

Book Review - Refuting Compromise
By Greg Neyman
© Answers In Creation



First Published 8 July 2004
Answers In Creation Website
www.answersincreation.org/refuting_compromise.htm

The young earth ministry Answers in Genesis published a new book in 2004 titled Refuting Compromise, by Dr. Jonathan Sarfati. This book goes along with their ministry theme for 2004, Operation: Refuting Compromise. While it is not surprising that they argue against the position of progressive creationism, it is surprising that in this book they take aim straight at one individual, Dr. Hugh Ross of Reasons to Believe.

Normally, young earth ministries focus on winning souls for Christ, not in tearing down the efforts of other good Christians as they also seek to win souls. Therefore their effort against this so-called compromise begs the question "Why?" Why attack another ministry which is winning souls for Christ?

There is a fundamental difference between old earth believers and young earth believers, and I believe this is at the core of why they would write such an inflammatory book. Answers in Creation, Reasons to Believe, and other old earth ministries will defend anyone's right to believe what they want to about the creation. I'm an old earth creationist, but if you want to believe in a young earth, that's great! I'll sit right beside you in church, worshipping, fellowshiping, and witnessing to others. The reason for this is simple...the Bible does not say "Believe in a young earth and thou shalt be saved." I don't care what you believe about the age of the earth, because it's not relevant for your salvation. Evangelist Billy Graham says, "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."

However, young-earth ministries see the creation as a core doctrine. They believe that failure to believe in a young earth undermines the gospel, mostly due to their mistaken belief that there was no physical death before sin (there was no "spiritual death" before sin (see www.answersincreation.org/death.htm). This error in scriptural interpretation regarding death before sin is the number one reason for the existence of young earth ministries.

Even with this difference of the added doctrine of creation, why is it such a big deal? In the introduction to the book, the author addresses why the book is needed. He claims that Ross "reinterprets Scripture" to bring it into harmony with secular science (page 14). Is he correct in this claim? You bet! Consider the following example.

Suppose I invented the original camera, and wrote a book on it which became known loosely as the "camera bible." One of my users of this book, a person who made his living in photography, would swear by his book and camera. However, if he was told

that there was a new way of taking pictures in color, he would be skeptical. It is contrary to his 40+ years of training and use of his black and white camera.

The same is true in the creation debate. If you have believed in a young earth for many years, and suddenly someone claimed that they had evidence the earth was old, would you not be skeptical? For the photographer, upon seeing the new camera, and a print in color, he would have to change his thinking about photography. For the creationist, upon seeing the evidence for an old earth, he would have to reconsider the creation, compare it against the Bible, and reach new conclusions. The difference with young-earth creationists is that they are afraid to accept an old earth, instead preferring to live in a black and white world. In short, they are trapped by their traditional way of thinking, and refuse to entertain any evidence to the contrary.

Is there a conflict with death before sin (and, therefore, an old earth)? No...old earth creationists have shown that Scripture can be interpreted without causing a conflict. Young earth creationists call it compromise...however, is it compromise, or something else?

God created the world, and all that is in it. Old earth creationists consider the entire creation, using a scientific frame of mind. To do anything else falls short of God's Word. In Acts 17:11, Luke tells us about the Christians in Berea, and their desire to learn the truth. "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether these things were so."

If God tells us something in His Word (or, in His creation), is it not our duty to examine it in light of all the evidence? That is what the Bereans did...when they were presented the Gospel, they examined the scriptures to determine its truth. When old earth creationists are presented evidences from science, we examine the evidence, along with the scriptures, to determine its truth. We consider the creation, and all its evidence, its "color." Unfortunately, young earth creationists wish to cling to their black and white world, and ignore the overwhelming evidence from God's creation, choosing instead to create the facade of "creation science" to hide behind, creating all sorts of excuses to dismiss the evidence that we see in God's creation.

God created the earth, therefore if we examine His creation, it will truthfully tell its age. Over 99 percent of scientists accept the earth as old (they are the experts)¹. There is no compromise in accepting the evidence from God's creation as truth...especially when this evidence does not conflict with the Bible. One can accept the earth as old, and still believe in an inerrant Bible. From a theological point of view, this new book is unnecessary.

As for the claims in the book, Dr. Sarfati accuses Dr. Ross of going outside his area of expertise, into areas of biology, biblical languages, etc. Yes, Dr. Ross addresses areas outside his main area of astronomy, however, he does not do so blindly. Reasons to Believe has a team of experts in all these fields, which Dr. Ross receives advice from. (Dr. Sarfati also goes outside his area of expertise. He is a physical chemist, and he deals with geology, astronomy, etc. in this book, making him guilty of the very thing that he says Ross is guilty of.)

In the evidences that Dr. Sarfati disagrees with, it is usually a matter of interpretation, not a matter of Dr. Ross presenting bad information. For instance, for the Hebrew word for "day", it can be interpreted either as 24 hours, or as a long period of time. Dr. Ross

does not make a mistake in this...it is only a matter of young earth creationists reaching a different conclusion with the same Hebrew word. The number of Hebrew scholars who support Dr. Ross bears this out.

In my review, I have not addressed every issue raised, as many have already been refuted on this and other websites. On the whole, I don't recommend this book to anyone, as it is based on differences of opinion, and bad conclusions in theology and science.

¹ Estimating the number of scientists who believe in a young earth is almost impossible. Consider the following, which we present as an rough estimate.

There are 65 scientists listed on ICR's list of young earth scientists (granted, this is not a complete listing of all scientists who are young-earthers). Limiting our numbers to geologists, ICR lists 12 people that are in Geology or related fields. By comparison the Geological Society of America has over 17,000 members (keep in mind that not all geologists are members, just like not all young earth geologists are listed by ICR). That equates to 12 young earth geologists and 16,988 old earth geologists, or .0007 percent. This is by no means a scientific determination, but can be used to give a rough estimate.

It could also be argued that ALL scientists accept an old earth. I use the word 'all' because young earth scientists are not scientists. By definition, a scientist makes observations, then formulates theories about those observations. By contrast, a YEC "scientist" has made the theory first (that the earth is young) and then he looks for observations to confirm it. They are performing science backwards, thus deserve the term "theorist" rather than "scientist." This is not to say that they are not smart, intelligent persons. Many have made important scientific contributions, but in the area of the age of the earth, their preconceived ideas about the age of the earth invalidates any scientific work they do in this field of research.

Chapter 1 – The Authority of Scripture

To listen to a young earth creationist, there is only one way to believe in creation. His interpretation of the Bible is the correct one. This arrogant approach to creation is what causes them problems. There is no need for this "I'm right and you're wrong" attitude.

