



General Topics :: Mountains and the age of the Earth

Mountains and the age of the Earth - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/9/30 15:00

The Rockies and the Himalayas are sharp jagged mountains. The Appalachians are rounded and smooth.

Traditional geology says this is because the Rockies are much younger than the Appalachians and are therefore not as eroded.

How is this explained from a young earth perspective? Did the Rockies and Himalayas form after the flood? If so when were Appalachians formed and why do they look different? We know there were mountains at the time of the flood. If the earth is only 6000 years old how could the mountains have been eroded? The Great Pyramid is 4500 years old and still pointy.

I checked ken hams site and creation.com and could not find a succinct answer to this question.

Re: Mountains and the age of the Earth - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2014/9/30 18:23

I am told that the very same Appalachians mountains over here in Scotland, our mountains were eroded in the ice age under 3 miles of ice..

Something I see in Genesis is from Gen 1 to Gen 2-3 God creates the earth.

Then from Gen 2-5 he has to do some of it all over again...

Thats about as useful I can be on this subject...

Re: Mountains and the age of the Earth - posted by staff, on: 2014/9/30 19:17

Hi TMK

I think if you email Grady MCMurtry of www.creationworldview.org that he would give you a precise answer on this individual point. I hear him on tv and he seems to find the time to answer the individual.

When I look at the debate myself the overriding issue is that Jesus could not be saviour if sin and death had entered the earth before Adam.

On a personal note I noticed by the Holy Spirit I believe was this

Adam was created on the sixth day but later on in Genesis it says 'All the days of Adam were

All the days were counted by the writer of Genesis in terms of years, actual jewish years. From this I know that the writer 1. included day six and seven in the term "all" because in the bible all always means all.

2. if the sixth and seventh day of the week of creation are literal the 1 to 5 must be literal as well

Yours Staff

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/9/30 19:26

Staff-- why must it refer to physical death-- why can't it be just spiritual death.

Re: - posted by hulsey (), on: 2014/9/30 23:48

you might find this video interesting:

<http://youtu.be/cKsEPVDbymc>

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/1 5:56

Hi TMK

could you ask that question in a different way?Im a bit slow on the uptake Staff

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/10/1 6:22

Hi Staff-

Yes I was a tad terse in my comment. You said your big objection to an old earth is that you cannot see how sin and death had entered the earth before Adam.

My response is that it is spiritual death, and not physical, that Paul was talking about when he said that "death came through one man- Adam." After all, God warned Adam that on the day he ate from the wrong tree he would surely die; but he obviously did not die physically that very day- he died spiritually. Of course physical death was also a result- but not the pre-eminent result. If there were no humans prior to Adam (but just stuff like dinosaurs) there would have been no sinning therefore no spiritual death therefore no need for a savior-- yet.

I keep throwing out topics like this because I am trying to be more open to a "young earth" paradigm but it is very difficult. So I appreciate all your responses and they give food for thought.

But the thing about the Great Pyramid is mysterious to me, since it is almost as old as the earth (per young earthers) but is pretty remarkably preserved.

Maybe someone can answer this one off the top of their head-- per a young earth paradigm how long after Day 1 of creation was the great flood? I presume that the pyramid was built after the flood but it couldn't have been much after.

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/1 17:41

Hi TMK,

I think it is not possible to say that it was not physical death because the moment he ate the fruit from the wrong tree his body began to decay and cells began to die.

It could be said that it not possible to die Spiritually even though we have to be born spiritually.

Also Man and animals were made on the same day.

If Adam didnt bring death and sin into the earth why do animals die?

Another question that is important is why do christians argue other than a literal 7 day creation week?

The answer must be in my opinion that they want to marry up evolution in some way with word of God.

Yours Staff

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/10/1 18:16

No staff--

I absolutely do not believe in evolution- nor does Hugh Ross who is probably the most prominent Christian ancient earth proponent. I don't care if the earth is 20 billion years old- evolution is still not true. I do think, however that that is why some Christians are afraid to consider an ancient earth, because they feel it opens the door for evolution. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The reason that Christians (like me) have a hard time with a 6000 year old earth is because there is so much abundant evidence against it and I have a very hard time accepting that all that evidence is somehow biased for insidious reasons. I am not saying that there are not two sides to the issue. I obviously understand that.

I do believe that part of the curse (for humans) was physical death. But I also believe they died spiritually. Not sure what that means exactly but scripture seems to bear it out ("you were dead in your trespasses and sins").

Since at this point I do believe that animals lived and died prior to the fall, I don't think that aspect of the curse applied to animals. I do however believe they were subjected to the curse in other ways (like getting killed for clothing).

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/2 10:59

Hi TMK,

How old do you think the earth is then?

Animals were made the same day as Man so how could they die before Man except if a day is not a day but later in Genesis we see that the writer is including day six and seven in the age of Adam.

Even if they died what was the purpose of their death? and also God saw that it was "good" which is hard to believe if they could die.

When you take out fossils as evidence there is not much else that can't be accounted for.

When asked Fossils are as old as the rocks and rocks are as old as fossils but no dating mechanism is anyway accurate

Your position although not believing in Evolution it is a stepping stone that allows others to take a step or two further towards evolution. Also if some Christians are not trying to marry up with Evolution they are trying to marry up with what the people of the Earth currently believe so as not to look crazy. But our faith is crazy in the eyes of the world but its power is in how radical it is. That's why we find it so hard to follow because it is so removed from what the world says. Yours Staff

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/10/2 13:23

Hey staff--

I get what you are saying-- if the earth is only 6000 years old it is definitely not what the world thinks!

Do you think that mainstream geologists etc are lying about the science or simply mistaken about the science? This would go for astrophysicists as well.

I have said it before here- I could see scientists being 10, 20, or even 50% wrong about the age of the earth. But is the earth really 6000 years old and mainstream science says it is 6 billion years old that is like a million percent wrong. Is that possible?

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/2 16:38

Hi TMK

I think that mainstream Geologists etc are under a strong delusion and do not question evolution but taken it as a given. If they took the starting point as God's plain and simple word then they would look at things with the correct starting point

For instance the amount of silt at the mouth of the world's major rivers which you count

b. fossils are found in sedimentary rock

c. the moon moves 3-4 cm per year which means 1m every 25 yrs

or 40m every 1000yrs or 240m in 6000yrs which is all fine but when you get to 1 million years it would be 4km and 1 billion on the moon would be right on top of the earth. This means the environment for evolution would not exist.

They are 100% wrong because they believe in a religion called Evolution/Atheism. They are deluded which is the main effect of all religions.

It's just religion....

Staff

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/10/3 9:59

Hey staff---

How can science be so wrong about the age of the earth/universe and not everything else? We have made some pretty incredible advances in the past 100 years. Are you suggesting that the delusion only applies to geology and astrophysics?

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/3 12:14

Hi

The delusion is religious. The age of the earth is a religious issue for them not a scientific one.

