The Unraveling of Starlight and Time](#)
[Woodmorappe Misquotations](#)
[Woodmorappe's Shotgun Attack on Ar-Ar Dating](#)
[CSE and Dinosaurs](#)
[Black Holes](#)
[Plesiosaurs - What If?](#)
[Pondered Points](#)
[How Good Are Those Young Earth Arguments?](#)
[Creation Evidence Museum Lacks Evidence!](#)
[Paluxy Tracks](#)

Chapter 11

Great Swelling Words

No evidence is presented in this chapter that needs a rebuttal. This two page chapter is a simple admonishment to young earth creationist readers to ignore the words and arguments of old earth proponents. Instead, the readers should only accept the instruction of young earth theologians. This is exactly what Glenn Morton talks about in his article Morton's Demon (www.answersincreation.org/mortond.htm). The young earth creationist has a built-in mechanism that allows him to ignore solid facts.

Chapter 12

Hermeneutical Gymnastics

In this chapter Morris attempts to show that the interpretations used by old earth creationists are extreme, and not possible using good, sound biblical interpretation. What is really meant is that they are not possible using young earth creationist's rules and interpretations.

He starts out with a story about Bill Clinton...nice, but irrelevant. On the second page, he sets the tone, quoting a passage of scripture from Isaiah. In part, it warns of calling evil good, and darkness light. Since it is talking about moral absolutes, it has nothing to do with creationism, although Morris uses it to build up to his condemnation of old earth creationists. Hence, you see one popular tactic of young earth creationists...taking verses out of context to support their position.

Deconstruction of Scripture is Old News (Page 170)

Yes, this has always been done, and always will be done. In Jesus day, they had the Pharisees...in ours, we have our share of liberal scholars who take liberty with God's Word. Fortunately, progressive creationists are not liberal. We accept the inerrant Word of God, literally interpreted in Genesis.

On page 171, Morris makes the statement, "Sadly, all such schools place the filter of their own hermeneutic over the words of Scripture." His statement is true for many schools. It is especially true for young earth creationist schools, who use their young earth hermeneutic to insist the earth is young. They apply their "young earth" rules of ordinals with the word day, and no death before sin (they won't even consider it...all verses must be interpreted to support it). Since young earth scholars are so dogmatic in their approach to Scripture, they are the worst offenders of "applying their own hermeneutics."

He says that faithful pastors and theologians have a different agenda. I agree, a young earth agenda...no matter what the evidence, twist it to represent a young earth. What Morris is doing is imploring young earth creationists to only listen to young earth creationist teachers. This way, they can ignore the truth of science...they don't have to confront it if they don't hear it. They are proving Morton's Demon true (see www.answersincreation.org/mortond.htm).

Morris uses the example of the Pharisees, in an example to show how people today behave the same way as they do. But there is no comparison for progressive creationists. We do not add laws and regulations to Scripture, as the Pharisees did. Creation is not an issue of something that we have to obey, or some law we must follow, as the Pharisees taught. It is inappropriate to compare us to Pharisees, as this is like comparing apples and oranges.

Common Sense is Common Sense (Page 172)

He uses the quote, "If the plain sense makes common sense, then seek no other sense." I agree. If a person wants to take Genesis as plain sense, they are welcome to do so. However, if you apply this saying to Geology, then the common sense says the earth is billions of years old. If you apply this saying to Astronomy, then the common sense says the universe is billions of years old.

Since the earth and universe is obviously old, then the "days" of creation must be long ages. If one insists that "day" is 24 hours, then the Bible cannot be true. The old earth interpretation makes the most sense, and it maintains the inerrancy, infallibility, and literalness of Genesis. If you still want to say the plain sense of Genesis means six 24-hour days, then go ahead...but realize that old earth creationism is just another, equally valid interpretation of the Scriptures. Your different interpretation does not give you the right to talk down to fellow believers.

Truth Brings Clarity (Page 173)

Morris uses several quotes from Jesus, which have no bearing on creationism. He uses them to add to the emotional impact of his words and admonishments to fellow young earth creationists. Further down, he says the same scholars who claim to believe in the deity of Christ want to distort His words. Since the teachings of Christ have nothing to do with creation (other than the fact that he references it, without any claims of the duration of creation), it cannot be claimed that we have distorted His words. This amounts to nothing more than an empty emotional claim with no basis in fact.