The author attempts to paint the picture that old earth creationists, including Hugh Ross, do not uphold the authority of Scripture. This is simply not true. As an old earth believer, and a fundamental Baptist, I believe in the ultimate authority of the Scriptures. If I see something in the scientific world that disagrees with Scripture, then the Scriptures must be right. This is also the belief of Dr. Ross. If there is a disagreement, there are two possibilities. First, the scientific data is flawed, or second, our interpretation of the Scriptures is flawed.

Is it wrong to reinterpret the Scriptures because of science? No, it is not. In fact, God tells us to examine the Scriptures for ourselves. If you want to take what the young earth creationists are saying as the truth, then there is no need for you to interpret your own Bible...they will do it for you. In reality, we are all individuals, all capable of interpreting the Bible as we see fit.

Yes, Dr. Ross does imply that the creation is the 67th book of the Bible. I would not make such a statement, but he is not far from the truth. Did God create the world? Yes. Then he “wrote” the creation story for all to see. We can interpret and study His creation, and in the process, we discover many wonderful things about what He did.

Therefore the creation, which God made, must agree with the words of the Bible. As a person with a scientific background, it is plain to me that the earth is old. If there is an apparent conflict with the Bible, it is our duty to examine the Scriptures, and either discard the scientific data, or reinterpret the Scriptures. This does not mean that we re-examine and re-examine the Scriptures until they agree with science (as young earth creationists do in reverse...they re-examine science until it agrees with the Bible). There is a plain, easy interpretation of the Scriptures which allows for old-earth belief. This is what Dr. Ross did.

In the opening pages of this chapter, Dr. Sarfati quotes from several sources to affirm the ultimate authority of Scripture. This is great, as I also believe in these, as most old-earth believers do. He concludes the first section with “The Timothy Test.” It basically says that using the common language of the Bible, how would a person such as Timothy (Paul’s disciple) interpret the Bible? Yes, a simple person with little scientific knowledge (none of which was available to Timothy) would believe that Genesis is speaking of six 24-hour days. Does that mean we should ignore the evidence we have today? No. We can study the creation in much more depth than Timothy could. Consider this...

If you were to put the earth on trial, and let two lawyers argue each side, would you not give them all the available evidence? Of course you would let them examine all the evidence. Timothy did not have that opportunity in the first century...but we do. Unfortunately, the young earth proponents want you to ignore the evidence, and go strictly on God’s Word. However, since God created the earth, His creation also testifies to its own age. This is what Dr. Ross and old earth creationists do...they consider the evidence which God created, in addition to His written word...there is no crime in that, it’s just good common sense.

Young earth creationists know this, so they try to show that the creation gives evidence that it is young. However, this is where they fail miserably, because it does not. This is why they are scoffed at by the scientific community, as they come up with shaky theories to show the earth is young.

Just because Timothy would view the earth is young, does not mean that we have to. Fortunately, God has given us each a free will, and we can look at the evidence and choose for ourselves what the answer is.

The 67th Book? (page 41)

Does Dr. Ross unfairly and unjustly equate the creation as the 67th book of Scripture? The young earth author gets wrapped up in this simple statement from Dr. Ross, when in fact, he is reading way too much into the statement that is not there! If you look closely at Dr. Ross’ statement, he says it “may be likened” the 67th book. Dr. Ross does not believe that the general revelation of nature is infallible. He knows that science is not perfect...that is why we must study it closely to determine the facts.

What is the real reason that young earth creationists are upset by this 67th book statement? It is simply this...if you look at the evidences from nature, you would

conclude, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that the earth is old. Dr. Ross embraces science and its conclusions. For young earthers, acceptance of science would mean the end of their cause. Therefore, they discard nature and its conclusions, and any notion that it equates to revelation from God, because it is contrary to their point of view. In short, discarding nature is a cop-out on their part to ignore the evidence that is contrary to their cause.

Of course they will tell you that they don't ignore nature, that they look at it closely, and that it supports their cause. They claim that true science, when applied to the earth, will testify that it is only 6,000 years old. However, this is using their definition of science, which less than 0.1% of scientists believe in¹. I encourage you, as a believer, to examine the evidence independent of young earth claims. Put the earth on trial, to determine its age.

The Big Bang and Hermeneutics (page 47)

The claim here is that Ross was brainwashed with the Big Bang theory, thus he was predisposed to believe in the old age of the earth. Sarfati goes so far to say that he was "already brainwashed into the 'facts' of science like the 'big bang.'" Brainwashing happens when a cult, or some other minority faction, trains you to believe in their ideals. Sarfati is actually claiming that over 99.9 percent of all scientists are "brainwashed" into believing the wrong theory. I think he has the story backwards. It is obviously the young earth scientists that are brainwashed, and they attempt to keep their followers in this condition as well.

Why are the young earth organizations always on the offensive, always trying to argue their point? To keep their followers true to their brainwashed lies. The old earth people (the other 99.9 percent of people) do not have to do this public education effort on a constant basis...they are not trying to brainwash anyone. Everyone is free to make up their own minds. I ask you, who appears to be brainwashed?

Magisterial vs. Ministerial (page 49)

The author goes to great lengths here to explain something that is very simple. He points out that ministerial means that scripture is the ultimate authority, and magisterial means that science/nature takes authority over scripture, and then goes on to claim that old earth creationists are magisterial in their approach to scripture. The author appeals to Article XII of the Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy, saying that old earthers violated this article which they signed. Sarfati fails to flesh out this claim, instead leaving the reader to accept his conclusion at face value. In fact, we have no problems with this Article, and can believe in an old earth and an inerrant Bible. The statement says "We further deny that scientific hypothesis about earth history may properly be used to overturn the teaching of Scripture on creation and the flood." Old earth creationism does not overturn the teaching of Scripture, it is simply an alternative interpretation to young earth creationism. The scriptures about creation and the flood are still intact and inerrant.

Sarfati goes on to list many scholars who appear to have let science overturn scripture, in an apparent attempt to drill into the reader the faulty notion that old earth creationists

have let science have magisterial authority over Scripture. It doesn't matter how many examples he gives...old earth creationism is still merely an alternate interpretation, not in contradiction to Scripture. Sarfati and his colleagues don't like it because it's contrary to their young earth viewpoint, and they think it's the wrong conclusion. It's not wrong, it's just different.

Scientific Discoveries (page 58)

Sarfati blasts Ross for reinterpreting Scripture based on science. Again, I go back to the idea of a trial. When new evidence surfaces about someone's guilt, the jury is obligated to consider this evidence, and "reinterpret" the person's guilt. God encourages the believer to investigate the Bible and come to their own conclusions (Acts 17:11). Since when is reinterpreting the Bible a crime? Apparently, when it contradicts with the conclusions of young earth creationism! Ross is doing exactly what he should do, "rightly handling the word of truth."