Also you said that you don't believe in Evolution:

LOOK how wrong they got that! despite all the advances. Even in your own beliefs you can see how wrong they get things. 100% wrong according to what you believe.

People from 100 years believed in the right thing and our generation despite all the scientific tools believe in the wrong thing.

We might go down as the stupidest generation of people in 6000 yrs.

Yours Staff

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/10/3 12:35

The only difference is that the evidence for evolution is exceedingly weaker than the evidence for an ancient universe.

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/3 12:45

Hi

I disagree there is no evidence for evolution. I don't believe in it at all! There is no strong or weak evidence for evolution. Staff

Apparent age difference in mountain ranges. - posted by Myst (), on: 2014/10/4 2:00

When I was working on my master as a geology, I thought the apparent difference in aging (due to the topography of the ranges) could be attributed to the climate on the west vs the east coast. Not putting any time into this idea, it could be fairly easily evaluated by comparing other mountain ranges under differing climatic settings. That being said, we should remember that dramatic shifts in climate in very recent history can be ascertained in the written records of Herodotus, Scripture, and other sources noting that areas that were once extremely fertile (again within historical times), and now completely desert and barren. This is verified by archaeological studies in many now desert.

Although we might be tempted to attribute the structural difference of the Rockies and the Appalachians to the differing tectonic on the coast, the obvious factor is one of weathering and erosion, not the mode of mountain building.

To recap, more weathering (Appalachians) could indicate a greater age in an old Earth, or a consistently wetter climate in the eastern continent in a young Earth scenario.

We don't often realize that there were more globally catastrophic events than Noah's flood. Scripture describes Earth originally created with one continent/one Ocean, the Pangaea/Tethys Sea of science. Scripture also refers to the division of Earth in the time of Peleg, which we normally assume to be a societal division, not a continental division as well. We might see hints, too, of the ice age, in the various mention of famines in the times of Abraham, Joseph, and ancient secular histories, such as in the Histories of Herodotus (et al). This last evidence might seem to be too von Daniken-ian to be credible, but if we look at the overwhelming evidence for rapid changes in Earth it becomes credible.

These separate dramatic global changes are clearly undeniable: the existence of a single continent undergoing violent structural damage (Flood), separation of the continents creating mountain range and basins of deep deposition (Peleg / Babel), and ice ages (global famines, sea level changes, desert formation, dramatic loss of species). The basic difference between a scientific v Biblical interpretation of geological evidence is a matter of time (billions v thousands of years) and paradigms (atheistic scientific v Scriptural). Sadly creationists began by failing to recognize the other major, but separated events of the division of Earth, and the rapidly ensuing major climate changes, and that created confusion as to just how much and in how many different ways the earth has been altered, so our interpretation of the geological data was skewed and incorrect, making our overall conclusions rightly vulnerable to scientific scrutiny.

During my time in geology, I found a curious fact. Very often when a geologist was converted, it was an easy step for them to abandon the evolutionistic old Earth paradigm for a young Earth creation view. And the same went in the other direction. This showed me the inherent spiritual nature of how our beliefs change with our spirit.

I dropped virtually all my interest in this debate, after I discovered the powerful apologetic tool used by Christ and focused on that: the work of the Spirit in His works of Love by healing us in body, soul, and spirit.

Eternal Blessings

Re: Apparent age difference in mountain ranges. - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/4 4:41

Hi Myst,

Hi as to the importance of the whether the Earth is what the bible carefully counts out or older enough to encompass evolution the debate is right up there at the top of the list.

Stemming from evolutionary thinking comes all sorts of problems. Jesus didn't negate the importance of other subjects when he focused in on the works of Love but dealt with them as well. Nothing is greater than Love but it doesn't mean we stick our heads in the sand.

I don't agree with your statement below creationists do get into the division of Earth and Climate change etc. Grady McMurry www.creationworldview.org

The problem with scientific scrutiny is it is dominated by a group of people that do not believe in God and like all unsaved people are influenced by demonic forces in some shape or form. It is a religion like all other religion it is controlled by Satan to one degree or the other.

You are right our belief changes with our Spirit but also with correct teaching. I have never met yet a born again believer truly saved changing to an evolutionary old earth view because they changed not to believe in God.

.....
Sadly creationists began by failing to recognize the other major, but separated events of the division of Earth, and the rapidly ensuing major climate changes, and that created confusion as to just how much and in how many different ways the earth has been altered, so our interpretation of the geological data was skewed and incorrect, making our overall conclusions rightly vulnerable to scientific scrutiny.

.....
Also in conclusion the way to change minds of non Christians is to change their Spirit which can only be done by leading them to Christ because when the Spirit of Truth comes in he does not tell us foolish lies but plain and simple truth. Yours Staff

Re: Mountains and the age of the Earth - posted by twayneb (), on: 2014/10/6 10:25

To answer the OP, this is my own understanding for what it is worth.

We do not fully understand all of the geologic processes that preceded the flood or that followed the flood. We do know that there was rapid movement of the plates that make up the earth's crust. The Rockies and the Himalayas were post flood events as is evidenced by flood remains found high in these mountains. So we would not expect them to be rounded or show great erosion. It is possible that the Appalachians were, for the most part, submerged when they were pushed up and were eroded as the flood waters flowed off of them. The pyramids are post flood structures built in the same time frame that Israel was in Egyptian captivity. They are in a pretty dry climate, so the greatest agent of erosion, rain, has not had the same effect on them as it would on a structure in a wetter climate.

Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2014/10/6 12:45

Quote:

-----staff wrote:

jewish years. From this I know that the writer

1. included day six and seven in the term "all" because in the bible all always means all.

2. if the sixth and seventh day of the week of creation are literal the 1 to 5 must be literal as well

Just a question:

When within the last 6000 years did dinosaurs live?

Re: - posted by drifter (), on: 2014/10/6 14:00

I highly recommend watching Kent Hovind's seminar # 3 for more info on this subject.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/10/6 14:15

Twayneb--

Thx for the response. So are you saying the Alps and Himalayas are less than 6000 years old? What about the "mountains of Ararat?"

Lysa- great question but simple answer per young earth paradigm is that the Flinstones had it right. Perhaps Noah used dinos to haul logs for the ark. If earth is only that old anything is possible and the same would be true for the pyramids puma punko etc

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2014/10/6 17:36

For what it's worth:

This weekend I went to the Linville Caverns in mountains of North Carolina. While in there, our tour guide pointed out a fossilized sand-dollar hanging about 10-15 feet above our head. I even took a picture of it. Pretty clear. According to our guide, the cavern we were in... About 600 feet under ground... Once was buried in ocean water. He pointed to markings in the cave that where the salt water left its evidence of having been there. We also walked under a large crack that used to be an active tectonic plate years ago.

How one does or does not reconcile this apparent evidence of an ancient earth... I'm not sure I can say. I believe the scripture teaches a young earth and Paul's theory of atonement is clearly at odds with evolutionary theory. I won't say the earth is only 6,000 years old, as that is not something the bible ever asserts. But it can't be much older than 10 or 20,000 from a scriptural reasoning.