At the top of page 174, he says "God makes a wonderful promise to liberally grant wisdom to us when we ask him for it." I agree, and it applies equally to old earth creationists. I pray for wisdom in understanding creationist arguments, and God grants that wisdom. Young earth creationists do the same for our old earth arguments. I'll come back to this at the end of this chapter.

Morris next throws in two pages of mostly emotional appeals. On page 175, he makes a distinction that young earth creationists represent "truth," "light," and "wisdom," with the implication that all others are evil deceivers. As a Christian brother, it is hard to understand how another brother can make such a slanderous, sinful claim against fellow believers. Such is the condition of young earth creationist leaders, that they are so brainwashed as to be blind to sins that they commit against other believers, in the name of young earth creationism. They justify their sins in the name of their crusade, blinded to the real truth.

Professional Jargon (Page 176)

Not much of significance here. Morris admonishes young earth creationists to ignore any evidence for an old earth. He claims we couch our research in fancy words to impress people. Scientific research involves scientific terms. There are no hidden agendas.

Obfuscation (Page 177)

Morris says of old earth creationists, "...they insist that the simple words of Scripture cannot be understood merely by reading them." Yes, they can be understood by simply reading them, and if the reader wants to accept them at face value, go ahead and do it. But if one wants to truly understand creation, he must study creation itself. This demonstrates a simple truth...the "how" of creation really isn't important...as long as you give God the glory, you're ok. As the young earth crowd claims, creation was written in simple terms, so that even a first grader could understand that God created. We are free, however, to move on to a college level understanding of creation. Stay at the 1st grade level if you want, but don't criticize us for wanting a deeper understanding of creation.

The Local Universal Flood (Page 178)

He starts out with little in the way of arguing against this. He gives a good sight-picture on page 179, of how old earth creationism appeals to the masses. He asks the question at the end, "If Christian leaders sell out the biblical record of the Flood to appease skeptics, on how many other biblical teachings must they sell out? First, we have not sold out the biblical record...we have sold out the young earth interpretation of the biblical record. Second, it was not done to appease skeptics...it was a necessity to maintain harmony of the Bible with science, but without harming either. Third, the answer is none. No other doctrines of the Bible are changed by accepting an old earth. Morris would have his readers think we are the worst thing to come along since the Pharisees, but nothing could be further from the truth. His lack of understanding of progressive creationism continues to astound me.

On page 180, Morris asks if the view of old earthers is "fundamentally at odds with the huge abundance of scientific evidence strongly supporting a geophysically necessary global Flood? In the minds of young earthers, they actually believe that the evidence shows a global flood. However, as I and others have pointed out, their so-called "model" for the Flood completely fails to be a workable solution. Contrary to Morris' claim that there is a "huge abundance of scientific evidence," there is actually no evidence. Morris has not presented any of this so-called evidence in this book.

Morris makes a big deal out of Ross' statement of the Flood only affecting humans and their domesticated animals. Of course, wild animals were killed in the flood also. In the sub-paragraph, he again says that the curse caused the ground to bring forth thorns and thistles. While there may not have been any thorns and thistles in Eden, they certainly existed outside of Eden. God could not have created them here after the Fall, since He had rested from His creative works at this point.

In sub-paragraph b, Morris talks about the earth being filled with violence. The implication here is that mankind had filled the earth, therefore you needed a global flood to kill them all. One only need look to the Tower of Babel to confirm this is not true. The people all congregated together in this region, as they were all of one language. Before the Flood, there was only one language, and there is no reason to suspect that man had filled the earth in only 1,300 years since the creation week.

God's use of the terms "all" and "every" present no problem for old earth creationists. The account of the Flood is written from man's viewpoint. From the point of view of Noah, sailing on the ark, it appears that "all" was wiped out, and that "every" place on earth was flooded. As far as Noah could see, there was only water. The language of God is necessary. Had God said, "I'm going to send a local flood to wipe out everyone," they would have simply moved away for a few months. Was God lying by saying "every" and then only flooding a local area? No, because he killed every animal in the "known world" at that time. Just like the creation account, it is written from the point of view of a man, on the surface of the earth. From that point, every means "every," and all means "all."

Morris claims that "the local universal flood concept so belittles the nature and extent of God's judgment and Christ's restoration that it borders on blasphemy." In this statement, he is referring to 2 Peter 3. As an old earth creationist, I have absolutely no problems with this passage of Scripture, despite the mistaken idea from Morris that it conflicts with the local flood scenario. Again, Morris shows he really does not understand progressive creationism. If he did, he would not make such claims.