General and Special Revelation (page 59)

This section is a hammering home of Sarfati's claim that Ross believes nature is the 67th book of the Bible. Ross understands that nature is not perfect, because it is dependent upon the scientific interpretation of humans. Just because it is interpreted by humans does not mean we should ignore it. It merely means you have to be careful in interpreting it. There is really nothing new here, just more rhetoric to drive home his mistaken point that Ross thinks science is more important than Scripture.

Science: A Result of Creationist Theology (page 63)

Not much important here, but one interesting item is the statement about Genesis 1:28, which Sarfati says "gives us permission (and by implication even commands us) to investigate creation." Investigating creation is exactly what Ross does. I guess if you are a young earth creationist, you are forbidden from reinterpreting creation based on your investigations...so why investigate at all?

Origin and Operation Science (page 64)

This whole section supports the "Were you there?" notion. Ross explains (and Sarfati tries to condemn him for it) that astronomers do deal in the past, and are examining the creation at a younger age. I personally like to turn this question around, and ask it of the young earthers. Sarfati, were you there? No, he wasn't. He also must rely upon the scriptures and nature, just as Ross does, which leads us back to the truth of the matter once again...old earth creationism is not wrong, it is merely an alternate interpretation of the same data.

Conclusion

Sarfati gives no credible evidences against Ross. His only argument is vile rhetoric, which to the followers of young earth creationism, is music to their ears, but to the open minded believers, and non-believers of the world, marks them as radical, brainwashed followers of a false theory. In the end, all they have to rely upon are empty words.

In reality, I personally support them in their desire to believe in a young earth. The important matter is that they have Jesus. The age of the creation is insignificant when compared to salvation. Praise the Lord that many have come to Christ through young earth ministries. May they continue to save souls for Him. However, there is no need for them to criticize fellow believers who are old earth creationists. With this book, they have sunken to new lows, and sacrificed the brotherly love they are supposed to have for fellow believers, in order to blindly follow their young earth theory that doesn't even matter when it comes to salvation. We need to continually pray for their reconciling with the rest of the church.

¹ There are 65 scientists listed on ICR's list of young earth scientists (sure, this is not a complete listing of all who are young-earthers). It is difficult to locate a complete number of scientists, so let's limit our numbers to geologists. ICR lists 12 people that are in Geology or related fields. By comparison the Geological Society of America has over 17,000 members (keep in mind that not all geologists are members, just like not all young earth geologists are listed by ICR). That equates to 12 young earth geologists and 16,988 old earth geologists, or .0007 percent. This is by no means a scientific determination, but you get the point.

Chapter 2 – The Days of Creation

This chapter boils down to the meaning of YOM, the Hebrew word used for Day. For an extended discussion, see my article Word Study: Yom (www.answersincreation.org/word_study_yom.htm). Here I will present a short synopsis, and will not address all of Sarfati's claims.

First, one must understand that the Hebrew language is not nearly as diverse as our English language. Whereas we have over 500,000 words in the Oxford English Dictionary, the Hebrew source for the Old Testament only consists of slightly less than 8,700 words...and many of these could be considered duplicates with only slight differences. Thus, words which contain multiple meanings are common. Such is the case with the word Yom.

Hebrew Dictionaries

Let's start with the meanings from Hebrew dictionaries.

The Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament (1980, Moody Press)

"It can denote: 1. the period of light (as contrasted with the period of darkness), 2. the period of twenty-four hours, 3. a general vague "time," 4. a point of time, 5. a year (in the plural; I Sam 27:7; Ex 13:10, etc.)."

Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible (symbols omitted)

from an unused root meaning to be hot; a day (as the warm hours), whether literal (from sunrise to sunset, or from one sunset to the next), or figuratively (a space of time defined by an associated term), [often used adv.]:--age, + always, + chronicles, continually (-ance), daily, ([birth-], each, to) day, (now a, two) days (agone), + elder, end, evening, (for)ever(last), ever(more), full, life, as long as (...live), even now, old, outlived, perpetually, presently, remaineth, required, season, since, space, then, (process of) time, as at other times, in trouble, weather (as) when, (a, the, within a) while (that), whole (age), (full) year (-ly), younger

As you can see, Hebrew dictionaries attest to the fact that the word Yom is used for anywhere from 12 hours up to a year, and even a vague "time period" of unspecified length.

Other Uses of Yom

Day is not the only translation for the word Yom. Here are some other uses. This is abbreviated here. For a more complete listing, see the YOM word study.

Time

It is interesting to note that in 67 verses in the Old Testament, the word Yom is translated into the English word "time." For instance, in Genesis 4:3, it says "*And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord.*" In this instance, Yom refers to a growing season, probably several months. Again, in Deuteronomy 10:10, it refers to a "time" equal to forty days. In I Kings 11:42, it says "*And the time that Solomon reigned in Jerusalem over all Israel was forty years.*" In this case, Yom translated as the word "time" is equivalent to a 40 year period.

In Isaiah 30:8, it says "*Now go, write it before them in a table, and note it in a book, that it may be for the time to come for ever and ever.*" In this case, Yom is equal to "forever." How long is forever? An infinite number of years...billions upon billions upon billions of years. If Yom can equal trillions of years here, then why not billions of years in Genesis?

Year

Four times in the Old Testament Yom is translated "year." In I Kings 1:1, "*David was old and stricken in years...*" In 2 Chronicles 21:19, "*after the end of two years*" and in the very next verse "*Thirty and two years old.*" Finally, in Amos 4:4, "*...and your tithes after three years.*" In each case, Yom represents years, not days.

Ever

Ever is used to represent a long period of time, such as in Deuteronomy 19:9, "*to walk ever in his ways.*" Nineteen times Yom is translated "ever." The old testament uses "for ever" instead of the word forever. In sixteen cases of use of the word ever, for is placed before it, indicating an infinite period of time. I will not list them all (consult Strong's Concordance for a full listing) but here is an example. In Psalm 23:6, it says "*Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.*" Here Yom is translated as the final word of this verse, *ever*. Thus, Yom in this verse, and 16 others, represents eternity.

Word Usage in the Old Testament

As you can see, Yom is used in a wide variety of situations related to the concept of time. Yom is not just for days...it is for time in general. How it is translated depends on the context of its use with other words.

Yom in the Creation Account

Even within the creation account, Yom is used to represent four different time periods.

1. Genesis 1:5 "*And God called the light Day, and the darkness He called Night.*" Here, Moses uses Yom to indicate a 12-hour period
2. Genesis 1:14 "*And God said, "Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night, and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years."* Here, Moses uses Yom to indicate 24-hour days
3. Genesis 2:4 "*...in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens.*" Here, Moses uses Yom to indicate the entire creative week.

The fourth usage of Yom in the creation account is in the summary for each of the six creation days, "and there was morning and evening the first day". Yom is used to represent a finite, long period of time, usually either millions or billions of years. To show support for this, consider the uses of Yom by Moses.