But the apparent evidence for evolution seems very strong.

I will say this, I am happy living and accepting what some would call a paradox. That is... Two views that are apparently contradictory, yet true at the same time, I accept the bible teaches a literal 7 day creation and fall of man. But I also accept the preponderance of evidence indicates the world is much older than anything the bible alludes to. It's not a tension I care to live with, but in all sincerity, this seems to be the case. I'm a much better theologian than I am natural scientist. So I'll stick to teaching what I feel I know the Bible teaches. And I'll let brighter minds than me try to reconcile the two points of view.

I'm content with that.

Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2014/10/6 17:36

Quote:

-----by drifter on 2014/10/6 14:00:41

I highly recommend watching Kent Hovind's seminar # 3 for more info on this subject.

And herein is the great divide, drifter.... Astrophysics (Hugh Ross) vs young earth (Kent Hovind & etc)!! There really shouldn't be a great divide between the two but there is.

I will stick with Hugh Ross anyday, but that is just my opinion!!

God bless,
Lisa

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/6 18:37

Hi Lysa

Dinosaurs lived during the 6000 yrs Here is an extract from the webpage below

.....
After the close of the Old Testament , flying reptiles were mentioned by Aristotle, Josephus and Herodotus. The first century naturalist, Pliny, wrote about animals bigger than elephants living in India . When the Spaniards arrived in South America in the 1500's they found that the Inca Indians had carvings of what we clearly know today as dinosaurs, but these carvings were done at least 300 years before modern paleontologists described them from the fossil evidence. Accounts of dragons and flying reptiles are found in the literature of Persia , Scandinavia and England from the third to the 16th century A. D. The most famous of these references being St. George and the Dragon.

The story of St. George clearly depicts a Christian man rescuing a king's daughter from being sacrificed to a dragon in the late third century A. D. He gave the glory to Jesus Christ for his victory over the beast. His action and testimony convinced the local people to become Christians and to be baptized. He became the patron saint of England in 1350.

What better way to impress a woman of your courage and strength than to slay a fierce dragon on her behalf? Could it be that the extinction of the dinosaurs was nothing more than the competition between men trying to find a dragon to slay in order to get engaged? That is a fearsome driving force. Perhaps dinosaurs became endangered species from over hunting by men.

www.creationworldview.org

.....
Also may I add here is an account from Explorer Marco Polo 13/14th century

.....
Here are found snakes and huge serpents, ten paces in length and ten spans in girth . At the fore part, near the head, they have two short legs, each with three claws, as well as eyes larger than a loaf and very glaring. The jaws are wide enough to swallow a man, the teeth are large and sharp, and their whole appearance is so formidable that neither man, nor any kind of animal can approach them without terror. Others are of smaller size, being eight, six, or five paces long

.....
Yours Staff

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2014/10/6 19:22

A couple years ago we visited my brother in Colorado. One day we went four-wheeling up into the mountains - he lives in a valley (El. 7000 feet). We went to Summerville, I think it is called, a place where gold was mined many years ago. To day it is a ghost town. As we walked around it I found a rock with fossils of sea life. I considered it very interesting and worked to pry it from the soil so I could take it with me but it was so heavily embedded in that soil I could not even move it. I concluded this rock is a whole lot larger then I suspected.

What makes this so very interesting is its elevation - not sure what it is but suggest it could be around 12000 feet. To find a rock with sea creatures - now fossilized - this high up away from the sea was nothing short of amazing.

I am no expert on creationism but do note that many people are confused by the reading of Genesis 1:1,2. Some seem to think there was a created world that somehow was destroyed and God had to remake it. I have another idea: verse one introduces the reader what the topic is in subsequent verses and then backs up in verse two to share the details of how the earth, the universe came into being. In other words, verse one is what we could call the title to the rest of the chapter.

Dunno if this helps but I consider God the creator. He did a glorious job - no man with all his intelligence could ever begin to match what he did.

My understanding.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2014/10/7 15:47

Quote:
----- Thx for the response. So are you saying the Alps and Himalayas are less than 6000 years old? What about the "mountains of Ararat?"

That is exactly what I am saying. The issue of the age of the earth and creation is an issue of Biblical veracity and authority. In my opinion, when we begin to alter our interpretation of scripture so that it "better fits with secular science", then we concede that our view of scripture is lower than our view of man's current understanding of his world. We see scripture as less reliable than modern science. I think this is a poor view of scripture. I believe the Bible is accurate in every detail as it is the word of God. So, if science seems to contradict something I read in scripture, it is not the Bible that needs to be reinterpreted, but man's science that is inaccurate or incomplete.

Lysa mentioned dinosaurs. I am reminded of the discovery of a t-rex in Montana in the last 20 years or so that still had intact red blood cells in its bone marrow. This could only have happened had the animal died within the last few thousand years. Native art in the desert southwest routinely depicts creatures that we have labeled "dinosaurs". The people who drew these things inhabited their homes in the last few thousand years.

The bias of science toward long ages and millions of years is one of necessity for them, and as such they cannot and will not see it any other way. They must have millions or billions of years in order to maintain a purely naturalistic theory of origins. Their denial of God has driven their scientific theories.

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/7 17:29

hi Twayneb,
Thanks for saying so correctly and eloquently what I wanted to say. I agree with everything you say,
Yours Staff

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/10/7 17:43

But that means people living in Asia saw the Himalayas rising right in front of them. I cannot wrap my mind around that.

Again I agree that science may not be exactly right about the age of the earth but how can they be THAT wrong? I mean radioactive dating may not be perfect but good grief.

And I think your statement that science must always bow to scripture is true if the scripture is talking about science and of course that Gen 1 must be interpreted absolutely literally. I don't think it has to be literal so I see comparing science to what is stated in Gen 1 and 2 as comparing apples and oranges.

Two persons with an equally high view of scripture can differ on how Gen 1 should be interpreted. In other words viewing Gen 1 as a more poetic passage than a scientific treatise does not make one a flaming liberal.

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/7 18:17

Hi TMK,
I wonder what is the motivation to doubt what the bible simply says and not doubt what atheistic non christian science says in a complicated way.
It is usually one of two things
1.A person wants to marry up evolution to christianity
2.A person wants to marry up the age of the earth to a world dominated by a message of billions of years to make the bible seem more believable
All the dating tools have proved to be totally incorrect.
Not just science but everything must bow to scripture.
God said he created what he created, he said he did it in 6 days and he deliberately gave detailed yrs of how long each generation lasted so we would not be skeptical of his word and that is good enough for me maybe not other people but its good enough for me
Yours Staff

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/10/7 22:09

What about passages like Deut 33:15 that talks about "ancient mountains" and Hab. 4:6 that talks about "ancient mountains" and "age-old hills?" According to young earth paradigm these mountains were practically brand new and in fact were likely still being created.

Even if the earth is 20 billion years old there is not enough time for evolution by chance processes so I am not clear what people are afraid of when considering the possibility that earth might be 4 or 6 billion years old.