Good Fruit From a Rotten Root (Page 183)

Morris gives some arguments, all of which can be agreed upon by old earth creationists. Nothing that he presents is contrary to an old earth interpretation of the Scriptures.

Itching Ears (Page 185)

Morris quotes 2 Timothy 4:3-4, which is about lusts, and turning away from the truth. This has nothing to do with creation. Old earth creationists, particularly progressive

creationists, have not turned away from the truth...we fully accept the inerrant Word of God. We have turned away from the young earth interpretation of the Word of God. There's a huge difference. Morris equates the young earth interpretation of God's Word to be equal to God's Word. I would think twice about taking this position.

Morris wraps up by saying there are false teachers, willing to "scratch this itch" even if it means justifying sinful cravings. Therefore he equates our belief in an old earth as sin.

Let's now go back and discuss the issue of God granting wisdom, and of sin. As Christians, we all have the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit guides us, convicting us of sin. If our actions are sinful, then why hasn't the Holy Spirit convicted us of this sin? Why is it, when I pray for wisdom to understand young earth arguments, God grants me that wisdom?

Could it be that this is not a matter of sin? Could it be that what we think about the "how" of creation is not important to God? It would appear to be the case. God lets us argue these points back and forth, without convicting either side, through the Holy Spirit, that we are wrong. What is important is that we both have Jesus Christ. That really is the only important point from God's perspective.

Morris' claims in this book that we are sinful, amounts to sin itself. Matthew 18:15 says that if a brother sins against you, let him know. Mr. Morris, this business of falsely accusing brothers in Christ is irresponsible for a Christian brother. If God doesn't care how we view creation, who are you to impose your brand of creationism upon the church?

Chapter 13

Lean Not To Your Own Understanding

He begins by using the story of Charles Templeton again, no doubt an effort to drive home the belief in young earth minds that a belief in long ages will lead to apostasy. Morris effectively uses this scare tactic to exhort young earth creationists to remain true to a young earth.

To his credit, he does say that others remain firmly Christians and believe in an old earth. He says some, however, have not (such as Templeton). It is also true that some young earth proponents end up apostates as well. Believers who backslide come from all walks of life, all forms of belief.

He slips into his rapid-fire question mode on page 191, as he is prone to do on many occasions in this book. It is an effective tool for admonishing young earth creationists to remain such. Heaping apparently valid questions upon the young earther is the same as heaping emotions up, until the person is firmly on your side. There are no arguments presented...just incessant emotions.

What Does God's Nature Teach Us? (Page 190)

Morris says we can learn from God's nature to discern what is from evolutionary thought and what is from God. It can be done without the study of God's nature, however. He presents nothing here, and lists several attributes of God, which old earth

creationists can agree with. While he lists several negatives in the descriptions, the attributes of God's nature itself is not a problem. As such, it is merely more emotional baggage.

Understanding God's Nature Brings Clarity (Page 192)

At the bottom of the first page, he says it's hard to "imagine why any Christian would trust the words of "experts" to interpret the words of God." This, however, is exactly what young earth creationists do! Young earth creationist experts, such as Morris and others at the Institute for Creation Research, and Ken Ham and others at Answers in Genesis, provide the "expert" opinions, and young earth creationists everywhere are expected to believe them without question. With that said, there is nothing wrong with seeking the opinions of experts before making a decision on a topic. Young earth creationists, on the whole, blindly accept the words of their experts. Old earth creationists, who are much more critical in their analysis of things, are much less likely to blindly accept an expert opinion, as Morris claims we do. Most old earth creationists believe in an old earth because they have studied the creation and reached a personal decision, and not because they blindly accept the words of experts. The young earth crowd is much guiltier of this than we are.

At the top of page 193, Morris says, "Evolutionists and atheists (and compromisers) are horrified and mystified by the growing acceptance of biblical creationism among those with strong backgrounds in science." Wow! I'm shaking in my boots from fear! Nothing could be further from the truth. There are a growing number of scientists who accept a young earth, only because they are "home-grown." Young earth creationists teach their children from a young age that the earth is young...they are essentially brainwashed. When they grow up, they attend young earth colleges, earn degrees, and go to work in the scientific field, or work for young earth organizations. These scientists are not "converting" to young earth creationism...they always were young earth creationists.

I've heard it said that not one person ever examined the earth and universe, concluded that it was young, and then went and found religion. Those who become young earth creationists at some point in their past, were taught that the earth was young. For more on the young earth creation scientist, see Creation Scientist? (www.answersincreation.org/scientist.htm).