Moses Other Uses of Yom

Moses, the author of the first five books of the Bible, and of Psalm 90, used Yom in many different ways.

1. Genesis 4:3 "*And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord.*" In this instance, Yom refers to a growing season, probably several months.
2. Genesis 43:9 "*...then let me bear the blame for ever.*" Here, Moses uses Yom to represent eternity
3. Genesis 44:32 "*...then I shall bear the blame to my father for ever.*" Again, Moses uses Yom to represent eternity
4. Deuteronomy 4:40 "*...that thou mayest prolong thy days upon the earth, which the Lord thy God giveth thee, for ever.*" Here Yom represents a lifetime or eternity
5. Deuteronomy 10:10, "*Now I stayed on the mountain forty days and nights, as I did the first time,...*" Here, Yom is a "time" equal to forty days.
6. Deuteronomy 18:5 "*...to stand to minister in the name of the Lord, him and his sons for ever.*" Again, Yom is translated as eternity
7. Deuteronomy 19:9 "*...to love the Lord thy God, and to walk ever in His ways...*" Here, Yom represents a lifetime. As long as we live we are to walk in his ways

As you can see, Moses used the word Yom to represent 12-hours, 24 hours, the creative week, forty days, several months, a lifetime, and eternity.

Common Young Earth Arguments Used by Sarfati

Sarfati uses the standard young earth arguments. To get around the obvious conclusion that Yom in Genesis 1 can mean millions of years, young earth theorists create Hebrew rules of interpretation, none of which is supported by common Hebrew grammatical rules according to Hebrew experts (such as Dr. Walter Kaiser). These rules were created by Hebrew language experts who are young earth creationists to begin with, thus their viewpoint is obviously biased. They have a specific agenda they are trying to prove, and thus cannot be objective.

Ordinals/Cardinals (Pages 73-79)

Young earth creationists say that whenever Yom is used with an ordinal or cardinal number (1st, 2nd, 1,2, etc) that it always represents a 24 hour day. However, this is not true. 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>).

Sarfati addresses the verses in Zechariah and Hosea. Although his argument sounds impressive, you have to recognize it for what it is...he is arguing for his young earth agenda, thus any rules that he espouses must be examined by true Hebrew scholars who are impartial. Hebrew scholars do not recognize this fabricated rule.¹

What Sarfati thinks is not important...what is important, as Dr. Walter Kaiser points out,¹ is the intentions of the author. We should not create rules that support our own agendas, but should strive to understand the author's intended meaning.

Evening/Morning Construction (Pages 89-90) and Days and Nights on Days 1-3 (Pages 84-86)

In Genesis 1 Moses says "and there was evening and morning the xx day". Does the use of evening and morning indicate a sunrise and sunset for each creative day? First, let's look at what evening and morning are not. They are not actual evening and mornings, as this requires a sunrise and sunset. According to young earth theory, the Sun was not created until Day Four, thus there could be no sunrise or sunset for the first three days of creation. However, God uses the terms evening and morning for those first three days. Therefore, they cannot be actual evenings and mornings.

We are left with only one option. The words for Evening and Morning can only represent the beginning and ending of the creative period, and not actual sunrise and sunsets. Scripture itself sets this pattern for us. Morning and evening are used figuratively in Psalm 30:5, Psalm 49:14-15, and Psalm 90:6. Thus, the evening and morning of creation can mean the start and end of the creative process that is attributed to that creation period.

Young earth advocates counter that traditionally, church fathers have always held that sunrise and sunsets do not constitute a day, and they accepted the sun creation on Day Four with no hint of the first three days being anything other than 24-hour days. For instance, Sarfati in *Refuting Compromise* mentions Luther and Calvin (page 84-86). However, Luther and Calvin did not have the means of modern science at their disposal. At the time, geocentricity was still accepted! Don't fall into the trap of following the teachings of our church fathers. For more, read [Church Fathers \(www.answersincreation.org/churchfathers.htm\)](http://www.answersincreation.org/churchfathers.htm).

If God's Creation Was Billions of Years Old...

If God's creation was billions of years old, how would He have written the creation account in Genesis? One thing is certain...God is good at telling us exactly what we need to know.

When God refers to a large number, He uses picture stories, such as Abraham's descendants being as numerous as the sand. Why does He do this? If God had said, "You will have millions of descendants," Abraham would have asked, "What is a million?"

When considering the creation, if we broke it down into days, that would be 5,000,500,000,000 days, or roughly 13.7 billion years. Do we need an account for each day of creation...of course not. God in His infinite wisdom, saw fit to tell us the creation story by breaking it down into creative segments, each of which was attributed to a specific creative act or acts. We need to give the early Hebrews of Genesis a break...they didn't have calculators like we do!

One must also consider that time with God has no meaning. To Him, 10 billion years is like a day. Thus, it is no problem for God to put billions of years into one of His days. Dr. Hugh Ross puts it best in his determination that the frame of reference for creation is the surface of the earth. Genesis 1:2 puts the witness of creation on the surface. But who is witnessing these events? It is God himself. During the first 5.99 days of creation, God is the only one present. Thus, human time does not matter...no humans were there to

witness the passage of time. What matters is how God sees time! Thus, a billion year day is only a passing moment in God's eyes.

The creation account is written in such a manner for all people to understand it. The issue is not how long creation took...the issue is that God did it, and that's all that matters in the end.

Conclusion

With such a wide usage of the word Yom for many different time periods, it cannot be claimed that Yom in the Old Testament only represents a 24-hour period. During the creation account alone, Yom represents four different time periods. Rules of Hebrew, created by young earth Hebrew scholars, are invalid. Because of their biased position, they are trying to prove their own agenda.

Since humans did not witness creation, our own concept of a 24-hour day does not apply. The only thing that matters is God's concept of time. Thus, the only evidence we have to accurately assess the age of creation is the creation itself. Since the rocks and stars say we are billions of years old, that must be the truth. This fits perfectly with a literal interpretation of Genesis, and an inerrant Bible, and does not impact any other Biblical doctrines.

¹ Television Show and Transcript, "Are the Genesis Creation Days 24 Hours or Long Periods of Time," The John Ankerberg Show, 2005.

Chapter 3

The History of Interpretation of Genesis 1-11

When you look at the explanations given by Dr. Sarfati, he appears to blast holes in all of Dr. Ross' explanations of church fathers who believed in an old earth. In fact, both sides of the creation debate take liberties in order to prove their point. Let's look at the section about Augustine (pages 118-119).