I mean if it were absolutely proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that the earth was 5 billion years old, would you lose your faith?

And one other thing-- there are many other planets and moons out there like Mars etc that did not experience a great flood but have similar geologies- how are those mountain ranges etc explained?

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/8 5:48

hi Tmk

The term ancient does not mean billions of years.

Up to the last 200 yrs or so we didn't use millions or billions to describe anything and a thousand yrs got its rightful place as being an extremely long period of time and 6000yrs could as well be 20million yrs in our minds.

By making the argument without any evidence you are just giving a stepping stone to evolution as the main thing they preach in their religion is first millions and then billions.

If the earth is billions of years then Jesus is not Saviour.

The question is what is your motivation to think that the earth is old?. It is not evidence because it doesn't exist. Why do you believe atheistic teachings?

Believing in billions of years is just a teaching from a religion that has become a state religion.

Also The bible when mentioning time always uses correct time days and yrs when talking about History. We know they are talking about History because Adam was a real man and his age is given. God is factual when it comes to time.

I believe that billions of years is a "falling away" teaching.

As I said earlier in your belief system you are believing in people that have got evolution totally wrong. You believe in a group of people who are willing to make up fantasy stories instead of evidence. yours Staff

What about passages like Deut 33:15 that talks about "ancient mountains" and Hab. 4:6 that talks about "ancient mountains" and "age-old hills?" According to young earth paradigm these mountains were practically brand new and in fact were likely still being created.

Even if the earth is 20 billion years old there is not enough time for evolution by chance processes so I am not clear what people are afraid of when considering the possibility that earth might be 4 or 6 billion years old

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/10/8 6:25

quote: "If the earth is billions of years then Jesus is not Saviour."

I have no idea what you are talking about here. That is what I mean- if it was absolutely established that the earth was billions of years old it seems like you would lose your faith. Why? Whether the earth is 6000 or 6 billion years old, God created it and Jesus came to save sinners.

I have not been "fooled" into being open to a billions of years old universe/earth. There is plenty of evidence for it that you say does not exist. You might be burying your head in the sand just a tad. I mean the same scientists that you say are either making stuff up at worst or dead but honestly wrong at best have a rover on Mars driving around taking soil samples etc etc and sending the results and photos back to earth. These guys aren't dumb hacks. Now I am not ruling out that some may have an evil agenda but for the most part I think they use the best science that is available to them to do their work. They can't rely on the Bible for rocket science (or any kind of science). So they have to rely on something else.

If you are so insistent that geologists are so wrong about the age of the earth and astrophysicists are so wrong about the age of the universe, what makes you think that chemists, etc. have it right? We surely rely on their work every day of our lives. This laptop I am typing on is a good example.

Other Christians like Hank Hanegraaf are open to a billions of years old earth and believe me he is no slouch when it comes to handling scripture.

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/8 10:05

Hi Tmk

you have chosen to believe the same atheists /experts who say there is evolution a complete fantasy but do not question the same peoples judgement on real science. u look at there cv and say hes an learned expert he cant b wrong!you asked questions and when answered u skip to the next question. U are cherry picking .unless these demons dont exist who are very intelligent then these experts are under religious delusion How do you measure the age of the earth?its not about sticking ur head in the sand its about how old is the sand?it cant b measured
urs staff

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2014/10/8 10:18

TMK:

We have to remember that there were only 8 people on the face of the earth on the day the ark landed. These 8 people migrated south into the area we now know as Persia or Iran. They multiplied from there. We do not know how long it took for the Himalayas to rise to their current height. Actually, they are still rising, albeit slowly now. So men are right now witnessing their rise. But when the catastrophic flood processes were occurring, this rise would have been fairly rapid and in a part of the earth uninhabited at that time.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2014/10/8 10:24

TMK: If it were proven that the earth were 5 million or even 5 billion years old, would it shake my faith?

How can something that is contradictory to scripture be absolutely proven if the word of God is truth? I understand where you are coming from, and I have read the arguments on both sides. I realize that there is a debate about the interpretation of scripture. But I think you really have to get creative with your interpretation to believe that the earth is more than 6-7 thousand years old. To me, if the plain reading makes sense, why would I try to make any other sense of the account? If you are interpreting and one interpretation is forced while the other is plain, the plain interpretation is the correct interpretation. My faith rests in the finished work of Christ. I would like to say that an old earth would not shake my faith at all. But how can I consider something that to me cannot be possible?

Re: - posted by drifter (), on: 2014/10/8 13:45

And millions of people slip into hell while we debate about trivial things...

Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2014/10/8 13:53

Quote:

-----staff wrote:

I wonder what is the motivation to doubt what the bible simply says

Staff,

but the Bible "doesn't" simply say that... if it did, then there would be absolutely no argument with it.

Re: Trivial things - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2014/10/8 14:02

It is trivial things that lure people to hell all the time. Paul says in 2 Corinthians, "We destroy arguments, and every proud thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God."

He recognized that there would be endless excuses people would use to deny the obvious before them, and the god of "science" is very powerful.

Nevermind that the earth was formed as a perfect habitation for man, that the entire universe was laid out so that the earth would last a long time.

Nevermind that the dual bios of plants and animals would reproduce themselves, that the pull of the moon would allow for weather to move, and a zillion other impossible conditions would align themselves to allow our lives to occur.

Age of the earth? Who knows. I am totally impressed that it is even here!

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/10/8 14:17

Quote: "and millions of people slip into hell while we debate about trivial things."

And perhaps millions are slipping into hell because they cannot believe a Bible that Christians say teaches the earth is only 6000 years old.

I think a little less dogmatism on this issue from the like of Ken Ham might do great things for the expansion of God's kingdom.

This issue is far from "trivial" and my concern is not merely debating. There are many who do not consider Christianity because they view it as ridiculous in areas like this.

Re: - posted by back-to-acts (), on: 2014/10/8 16:40

I find it hard to believe that when people stand before the Judgement Seat of Christ that they are going to tell Him, "I would of believed in You, only if You would of said the earth was millions of years old!!" Or how about "There were a few seemingly contradictions in scripture here and there and because of that I could not believe in You" That is not going to fly. You get to the heart of someone and you find what the real issue is. And I have yet to find someone in a couple years of street ministry that when you get to their heart, they do not believe because Christians teach that the earth is 6,000 years old. Sorry just a side note.

Travis

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/8 17:24

Hi Lysa

I don't think it gets any simpler than that!

And God said, "Let there be light," and there was light. 4 God saw that the light was good, and he separated the light from the darkness. 5 God called the light "day," and the darkness he called "night." And there was evening, and there was morning—the first day.

Yours Staff

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/8 17:33

Hi TMK

On your quote below tells us exactly where you are coming from. Should we then get rid of the other ridiculous areas so that people will consider Christianity!

The ridiculous things Like

-Jesus was sinless

-Speaking in Tongues

-Miracles

-Burning bushes, Sea's that divide etc

-Demons and Devils

etc etc

Where do we stop the compromise so that we look normal!

