

Preconceptions
By Greg Neyman
© Answers In Creation



First Published 6 March 2003
Answers In Creation Website
www.answersincreation.org/preconceptions.htm

Tas Walker wrote a rebuttal to a critique of one of his articles (answersingenesis.org/home/area/feedback/negative_05august2002.asp). The main theme of the article is not important, but let's take a closer look at the preconceptions that Tas has (and that all young-earthers have).

In his response, Walker first (and again at the end) appeals to the emotional appeal of the Bible, by stating true knowledge begins with the Bible (interpretation...if science and the Bible disagree, then science must be wrong). He goes on to state in the next paragraph "*He (God) knows everything, does not tell lies, and does not make mistakes.*" I agree.

However, in the next paragraph he makes a startling admission. He states the Bible teaches that the world is young, and that "*If the Bible taught that the world was millions of years old, we would believe that.*" Wow, this is an admission that the scientific evidence supports an old earth, but because of his improper interpretation of the Bible teaching that the earth is young, he cannot accept the scientific facts as truth.

The Bible's Claims on Earth Age

Nowhere in the Bible does it teach that the earth is young. The Bible does not say "the earth is 6,000 years old." Nor does it say "the earth is 4.5 billion years old." The fact is, the Bible makes no claims as to the age of the earth. We must interpret the age of the earth from science.

Young earther's will make a defense of the "days" of creation being literal 24-hour days. The truth is, there is no claim in the Bible that states the length of these days. If you are a young-earthier, the "day" as we know it didn't even begin until the fourth day of creation, when the sun and the moon were created. The saying I like to use is, if you are God, and you are in outer space, a million miles away from any stars or planets, then how do you mark the passage of time? As God, you do not sleep, you do not need rest.

Should finite man limit an infinite God to a twenty-four hour day? It is finite man that has imposed his interpretation of the word "day" onto an infinite God. Well, our rules of time don't apply to an infinite, everlasting being. Just look at the creation. God rested on the seventh day. In fact, he is still resting, and we are still in the seventh day! If this day has lasted for over 6,000 years, then who are we to impose time limits on the other days of creation? The use of the word day is just so that man can have some type of framework to understand creation, and does not imply 24-hour days.

The Bible says in II Peter 3:8, "*...that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.*" God does not see time the same way we do! To him, one second could be an eternity.

Young earthers claim that an old world dilutes God's strength, by saying that God is not omnipotent, because He could not create the world in days, but had to take millions of years. Hogwash! If God wanted to take 6 twenty-four hour days, he could have. However, using II Peter 3:8, those millions of years are a "day" to God. Remember Walker said God does not lie. Therefore, whatever we see in science is true...and science says the earth is 4.5 billion years old.

If you think God's power is diluted, then think of it this way. Starting right now, I'll give you 4.5 billion years to create a world, complete with a thriving ecosystem, and beings which look up to you as a god. Can you do it? Of course not! God is the only one who can...and did, create the universe. The matter of time DOES NOT MATTER, because only God can do it.

Walker goes on to say that "the concept of millions of years of death and suffering contradicts the Word of God, and destroys the foundation of the Gospel of Christ." Again, he is wrong here. There is no evidence in the Bible that proves an old earth contradicts the Bible or the Gospel. What he is alluding to is the mistaken belief that there was no death before sin was introduced by Adam and Eve. To see my critique of this theory, see my article on teeth (www.answersincreation.org/teeth.htm).

Conclusion

As shown earlier, Tas Walker believes the scientific evidence supports an old earth. If he would correctly interpret the Bible, then he would reach a different conclusion. The problem is, he has been conditioned by years of young-earth belief, and refuses to accept, or examine, the alternatives outside of the preconceptions that he has. As such, he, and most young-earth scientists, are completely controlled by their preconceptions.

Footnote: I did not critique the main points of this article. Walker presents some isolated examples of rapid cooling, which in no way invalidates the thousands of other examples of slow cooling. My main point here is his incorrect pre-assumptions.