On pages 118-119 Sarfati quotes Augustine's *City of God*, note 29 is from book 12, chapter 10. When you read the context of the quote you find out that Augustine is speaking not about the age of the earth, but about the history of mankind. Note 31 is also from book 12, but is chapter 11, the very beginning of chapter 12, and a portion of chapter 13 (note the triple periods at the end of the paragraphs, indicating there is other text in between, showing that Sarfati has compiled the text that is most desirable to reach his own conclusions and omitted the rest). The problem again is that Augustine is speaking about the history of mankind, not the age of the earth. Sarfati stops his quotes before this would become obvious. Here is a more extensive quote (not the same translation):

As to those who are always asking why man was not created during these countless ages of the infinitely extended past, and came into being so lately that, according to Scripture, less than 6000 years have elapsed since He began to be, I would reply to them regarding the creation of man, just as I replied regarding the

origin of the world to those who will not believe that it is not eternal, but had a beginning, which even Plato himself most plainly declares, though some think his statement was not consistent with his real opinion. If it offends them that the time that has elapsed since the creation of man is so short, and his years so few according to our authorities, let them take this into consideration, that nothing that has a limit is long, and that all the ages of time being finite, are very little, or indeed nothing at all, when compared to the interminable eternity. Consequently, if there had elapsed since the creation of man, I do not say five or six, but even sixty or six hundred thousand years, or sixty times as many, or six hundred or six hundred thousand times as many, or this sum multiplied until it could no longer be expressed in numbers, the same question could still be put, Why was he not made before? For the past and boundless eternity during which God abstained from creating man is so great, that, compare it with what vast and untold number of ages you please, so long as there is a definite conclusion of this term of time, it is not even as if you compared the minutest drop of water with the ocean that everywhere flows around the globe.

The only quote I am aware of where Augustine does speak about the age of the earth seems open to Ross's progressive creation view, or even more, Collin's analogical view. Here is the full text of City of God , book 11, chapter 6 (the last line says it all):

THAT THE WORLD AND TIME HAD BOTH ONE BEGINNING, AND THE ONE DID NOT ANTICIPATE THE OTHER. *For if eternity and time are rightly distinguished by this, that time does not exist without some movement and transition, while in eternity there is no change, who does not see that there could have been no time had not some creature been made, which by some motion could give birth to change, — the various parts of which motion and change, as they cannot be simultaneous, succeed one another, — and thus, in these shorter or longer intervals of duration, time would begin? Since then, God, in whose eternity is no change at all, is the Creator and Ordainer of time, I do not see how He can be said to have created the world after spaces of time had elapsed, unless it be said that prior to the world there was some creature by whose movement time could pass. And if the sacred and infallible Scriptures say that in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth, in order that it may be understood that He had made nothing previously, — for if He had made anything before the rest, this thing would rather be said to have been made “in the beginning,” — then assuredly the world was made, not in time, but simultaneously with time. For that which is made in time is made both after and before some time, — after that which is past, before that which is future. But none could then be past, for there was no creature by whose movements its duration could be measured. But simultaneously with time the world was made, if in the world's creation change and motion were created, as seems evident from the order of the first six or seven days. For in these days the morning and evening are counted, until, on the sixth day, all things which God then made were finished, and on the seventh the rest of God was mysteriously and sublimely signaled. **What kind of days these were it***

is extremely difficult, or perhaps impossible for us to conceive, and how much more to say!

How many more liberties Sarfati took with the quotes of the church fathers is unclear. One thing is clear. When it comes to creation, you, the believer, have to make up your own mind. It doesn't matter what the Church Fathers of old have said (see my article [Church Fathers](http://www.answersincreation.org/churchfathers.htm) (www.answersincreation.org/churchfathers.htm)). With modern science, you know 100 times as much information as the Church Fathers did about the creation...you are in a much better position to decide than they were.

Chapter 4 – The Order of Creation

Dr. Sarfati makes an error in the first paragraph of this chapter. He states “Ross makes serious errors in exegesis in his attempt to try to make the Bible fit the evolutionary order.” Dr. Ross does not believe in evolution, so he could not be guilty of trying to make the Bible fit the evolutionary order. Young earth proponents have always tried this tactic of tying Dr. Ross to evolution. Despite the fact that it is clear Dr. Ross is not an evolutionist, they still label him as one.

If you accept the young earth model, this chapter will make perfect sense to you. If you want to understand the old earth model, this chapter is useless. This is a very short chapter that fails to make a very good effort in explaining the order of creation. Since Dr. Sarfati failed to adequately present the old earth theory, so that the reader could decide, I will have to present it here.

Old earth theory uses what I call Creation Overlap. Each day of creation overlaps the other days of creation. For instance, God started creating plants on Day Three, but he continued creating new plants right on up through the creation of Adam on Day Six. In other words, the days of creation are groupings of events, and not literal 24-hour days (that's not to say the Bible cannot be taken literally. "Day" in Genesis 1 can mean a long period of time).

The claim that the creation of plants on Day Three being contrary to the fossil record is false. The first organisms in the fossil record are simple single cell algae, a plant. There was not a lot of plant creation until after animal creation started in earnest, but the important point is that it was started.

If you are a theistic evolutionist, this works great. God started the process of evolution, and let it develop from the algae. All throughout the evolution process, God was there overseeing the development of life.

If you are a progressive creationist, it also works great. God developed the first algae, and then moved on to other creative works, without evolution. Each species was a unique creation. Although God started creating plants on Day Three, we see new plants appear in the fossil record after the creation of the first animals, so Day Three overlaps days four, five, and six.

This interpretation presents no problems from the standpoint of Biblical interpretation, including proper use of the Hebrew text. One does not even have to consider Dr. Ross'

explanations concerning the order of creation, although they are basically the same model, just explained differently.

Fourth Day Creation of Sun Undermines Day-Age Views

Not true...unless you are a young earth believer. Sarfati does not go into enough detail about this topic. Ross does an excellent job in his book *Creation and Time*, explaining about how this topic can be resolved based on the point of reference of the observer. Sarfati also fails to answer/address the young earth problem...if plants were created on Day Three, how could they grow without the sun, which was created on Day Four?

Leading Day-Ager Concedes Defeat

Concerning the alleged scheme about light not reaching the surface of the earth until day four because the atmosphere had thinned enough to see the sun...this is the standard accepted model for planetary development, so he is saying 99.9 percent of all astronomers are wrong.

It is no problem to find former old earth believers who are now young-earthers. Keep in mind that most people are erroneously taught young earth theory when they are young, before they become old earth believers. It is not hard to imagine that it is difficult for some people who are raised in young earth thought to totally shed the bonds of this indoctrination. It is equally easy (easier, in fact) to find former young-earthers who are now old-earthers (see www.answersincreation.org/testimony.htm). Finding someone who switched sides does nothing to support your side.

In summary, the order of creation presents no problems for old earth belief, although Dr. Sarfati would have you think so. It also presents no problems for young earth belief...so choose what you will, it doesn't matter so long as you are a Christian.

Chapter 5 – The Big Bang and Astronomy

Not being an astronomer, for this topic I defer to Dr. Hugh Ross, Dr. Stephen Hawking, and others.