You cannot Marry up Gods word and Earthly views to make it appear acceptable.

There are many who do not consider Christianity because they view it as ridiculous in areas like this.

Yours Staff

Re: - posted by jochbaptist (), on: 2014/10/8 18:49

Hi Lisa

The Bible states this very clearly.

Firstly in Genesis1, and then in Exodus 20:11

ForÂ inÂ six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in themÂ is, and rested the seventh day: wherfore the LORD blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.

Hi TMK

A question.

The bread and fish the Lord multiplied, ie created out of nothing, would its matter be the same "age" as the original 5 loaves and 2 fishes? I think so, but it existed for less time .

How do you measure the creation process of matter out of nothing, in time?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/10/8 20:19

All I am saying is this:

Most of the best arguments against the creationist viewpoint currently being made by mainstream scientists disappear when we give up our insistence upon a 6,000 or so year old earth. From the standpoint of presenting a strong defense for the Christianity, this has to be considered. Why in the world would we put such heavy emphasis on a doctrine that can deter some people coming to Christian faith when it is less than certain that the biblical data supports the position?

It is not fair to state that I am willing to throw out all the supernatural events in the Bible in order to make scripture more "palatable" for unbelievers. Comparing that to this argument regarding old earth/young earth is comparing apples and oranges.

I believe and would tell anyone that God miraculously created the universe out of nothing. I would tell anyone that the miracles in the Bible are true because God is supernatural; after all that is part of who God is. Any reasonable person should have no problem understanding that the position of Christians is that God works miraculously and in fact miraculous events like the incarnation and resurrection are the foundations of our faith. Obviously if they totally rule out the possibility of the miraculous and therefore cannot accept Christianity, so be it.

But I believe that if a person is stumbled by a Christian's insistence on a young earth, then that can prevent them from moving on in the story of redemption. Why would we put that stumbling block in front of people when there is true room for doubt about the age of the earth?

I am not talking about watering down any foundation of the faith. But this issue of the age of the earth is not a foundational truth and I will continue to assert that our insistence that it is does a disservice to potential believers.

Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2014/10/8 22:59

Quote:

-----Hi Lysa
I dont think it gets any simpler than that!

And God said, "Let there be light," and there was light. 4 God saw that the light was good, and he separated the light from the darkness. 5 God called the light "day," and the darkness he called "night." And there was evening, and there was morning--the first day.

Yours Staff

And again, where does it say 6000 years old? People just "infer" that because of a verse that says 'one day is a 1000 years' but even that is not written in stone or made plain.

And about the dinosaurs... every museum in the world has dino bones coming out the ying yang, that's proves there was millions of them walking, flying and swimming. There would be way more instances of them in the Bible if they lived and walked with the dinos. Just saying.

Bro Staff, the Bible does not say, "you must be born again and believe in a 6000 yr old earth," I am allowed to not believe in young earth and still go to heaven!

God bless you,
Lisa

Re: - posted by hulseys (), on: 2014/10/9 0:15

5 pages of posts and 1500 views later and both sides of the debate are as entrenched in their view as before.

A. W. Tozer once gave a young man advice about how to deal with the Calvinist Vs Arminian debates at his college and I think it is applicable here:

"You see those fellows over there debating this and that. You let them alone and as for you, you go on with the Lord. Years later you'll discover you've grown by leaps and bounds and you'll find them still arguing over the same topics."

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/10/9 6:12

Yes Hulseys but if it had been a debate Tozer was interested in he would have been right there in it.

The point to "debating" (i would say we are more discussing) is not necessarily to "win." I am actually unsettled on this issue of the age of the earth- I think it is super old but I am not dogmatic about it and these fellows have given me food for thought.

Let me just make it simple- if an unbelieving friend of mine told me that he just couldn't accept Christianity because he can't believe the earth is 6000 years old, I would tell him he doesn't have to. I would not insist that he must believe this or Jesus cannot be his savior.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/10/9 6:22

Lysa--

I agree with you about the dinos. The YE response is that they lived somewhere else (even though Mesopotamia was the cradle of life and fossils are found everywhere) or that they were dragons.

The scientist who made the original discovery of the dinosaur soft tissue has another explanation that a young earth. I am not insisting her explanation is correct, but it does make sense:

<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/soft-tissue-found-on-t-rex-explained/>

Re: - posted by back-to-acts (), on: 2014/10/9 8:14

Hey TMK,

I completely agree with you on this one. I would do the same thing. The age of the earth is not as important as the Savior of the earth. But, the real issue as to why they cannot or won't believe is not because Christians claim the earth to be 6,000 years old. That may be an imagination or a thought that has captivated their mind to hinder them from believing. And we as the army of The Lord have the power through His Spirit to cast those things down and bring them to the obedience of Christ. We preach Christ crucified!

But if you were to ask that certain individual if they really felt like when they stand before God the excuse they are going to use is, "all of Your church claimed the earth was 6,000 years old and I just could not believe that, so I could not believe in You." If the person is honest with themselves they would also understand the foolishness of that.

I think we need to be careful when we stay on the surface level of conversations with un-believers. We must get to the heart of the issue everytime, " they were pricked in their hearts" - not just their intellect.

Travis

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2014/10/9 13:57

Hello.

Interesting conversation. I thought I might add the following:

To put it in perspective, if you argue that the age of the Earth is only 6,000 years old, that means you have to be prepared to say that Noah's flood happened roughly 2400 BC... at a time in which some of the great ancient kingdoms of the world, such as Egypt, were in existence and having thriving dynasties.

I don't know about you, but I'm not personally comfortable dating Noah's flood to only 2400 BC.

I'm very much a champion of taking the Bible literally, and for that I believe in a literal creation, and even a young earth. But I have read in some scholarly literature that there are ways of counting the years in Genesis that would actually put Adam and Eve back in the Garden roughly 20,000 years ago.

Such a reading, I think should be preferred.

If we are to understand the Bible in a literal-historical-grammatical way (as I believe we should), then we need to read the Scriptures in their actual "historical" context. Adam, Eve, Noah, etc, were all historical people, and we should be able to date their existence into the actual history of the world.

Being that what is recognized as modern civilization and recorded history began to take root about 6,000 years ago, it seems to me only logical to believe Noah's flood would've happened some time before then. Indeed, if a universal flood happened (as I believe it did), then such a flood would've destroyed most of man's written record about himself. Such would explain why prior to 6,000 years ago, we have little account of mankind, and what evidence we do have is very scant and scattered. It's mostly fragments of broken pottery, tools, buildings, and other such things (they are things that would survive a flood.)

If we believe the Earth is only 6,000 years old, that means Noah's flood would've happened in 2,400 BC according to some accounting methods of Genesis's genealogy. Such doesn't seem to fit the historical record, which would suggest to me that our accounting methods might be off a bit.

In 2,400 BC, Egypt was a developed nation and was in the middle of its great dynasties. No flood seems to have happened in 2,400 BC that wiped out Egyptian civilization, or caused them to reboot their order of kings. They seem to have been just fine and without interruption.