Of the fossil record, he says there are gaps of millions of mythical years missing between them (fossil deposits). No, there are not. In locations, there are rock layers missing, but you can easily see these missing rocks in other locations. The stratigraphic column for geology is well understood and provides for no valid arguments of this type.

Interpretation Can Be a Slippery Slope (Page 194)

He once again revisits the story of a person who backslid. Each of us is responsible for their own behavior, and this person made a foolish choice. Millions of old earth creationists believe in the long ages of creation, while remaining strong in the faith. Sure, examples of backsliding apostates can be told...but so can tales of backsliding young earth creationists. A story from one person does not prove that interpreting long ages leads to apostasy...millions of us are defying this claim right now!

He mentions Eugenie Scott, and how this atheist is willing to wait a generation, so that long ages and evolution are accepted, and then it will be easier to eliminate religion. He is ignoring the millions of committed progressive creationists and theistic evolutionists who are solid Christians. We are growing rapidly, and we will be here in the next generation to proclaim Christ. Young earth creationism, however, may not be. Morris knows that millions are now committed old earth believers, and we are becoming a force equal to young earth creationists. Morris is fighting for the survival of young earth creationism. He sees the decline in the acceptance of a young earth, and he is "shaking in his boots."

The real reason for this book is to strengthen people's beliefs in a young earth, not convert people to young earth creationism. As you have seen, the book is full of emotional arguments to build up the young earth creationist.

I know that we will always have young earth creationists (we still have people who believe in geocentricity, and there are some who believe the earth is flat!). How long it will be before young earth creationism goes the way of geocentricity is unknown, but it is certainly headed in that direction.

Power to the Pastor and Pew (Page 196)

It certainly sounds noble, as the people in the pew should always have the power to decide for themselves. In the second paragraph, Morris says God wants us to take Him at His word, and using our intelligence, and His Spirit, we are to put God's words into practice. Exactly what portion of the creation account are we supposed to practice? The creation account requires no action. Saying we need to put God's Word into practice" concerning the creation is a stretch.

The entire section is instruction to pastors and laymen who are young earth creationists, admonishing them to accept God's Word, and act on it. (Still trying to figure out how we are supposed to act on the creation portion...are we supposed to practice creating things?).

This section is also a summary of arguments in this book...emotional appeals to tow the line on creationism. No need to get bogged down on the facts that prove young earth creationism (especially since Morris presents none throughout the book). Just stay emotionally engaged and you will not falter.

Naturally, Morris equates long ages with "the father of lies." Actually, committed Christian men have convinced the church of long ages, and not Satan. Satan has nothing to gain in proclaiming an old earth. An old earth, with the beginning foundation of the Big Bang, shows that there must be a God.

You can skip over all the arguments here, because they have already been addressed earlier in the book.

What Did Salvation Accomplish? (Page 204)

There are no problems with the paragraph headings. He does claim that progressive creationists have a problem, in that it brings uncertainty and doubt about the character of God's nature and His Word. Funny, I'm a progressive creationist, and I'm not uncertain about God's nature or His Word. Once again, Morris is only demonstrating his ignorance

of progressive creationism. We accept every part of the Bible, just like the young earth creationists do...the only difference is the days of creation are long ages, and there was death before sin. No doctrines of the Bible...let me repeat that...NO DOCTRINES OF THE BIBLE ARE CHANGED BY OLD EARTH BELIEF. If Morris truly understood progressive creationism, he would realize this. Unfortunately, in his brainwashed young earth condition, he would probably never be able to understand it.

How Then, Should We Interpret Scripture? (Page 208)

He sums it up with "Perhaps the best interpretation is the least interpretation." In other words, don't think about interpreting Scripture...just blindly accept it. No doubt, he would say listen to solid young earth teachers and pastors. No thanks...I prefer not to live by the principle of "the blind leading the blind."

In summary, this book has presented no problems for old earth believers. It is mostly an admonishment to young earth creationists, trying to keep them from leaving young earth creationism. It has many emotional appeals, with little in the way of hard evidence. As such, it is not typical of young earth books from the Institute for Creation Research. It does not try to use science, but instead argues from the Bible and emotions. Since progressive creationists fully accept the Bible as the inerrant Word of God, its arguments are totally ineffective.

Most importantly, it shows the desperation of the young earth community. They are trying to shore up the defenses, to stem the losses of young earth believers to old earth belief. This book will probably have some effectiveness in accomplishing that goal.