For a general discussion of the Big Bang, from a scientist that has nothing to prove from a religious viewpoint, and is thus impartial, I would read the book *The Universe In A Nutshell*, by Dr. Stephen Hawking.

For a discussion of the Big Bang from a religious standpoint, we turn to Dr. Ross.

[Big Bang: The Bible Taught It First](http://www.reasons.org/resources/fff/2000issue03/index.shtml#big_bang_the_bible_taught_it_first)

http://www.reasons.org/resources/fff/2000issue03/index.shtml#big_bang_the_bible_taught_it_first

[Facing Up to Big Bang Challenges](http://www.reasons.org/resources/fff/2001issue05/index.shtml#big_bang_challenges)

http://www.reasons.org/resources/fff/2001issue05/index.shtml#big_bang_challenges

There are a growing number of scientists who see Intelligent Design in the Big Bang, and the evidence supporting the Big Bang gets stronger every day. In fact, to accept the

Big Bang, one must accept that there was a creator, because there was an obvious beginning. In this respect, the Big Bang is much better evidence of a creator than young earth creationism. To read some other articles in support of the Big Bang, check out our [Astromony](http://www.answersincreation.org/astromony.htm) page (www.answersincreation.org/astromony.htm).

I love the t-shirts that say “I believe in the Big Bang...God said it, and “Bang,” there it was.” This could be equally true for the old earth creationist as well as the young!

Chapter 6 – The Origin of Death and Suffering

When you boil the issue of old earth/young earth down to its roots, the topic of death is at the basis of young earth objections. If it were not for this, there would be no problems with old earth belief. They feel this way because they misinterpret key verses in the Bible.

Creation Was Very Good (page 195)

Yes, it was very good, even with death and suffering in the animal kingdom before Adam’s fall. God’s creation was “perfect.” It was a perfectly functioning ecosystem, self-renewing in its ability to sustain itself. If it were going to survive, it would have to be self-renewing. The cycle of life, where an animal dies, it decays, nourishes the plants, which are eaten by the plant eaters, who are eaten by the carnivores, is a perfect circle of life. This system does not contain evil. Unfortunately, the young earth proponents equate evil with death and suffering. The two are not related. I agree with Dr. Sarfati, there was no actual evil in the finished creation.

Adam’s Sin Just Brought Spiritual Death? (page 201)

Yes, it did just bring spiritual death. Contrary to Dr. Sarfati and his arguments, none of which disprove this, Adam’s fall only brought the penalty of spiritual separation from God. The proof is in the account of the fall, and, more importantly, God’s instruction to Adam and Eve.

Consider Genesis 3:2-4,

And the woman said unto the serpent, “We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden, but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.” And the serpent said unto the woman, “Ye shall surely not die.”

In this matter, Satan knew Eve would not die physically. How did Eve know what death was? In the perfect young-earth world, there was no death, so how was she to know what death meant? She obviously thought it meant physical death. Without experiencing death in some capacity, this threat from God would have been empty. If

Eve did not know about death, she could not fear it, thus she would have no reason to obey.

Now, consider God's instruction to Adam and Eve in Genesis 2:17.

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.

Did Adam and Eve physically die after eating the fruit? No, they did not. What changed after they ate the fruit? They lost their place of fellowship with God in the Garden of Eden. They became spiritually dead...but they did not die physically. If God's word is true, and you use a plain, straightforward interpretation of this verse, then the only way the young earth believer can interpret this verse is that Adam and Eve would have to physically die the same day they ate the fruit. Since they did not, then God must have meant spiritual death only.

The Actual Curse (page 202)

Dr. Sarfati reads something into the curse that is not there. The curse in Genesis 3:19 says,

In the sweat of your face you shall eat bread till you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; you are dust, and to dust you shall return.

Yes, Adam will die, but there is no indication that this physical death is part of the curse. He will certainly sweat, and toil with the ground to raise crops so he can eat, whereas before, in the Garden, his job was light tending of the Garden. In the second part God states simple fact. If God had said, "Because of your sin, you will physically die," then it would be a clear-cut case for the curse containing physical death. As the wording is, God is merely saying he will die. We are given no indication that this death is new.

Was Immortality Part of Adam's Original State ? (page 202)

It doesn't matter. If he was immortal...great. If not...great. Has nothing to do with the previous 4.5 billion years of earth history.

What Did the Fall Change? (page 203)

Dr. Sarfati claims "To Ross, all the Fall did was to make bad things worse." Not true at all. The Fall caused spiritual death, thus the need for Jesus Christ. Does Dr. Sarfati not think separation from God is bad?

Yes, Dr. Ross has a tendency to elaborate, and try to draw things out of the Bible text that may not be there (in this respect, he is much like the young earth creationists). Sarfati proceeds to tear into Ross' explanation of work in the Garden, and submission of the creation. The work in the Garden is not important. What is important is spiritual death. The work that Adam did in the Garden pales to the significance of spiritual death

and the need of everyone to have salvation in Jesus. The work in the Garden is a side issue with no importance, no matter what Ross and Sarfati claim.

Commentators on Sin-Death Causality (page 204)

Yes, it's possible to find Church Fathers who we all hold in high esteem, and who believe our particular position. The bottom line is...you have to make up your own mind, don't let some church father who has been dead for hundreds of years make it up for you (see Church Fathers, www.answersincreation.org/churchfathers.htm).

What Was Subject to Death? (page 205)

This section gives nothing new. It appeals to several past church fathers (Calvin, Wesley) to show that there was no death before sin. There is no solid scriptural evidence presented.

Vegetarian Diets in the Creation (page 206)

First, one point of contention. Sarfati appeals to Genesis 1:29-30, especially the statement "I have given every green plant for food." From this, he "adds to the Bible," saying that it teaches that vegetarianism was a worldwide phenomenon. It says no such thing...it is merely inferred from the passage. Yes, in combination with Genesis 9:3, I believe that mankind up until Noah were probably vegetarians. However, keep in mind this instruction that God gives Adam is for Adam himself and the human race...nowhere does it say that animals do not eat other animals. Without death, the ecosystem would not survive, because the food chain, which continually recycles itself through death, must have decay in order to survive. It is a perfect system, self-renewing. No decay (death), no renewing, hence imperfection.

With that said, **we must differentiate between the Garden of Eden and the Creation.** The creation event occurred from about 14.5 billion years ago, up through the creation of Adam, about 6,000-29,000 years ago. At the end of the creation, we have the Garden of Eden. Was there death and killing in the Garden of Eden? I do not believe so. Was there death and killing prior to the Garden of Eden...yes there was, the fossil evidence is unmistakable.