So, using some accounting methods of Genesis places Noah's flood during this time period. Such seems impossible to do if we hold to this historical-grammatical interpretation of Scripture. Therefore, I think we might need to revise our accounting methods in our reading of Genesis in order to better date the history of the Bible and world.

I could be wrong in my interpretation. But there is nothing specifically in the Bible that says the Earth is only 6,000 years

old. That's something that has been determined by reverse engineering the genealogies of Genesis using a very specific accounting method... a method which some scholars have disputed. Some have championed other accounting methods and ways of literally reading the genealogies of Genesis, which takes us back much further than 6,000 years, and possibly as far as 20,000.

Exactly how old the world is, I'm not sure. I don't believe it's billions or millions. But I don't believe it is only 6,000 either.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/10/9 14:48

Travis-- you are so right in what you posted. Thx

KJ- Good point. I am not sure what Ken ham does with Egypt. The flood did not wipe out the pyramids so I would suspect he says they are not as old as most archaeologists would say.

One quick question-- if the flood wiped out everyone except those on the ark where did the race of giants come from in the land of Canaan?

Re: - posted by back-to-acts (), on: 2014/10/9 16:20

Hey TMK,

According to this verse it seems that they were there before and after. Now how that happened I have always questioned and pondered. Because I do believe 1 Peter 3:20 where it says that 8 persons were saved. Did the deomns come down again after the flood and produce more giants?

The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore children to them. Those were the mighty men who were of old, men of renown. Gen 6:4

My opinion is that these giants represent spiritual darkness (the demonic & satans kingdom) that was destroyed by Christ at the resurrection. So God allowed them to stay so that He could put them to open shame. And the goal of the flood was to destroy the evilness of men, not yet the evilness of Satan. Just an opinion, not a doctrine.

TMK : What about the argument for when God created the earth He made everything good? So because of that He didn't make a baby tree that grows up, but He made a fully developed mature tree. So if we used the process of carbon dating it would show to be millions of years old, but when in reality it is only 6,000 years old in our time frame? I have always thought that, but I am not really sure if it is a viable argument. Just my own opinion on the subject.

What if all of our science is so under developed in the grand scheme of things all because when God created the earth He created it as fully developed to where if we try and date it with our current scientific methods it comes up to millions of years? Just a thought.

Travis

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/9 16:41

Hi TMK

I post this again you dont have to answer if you dont want you.

.....
On your quote below tells us exactly where you are coming from. Should we then get rid of the other ridiculous areas so that people will consider christianity!

The ridiculous things Like

-Jesus was sinless

-Speaking in Tongues

-Miracles

-Burning bushes, Sea's that divide'etc

-Demons and Devils

etc etc

Where do we stop the compromise so that we look normal!

You cannot Marry up Gods word and Earthly views to make it appear acceptable

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/9 16:49

Hi Lysa,

Nobody in the discussion said the age of the earth is a direct salvation issue.

I think that the verse "a day is a thousand yrs" is no proof for six thousand yrs and it isn't said in a historic context in the bible but anywhere the bible is recording history the bible is accurate and measured.

Also the bible simply says there are 76 generations to Christ(not 6000yrs)

God
Adam
Seth
Enosh
Kenan
Mahalalel
Jared
Enoch
Methuselah
Lamech
Noah
Shem
Arphaxad

Shelah
Eber
Peleg
Reu
Serug
Nahor
Terah
Abraham
Isaac
Jacob
Judah
Perez

Hezron
Ram
Amminadab
Nahshon
Salmon
Boaz
Obed
Jesse
David
Nathan
Mattatha
Menna
Melea

Eliakim
Jonam
Joseph
Judah
Simeon

Levi
Matthat
Jorim
Eliezer
Joshua
Er
Elmadam
Cosam

Addi
Melchi
Neri
Shealtiel
Zerubbabel
Rhesa
Joanan
Joda
Josech
Semein
Mattathias
Mahath
Naggai

Hesli
Nahum
Amos
Mattathias
Joseph
Jannai
Melchi
Levi
Matthat
Heli
Joseph
Jesus
yours staff

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2014/10/9 18:33

Also keep in mind some conservative evangelical scholars believe the genealogy in Genesis contains "gaps". It's impossible to go in detail here, but if you study the Bible closely you'll discover that genealogies sometimes drop names off here and there, depending on the alleged purpose of each author. If you read some more academically minded commentaries, you'll find this is a very commonly accepted belief about Genesis. What we could have in some parts is simply a compressed genealogy, representing the major figureheads on ancient history.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/10/9 18:35

Hi staff-

I did respond below at my post made 10/8 at 20:19:

"It is not fair to state that I am willing to throw out all the supernatural events in the Bible in order to make scripture more "palatable" for unbelievers. Comparing that to this argument regarding old earth/young earth is comparing apples and oranges.

I believe and would tell anyone that God miraculously created the universe out of nothing. I would tell anyone that the miracles in the Bible are true because God is supernatural; after all that is part of who God is. Any reasonable person should have no problem understanding that the position of Christians is that God works miraculously and in fact miraculous events like the incarnation and resurrection are the foundations of our faith. Obviously if they totally rule out the possibility of the miraculous and therefore cannot accept Christianity, so be it."

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/10/9 18:41

Hey Travis-

I have never been a fan of the idea that God could have created the universe and earth etc with "an appearance of age" because it seems deceptive and contrary to God's character. After all, God knew that man would advance in technology and learning and science etc and I don't think he would "trick" us in this fashion.

Many people have no problem with this concept, but I always have. For example, to me it would be deceptive for him to create full grown trees with growth rings. Or that Adam and Eve were created with evidence of aging (teeth that are a little worn, e.g.). I am not saying he didn't create them full grown- but rather he did so in a pristine condition. Nor would I think that he would create a mountain range that showed signs of years of erosion.

Once again many people have no problem with this concept, so maybe its just me.

Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2014/10/9 19:35

Staff, explain this away....

Quote:

-----king jimmy wrote:

To put it in perspective, if you argue that the age of the Earth is only 6,000 years old, that means you have to be prepared to say that Noah's flood happened roughly 2400 BC... at a time in which some of the great ancient kingdoms of the world, such as Egypt, were in existence and having thriving dynasties.

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/9 19:37

Hi KingJimmy

I believe it is what it simply says one begat another etc

Although they don't fully marry up in one place only as far as I remember when I studied it doesn't add up to a long period of time

Yours Staff

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/9 20:39

Hi Lysa

The timeline of the bible is accurate and correct I believe.

You have to remember when it comes to Egyptian timeline you are talking about something that is not a precise science.

I take the bible timeline as having authority and the secular timeline as being incorrect.

After all the same people who date the Egyptian timeline are the ones who date the earth to be millions of years old and who work from that premise. You can't get away from it to come to a conclusion that Genesis is not literal and accurate the Christian has to believe in non-Christian secular atheists for the most part.

The question is where you start with the bible being authoritative or man's wisdom as being authoritative.

Like in all other issues when you take the bible as authoritative you will get the correct answer,

Yours Staff

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/9 21:04

HiTMK

Apologies i did not see that post.

I disagree with your qoute below.

Mainstream scientists(what a scientist anyway)would not change at all their attitude because their attitude has nothing to do with facts.They are non christian atheists and this belief is a doctrine from the devil.You dont deal with the spiritual at all in your discussion.You dont take into account that all religion is a work of Satan.You threat these scientists as if they were neutral,non effected when it comes to influence from Satan because of their intellect.Except in Christ nobody is im mune from the work of Satan.Just because scientists dont believe in Satan doesnt mean hes not there.

What is Mainstream?only the blind leading the blind.

Mainstream is man's opinion of himself,his own puffed up CV.

When no evidence exists man says "I AM AN EXPERT" listen to me.

.....
Most of the best arguments against the creationist viewpoint currently being made by mainstream scientists disappear when we give up our insistence upon a 6,000 or so year old earth
.....

When the Holy Spirit goes to all the trouble of recording individual names ages births and deaths we know they are exactly what he says.If the bible is not an historic document accurate then it is not worth the paper it is written on

Yours Staff

The question is are "Mainstream Experts" your starting point or is the word of God the starting point?Who do you trust?

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2014/10/9 21:35

Staff,

I love bouncing these ideas around, too. Testing our knowledge. Pushing our assumptions where they bear pushing.

Without commenting on the specifics of any age of any feature of Earth, the Bible has no timeline against which to measure the ages of any feature of Earth.

Before you point to generations from Adam and their respective biblical ages, I would submit to you that the Bible itself does not offer those for the purpose of measuring time. I do not consider any scientific (so called) method that does attempt to measure the ages of things as reliable, so it is not a question of man's wisdom. Man is a presumptuous fool on his best day.

I start with Scripture. Day one and two of creation, for example, taking merely the Scripture and yielding to its authority, demonstrate periods of activity that are not possibly consistent with one day. "Yom" cannot be a 24 hour day because there was no sun on Yom 1 for the Earth to orbit or to rotate in relation to it. If you can locate the Sun on day 1, please show it with the certainty that you assert the Bible offers. In fact, I would submit that you will not even arguably find a single star until creation day 4. The Sun is a simple star. Until day 4, there is no true "day".

So, if Scripture clearly uses words and phrases that, although we typically understand them to take on our presently understood meaning, do not offer themselves as meaning what we think or how we apply those words regarding time, we cannot overdraw conclusions from them and remain faithful to sola scriptura.

I take Genesis literally. Because I do, I cannot follow you to your conclusions about time insofar as you rely on the bible for them.

It is dangerous to say the Bible is worthless if inaccurate when the basis of that accuracy is not the reliability of God but is the insistence that it speaks to something that, manifestly, it does not. It is more than He asks to attribute to God the Holy Spirit a motive for His revelation of himself (i.e., your argument that He went to great lengths to record ages, etc.) that He does not claim for Himself.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2014/10/9 22:15

While I would not at all venture into the idea of theistic evolution or a really old age for the earth, even when one studies the Bible in a very literal fashion, as I believe we should, one must take the text at face value and admit our perfectly polished doctrines don't always flesh out when we look at all the data.

We already know that Genesis isn't trying to tell us the full story from the get go, as it doesn't explain things such as what was happening outside the garden of Eden, or where Cain fled to after murdering Able, and the cities he went to, and why it was he was afraid of others avenging his brother's death, who did he marry, etc. It shouldn't surprise us if there are gaps in the genealogy laid out in Genesis, as we see such a phenomenon in other places in the Bible.

To bury one's head in the sand about such a thing is to prefer one's doctrine to all of the data found in the Bible. We can still hold to our doctrines, but simply admit there are things we don't have a full explanation for. Also, when taking the Bible literally, such involves understanding it in its historical, grammatical, and literary context. While we need to take secular history with a grain of salt, we also must be careful to make sure we don't impose things on the Scripture that they could never mean in that same historical context. Otherwise we are guilty of inventing fictions, and claiming something God's word never claims. The Book of Mormon does that. Let's not stoop to such a level.

God's word doesn't demand a 2400 bc flood, so we should not be trying to force such a story into the history of mankind, especially when there is ample historical record available to us at that time period to suggest there was no global flood that history gives testimony to as having happened at that time. The world seemed to exist just fine in 2400 BC. An older date should be preferred. I like to place it a few thousand years before.

Of course, historians could be very wrong about a lot of things. But I don't see this interpretation of things that somehow contradicts or undermines the things we actually see in Scripture, nor does it change or threaten what I believe about a very literal interpretation of Genesis. If anything, it enhances it, and does not take away.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2014/10/9 22:26

And if you are interested in it, check out this link: http://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Egyptian_pyramids

This wiki article documents the history of the Egyptian pyramids being built between 2600 and 600 BC. Do you really believe the Bible teaches that Noah's flood really happened in 2400 BC? In all due respect, the Egyptians would beg to differ.

Before you answer, keep in mind these are the same Egyptians the Jews were freed from under Pharaoh in 1400 BC, a mere 1000 years later. Do you really believe all of Egyptian civilization formed so quickly and so powerfully after the flood, and got to monument building practically overnight?

Re: Mountains and the age of the Earth - posted by RogerB (), on: 2014/10/9 22:35

As The angelic host was being made.... and since God can see the future, he saw that Lucifer and some of the angels would rebel. That's what necessitated the creation of earth. God was going to need a prison. The Book of Psalms has a lot of references to the word prison, how God sees his prisoners. Earth has an electric fence around it too called the Van Allen radiation belt. I believe it's Isaiah that mentions that Lucifer was once in the garden of Eden, but that was long ago. That period of the earth was finally flooded with water as you read in Gen 1:2. It became void. God cleared it up as time passed and replenished the earth.

Re: - posted by crusader (), on: 2014/10/10 0:04

My thinking around the age of the earth is this that it was formed 6 thousand years ago but the earth was created in a mature sense rather than a young sense because it needed to be ready for the occupation of God's creations.

"Which came first the chicken or the egg" the chicken has to be mature enough to produce eggs. What would have to be the age of the earth to be mature enough to maintain life. It is evolutionary thinking that all things have to start from a young perspective because it doesn't make sense otherwise in their theory. We have a God that is not bound by these laws and does what he thinks fit at the time.

At the end of the day it will always lead back to faith because science can only qualify what it can observe anything other than that is theory and theories come from a belief point. There is individual supporting evidence which can sway these theories for us personally and for me this was experiencing Jesus Christ in my life and doing what he said he would do in

his bible. the bible for me has the only explanation of why we are the way we are, the spirit realm, sickness and death. why we fight and love.

just my view :)

Re: - posted by yuehan, on: 2014/10/10 3:32

On KingJimmy's post - this reminds me of something I once read:

"The 6000-year thesis is nowhere stated in the Bible, and apart from rather tenuous speculation it's difficult to find anything in the Bible from which to make a doctrine out of it. The 6000-year thesis has been stubbornly clung to by Creationists, but I believe this to be unnecessary as it is extraneous to the revelation of God. I personally have no opinion on the thesis, as the Bible says nothing about it and as the debate is fairly polarised.