You may be saying, "What about your functioning ecosystem?" We also must remember that the Garden was a special place, where man and God fellowshiped together. Supernatural forces were in place here, apparently preventing the animals from following their instinct to kill and eat. Also, keep in mind this is the Garden...what is happening outside the Garden of Eden, in the other 99.99 percent of the world? Is it life as usual in the animal kingdom, with killing? We don't know. What would have happened if Adam had not sinned...suppose the human race multiplied, without sin, and outgrew the Garden? When they exited the Garden, would they then have seen death in the animal kingdom? Very interesting questions...ones that we will never know the answer to. Does it matter? No, because your salvation in Jesus is the only thing that counts. You may believe whatever you want about the creation.

In the Restoration (page 208)

This is restoration to the ideal life as depicted in the Garden of Eden, which happened after the creation. God is not restoring the world to what it was like “during” the creation.

Carnivory and Disease (page 211)

Carnivorous activity has always been a problem for the young earther. Dr. Sarfati explains it with three factors. The third is especially interesting. “God foreknew the Fall, so He programmed creatures with the information for attack and defense features, which they would need in a cursed world. This information was “switched on” at the Fall.” If you will recall, only Adam, Eve, and the serpent were cursed...not the animal kingdom. Why would they be “switched on” at this point?

Young earthers have long held that these preprogrammed genetic traits are responsible for the growing of fangs, claws, etc, after the fall. The vegetarian statement by God was in effect until after Noah, when He granted to Noah the right to eat meat. Were animals carnivorous between the Fall and the Flood?

According to the young earth model, they were not...yet young earthers claim these attack and defense structures developed after the Fall. Remember, only the serpent was cursed...the animal kingdom was not cursed. Not until Genesis 9:2, is the animal kingdom changed.

Did Adam ever eat meat? According to the young earther, the answer is no. One clue we have is in Genesis 4:4, with Abel’s offering to God,

And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof.

God has instructed us to give of the “first fruits” of our produce. For Abel, this was sheep, and the fat thereof (the Hebrew word is Chêleb, the richest or choice part, finest part). If Abel was giving of his produce, and he gave fat, then Adam and his family must have killed sheep. Did they kill a sheep only for the fat...it’s possible. Could they have eaten sheep? It’s also possible. But then, what about God’s instruction to Noah in Genesis 9:3?

Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things.

Apparently before the Flood, mankind may have been allowed to eat certain animals. After the Flood, he could choose any animal to eat. Is this true...I don’t know. It makes for something to ponder. Does it matter what you believe? Not at all.

Pathogens and Creation (page 212)

So where did disease come from? Was it introduced after the Fall? No clue is given in the Bible, so both old and young earth believers can only speculate.

Thermodynamics and the Fall (page 213)

This is one of those things with evidence which supports both old and young earth positions. Choose which you want, it doesn't matter.

Redemption (page 214)

Finally, something truly important in this book. Redemption through Christ can be supported with either a young or old earth. In this section and the ones that follow, Sarfati attempts to show that a young earth supports it more. Does this mean that young earth believers are "twice as saved" as old earthers? Again, it makes no difference whether you believe old or young.

Death of Darwin's Daughter (page 218)

Darwin used the death of his daughter Annie to fortify his loss of faith in God. This is unfortunate, but it was his choice. Equally important is that I can point to examples today of Christians, in the same situation, whose faith is strengthened by the loss of a loved one. What Darwin chose was a personal choice, and has no bearing on the creation.

The Apostasy of Charles Templeton (page 219)

Sir David Attenborough (page 221)

Carl Sagan (page 222)

I'm sure that Dr. Sarfati could come up with many more names of famous people. It would be equally easy to come up with a list of young-earthers who became old-earthers, old-earthers who became young earthers, or whatever else you want to prove. These people made a personal choice to be the way they were...evolution, old earth progressive creationism, or any other factor are not to blame for their choices. Dr. Hugh Ross, when presented with the same evidences, has chosen to follow God. So has Dr. Fuz Rana, myself, and many other old earth creationists.

Bizarre Arguments (page 222)

No problem...throw these out, they are insignificant compared to other arguments Ross makes which are valid. You can just as easily go to young earth websites and pull up "bizarre arguments" (just read my Articles section for proof).

Conclusion

There is no problem with death before the Fall and proper Biblical interpretation, all the while maintaining an inerrant Bible. Choose to believe either position...it doesn't matter. What matters is that you have salvation in Jesus Christ.

Chapter 7 – The Created Kinds

You may skip this chapter if you wish, because it is really a side issue to the main debate. Both Ross and YECs argue against evolution. Ross has made claims that YECs believe in evolution because of their need for rapid speciation after the flood. This chapter seeks to rebut these claims and other minor ones. I will only touch on a few matters.

Young earth creationists must on the one hand provide a rebuttal against evolution, and then turn around, and with the other hand, claim that the Bible and their model supports rapid speciation after the Flood. Why is rapid speciation necessary? They have to limit the number of animals on the ark, or else the ark would be overfilled with all of today's species. So, on the one hand, they have to deny evolution, but on the other hand, they have to embrace some of evolution's principles.

They get away with this by claiming that no new genetic material was introduced by this speciation. It's a nice job of manipulating the theory of evolution.

The Biblical Model Predicts Rapid Speciation (page 235)

Or so Sarfati claims. What is his evidence that the Bible predicts rapid speciation? It is this sentence...

The biblical creation/Fall/Flood/dispersion model would also predict rapid formation of new varieties and even species. This is because all the modern varieties of land vertebrates must have descended from comparatively few animals that disembarked from the ark only 4,500 years ago.

That's it! That's all the evidence he gives to support this claim! Sarfati does in the following section (Examples and Mechanisms of Speciation) give a few minor examples of fish and insects, but nothing related to mammals.

This section gives us a glimpse of how the young earth creationist does science. By stating the biblical model predicts it by supposing that all animals descended from those on the ark, Sarfati (and others) have already reached the conclusion that rapid speciation occurs, before they ever look at the scientific evidence. A true scientist makes an observation, then formulates theories based on that observation. A creation scientist first formulates the theory (the earth is young), and then he looks for observations to prove his theory. This is backwards from the definition of a scientist. As such, you can't call a young earth creationist a scientist, since they don't follow scientific principles. They are best called "creation theorists."

Chapter 8 – The Global Flood and Noah’s Ark

Unfortunately, unless you have an open mind, you will not agree with me here. So I urge you to be open to new ideas about Noah’s Flood. This is against everything that the leaders of the young earth movement say...they don’t want you to listen to what they think is heresy, so they teach their followers to ignore it without seriously considering the evidence.

Because both sides of the debate like to pull text out of context from the other side, the only way to get a fair viewing of this subject is to read one of Ross’ books. If, however, you are a tried and true young earther, you have been taught that such books are heresy, and you avoid them like the plague. Unfortunately, you will never be able to discern whether you are right or wrong if you blindly accept the rantings of the young earth side without investigating the old earth side. The Bible encourages believers to investigate on their own...are you open minded enough to do so? (If so, get Dr. Ross’ books and read them).