It is also worth noting, although this may seem a triviality given the previous paragraph, the 6000 year thesis is based on the premise that the genealogies in the Bible are complete, ie Adam was the father of Seth, Seth was the father of Enoc h etc. While it is clear from the accounts that Adam was the biological father of Seth, there have been conjectures that the words translated as 'the father of' may also be understood as meaning 'the ancestor of'. An example would be in the genealogy of Jesus in Matthew, where Matthew credits Jehoram as being the father of Uzziah, when in fact Jehoram's son was Ahaziah, an ancestor by several generations of Uzziah.

What does this all mean? Possibly that the 6000-year thesis (a figure arrived at by adding up the lifespans of those in the genealogies) may be flawed. But all the same, that doesn't really matter as there is little doctrinal basis in Scripture for the proposition."

"So, as the Bible is silent, so am I."

Separately, he also wrote:

"The whole reason why the scientific creationism movement got off the ground is that people believed that they had to prove Creation scientifically true in order for God to exist. It is because understanding has such a high premium placed on it by our society."

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/10 6:11

Hi Yuehan,

Firstly Creationists who believe in a young earth are not clinging to anything or are being stubborn as if they know they are wrong but won't admit it.

In regards to Seth all the main bibles translate "father" rather than "ancestor" a big jump that non young earth believers may also be said to "cling" too.

Even if we took the view that their are flaws the flaws would not add up to a hill of beans.

The "Doctrine" of an old Earth ie 20'000 yrs would not be even discussed except that evolutionists preach about billions of years and in an attempt to look "reasonable" to the world's view we try to marry up the two.

The bible clearly says that from the Start Satan has been making up "doctrines" and Paul calls them "doctrines of demons".

The Doctrine of Millions and Billions is one of these Doctrines and although Christians might not believe in million/billions the doctrine influences them to believe an older age of 10's of thousands. So the doctrine stems not from reasonable scientific people insulated from Satan but from the evolutionary fathers,

yours staff

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/10/10 6:31

Quote: "It is because understanding has such a high premium placed on it by our society."

This is true-- I would probably be a lot better off if I didn't try to understand everything!

This issue regarding the age of the earth is more of an interesting thing to me than something I lose sleep over. I really don't believe it is terribly doctrinally significant and I certainly do not believe that the authority of scripture stands or falls on this issue.

That is what worries me about the Ken Hams-- they are so very invested in this that I am concerned what they will do as science advances and we can someday know how to date things with certainty. I have little doubt that day will one day come (if the earth lasts that long). of course, he might be proven right!

Someone earlier mentioned how the current dating methods (radioisotopes etc) and unreliable. I agree to a point. But when all of them point to a very old earth it is somewhat difficult to say they are all plain wrong.

When it comes to the flood, don't forget about the Epic of Gilgamesh which very closely parallels the biblical account, yet pre-dates the birth of Moses by several hundred years- to perhaps 2100 BC. Ussher thought Moses was born around 1450 BC. The point is that this would seem to necessitate pushing the probable date for the flood back from 2400 BC

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2014/10/10 6:47

Hi KingJimmy,

What is clear from both sides is that the pyramids had to be built after the flood.

Mizraim is a son of Ham, son of Noah (Genesis 12:10). This name is also the common name for Egypt (which is also known as 'the land of Ham,' for instance in Psalm 105:23)

The Secular timing of the pyramids depends on counting the Pharaohs Reign consecutively. The lists of Pharaohs come from ancient historians from before Christ. The dates are blown up.

This accounts for the secular discrepancy.

Josephus stated that Egyptians made "Israelites build Pyramids" In The Secular timing view would say that the Israelites could not be in Egypt at that time and Josephus would have to be wrong.

The bible says the Israelites at the time of Moses were making bricks and gathering straw which is in line with Josephus' account not the Secular timing view,

So they did have the time,

Yours Staff

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2014/10/10 9:24

I'm not in a position to say which view is correct.

My main point in all that I have said is that we always need to keep an open mind with such things, and ultimately, not be dogmatic about issues, that when we look at the complete evidence before us, leave questions that are difficult if not impossible to solve. Especially over an issue as small as the exact date of the earth.

Faithfulness in carefully handling the text we have is more important than being dogmatic. If the text raises questions about our dogma, we should always keep an open mind to fine tuning our beliefs.

Re: - posted by yuehan, on: 2014/10/11 14:44

TMK,

When approaching such questions on how to square the biblical account of creation with mainstream scientific theories, it's good to remember that all interpretation of evidence is subjected to assumptions (or "axioms").

Mainstream scientific theories and their accompanying methodology (e.g. radiometric dating) are predicated on certain tacit assumptions about how things were like at an earlier time. Some examples: (i) assuming that scientific laws and its parameters were the same as today; (ii) assumptions concerning the conditions of the earth and the universe back then.

These assumptions are hard to verify - unless you were there to witness these historical events, or you have a time machine. Secular scientists might think these assumptions are "reasonable", but that does not make them true (and some of them might not even be falsifiable - though Karl Popper's ideas on scientific falsifiability has more holes than a Swiss cheese i.m.o.).

From a biblical perspective, such assumptions concerning the past are not necessarily true. We know that the fall in Genesis had tremendous repercussions for creation. There's also the flood too, which likewise might have affected earth in significant ways.

The difficulty is that God has not told us how these events affected creation from a scientific perspective. Neither has He disclosed what scientific conditions were like in the past. And since we don't know which are the correct 'assumptions' to adopt, it's hard to churn out alternative theories to mainstream ones. We can point out all the shaky bits in mainstream theories, but that by itself would unlikely persuade the secular world (speaking from experience).

As there can be no scientific reasoning without presuppositions, I believe that all differences in opinion can ultimately be traced back to differences in assumptions adopted by different individuals.

I should perhaps point out that challenging the assumptions undergirding mainstream scientific theories is not an arcane activity confined just to creationists. One example would be João Magueijo, who has a good scientific pedigree (Cambridge, Princeton, Imperial College) and has done theoretical work on light possibly having a varying speed. Is he closer to the truth than other scientists? Only God knows... but at least he acknowledges the inadequacies and problems with the 'scientific' creation story promulgated by the mainstream.

This post might not have answered your question, but I hope it helps to put things in a better perspective.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/10/11 18:53

Thanks Yuehan. I appreciate your post. I understand there is much mystery here. I get that for radio dating to work a constant rate of decay is assumed. I suppose it is possible that decay was faster in the past-- who knows.

It's funny because I was watching an old classic sci fi film last night and the main character said something along the lines of "God gave man intelligence so he could discover the wonders of creation."

I believe this is true, although obviously intelligence is for more than just discovery.

Perhaps some day (when we have the time machines you mentioned- lol) we will find out what really happened back in the day.