With that said, there is so much negative comments in this chapter that it is hard to read without getting a little upset (I’m starting to doubt the sincerity of Sarfati’s salvation, since he so readily tears other Christians down).

Biblical Evidence (pages 241-243)

There is no problem with Ross’ interpretation. Think of it this way...the Bible is written from the standpoint of the human author...it is a history of the human race. The frame of reference is on the face of the earth, in the eyes of the humans. If God had said, “I’m going to send a flood in Mesopotamia to wipe out mankind” what would Noah and others have done? They would simply have moved! God told Noah exactly what he needed to hear...that God was going to wipe out everything. He could not have said anything different.

“All” was the only word that God could have used. By sparing the rest of the world, and only flooding Mesopotamia, was God lying? No...he did wipe out every living thing in the human world, which was contained in this geographic area. Remember, the Bible was written by humans (with the inspiration of the Holy Spirit). Everything that humans had touched was wiped out...the complete human world.

You say this is not the “straight-forward reading” as Sarfati alludes to on page 241. You’re right. But not all things are to be interpreted straight-forward...sometimes we have to think in order to reach the right conclusions. And, if you want to talk about straight-forward reading, then Genesis 2:17 invalidates the young earth creation science theory that there was no death before sin (see Chapter 6).

Concerning Sarfati’s listing of Other reasons on page 243...

Why did Noah have to build an Ark? Two reasons...first, it demonstrated his obedience and faith in something he could not see, and second, if Noah had simply moved away to avoid the flood, others would follow and also escape the flood

Why did God send every kind of animal into the ark? Did He? He sent every kind that was in that geographical area...all that were known to man. If God did not, Noah and others would have known they could simply move to avoid the flood

Why Birds? The same as above...all creatures known to exist in this geographic area had to be included.

How could waters rise/water seeks its own level. True, water does seek its own level. However, we are talking about a flood of biblical proportions. The hand of God is at work here, keeping the flood waters where they need to be. Just as God kept the waters of the Red Sea parted for Moses, so He also could keep these waters in place. (YECs criticize others for seeking natural explanations for biblical events, yet when it supports their cause, they are the first to bring up natural laws)

Partial Judgment. There was no partial judgment. The judgment of the flood affected all living humans.

God broke his promise. Has such a flood occurred again since the days of Noah? I'm typing this, so I guess not! A flood never again wiped out mankind the way Noah's Flood did. Perhaps the use of the term "local" is misleading. Yes, there are local floods, but they are not on the same scale as Noah's Flood.

Biblical words for the flood. If God had used a "local" word, Noah and the people would simply have moved away. Again, God told Noah exactly what he needed to hear

History of Interpretation About the Flood (page 243)

Here we go again...how did the church fathers view the flood. It's not the church fathers who are deciding this issue for you...you have to make up your own mind (see Creation Science Commentary: Church Fathers).

Evolutionary Geology Inspired Evolutionary Biology (page 248)

In other words, Ross looks at evidence from Geology. I'm glad he does. When considering the age of the earth, you would want to consider all the evidence before reaching a verdict. If you were on a murder jury, you would want to consider all the evidence before convicting the person of murder...it's the same principle.

YECs are taught to ignore the evidence from Geology (and Biology). No wonder it is so hard to teach them a proper understanding of God's creation...they ignore 99.9 percent of the evidence!

Ross's Arguments (pages 251-257)

Not much here other than differences of interpretation and opinion between the two sides. One important note is extra-biblical flood traditions (page 256). First, yes there are flood stories from all over the globe, just as you would expect...everyone descended from Noah and his family, so these stories would come from everyone all over the globe. Concerning Ross' claim about the flood stories varying the further you get away from Mesopotamia ...interesting, but doesn't affect the overall picture. If there is a pattern...great; if not...great.

As far as the ark providing a platform for Noah to preach from, Sarfati pulls this out of context. Yes, Noah can preach from it, and it would be an awesome platform, but it's not the only reason for the ark. Above all, it demonstrated Noah's obedience and faith.

Scientific Evidence for a Global Flood (pages 257-259)

My favorite subject...because there is none! In fact, this subject is so important to the young earth cause, that Sarfati devotes a whopping 3 pages to it (actually, 257 and 259 are half-pages, so two full pages...and almost half of it is illustrations).

He happens to choose one of my favorite young earth creation science arguments, the Coconino Sandstone (click this link to expose the problems with it).

Polystrate tree trunk (Figure 8.1)? Yes, catastrophic events do occur...the geologic record shows many examples of rapidly buried items...but it also shows many more examples of slow deposition. Do not be deceived by examples that YECs pull out of context.

In addition to my article on the Coconino Sandstone, check out these other articles which destroy the young earth creation science model.

Possible Mechanism for the Flood (page 259)

Catastrophic Plate Tectonics is a relatively new theory emerging over the last decade. It did not grow out of the evidence we see in the geologic record...it is a theory that came about because of the need to squeeze the geologic evidence into the young earth theory. It is a perfect example of young-earth theorists coming to a conclusion (the earth is young) before they examine the evidence.

Not even accepted by all young earthers, this theory is still a topic of debate in their circles. As with any theory, it could have happened with divine intervention, so there's no use in disputing it. One important fact...it is not supported in the geologic record...the YEC that devised it has only proved it could work through the use of a computer model...there is no empirical evidence from creation. (click here for the YEC materials).

Ross's Arguments Against the Flood (Page 263)

Sarfati resorts to a few swipes at Ross's claims which are not important for the bigger picture (they merely are meant to heap coals upon him). The meat of this section is the claims for the local floods which appear to have done much reworking of sediments, and they use this as an argument for the Global Flood.

I partly agree with Sarfati on page 264-5, where Ross claims that a flood of short duration typically does not leave a deposit substantial enough to identify later. It depends on the flood. Floods in a wide river plain would hardly leave any evidence. Floods in the locations of the examples given (Lake Missoula) would. It all depends upon the topography where the flood occurs and the size of the flood.

In the Mesopotamian Flood section, once again the young earthers look to natural explanations. Yes, the flood waters would naturally level out and drain out of the Mesopotamian basin. They do not consider the fact that Noah's Flood is supernatural,

with God's hand at work. As God held back the waters of the Red Sea when Moses parted it, so He could hold in the waters of this flood.

Misrepresentations of Noah's Ark Itself (page 270)

Sarfati appeals to a work by John Woodmorappe to put down the claims of Ross. Unfortunately for him, Woodmorappe's study contains a major flaw that invalidates it ([click here for more](#)). In short, he failed to account for one of the axis of motion when calculating the ark's seaworthiness (the ark could not merely have floated...it had to be seaworthy in a global flood). Unfortunately for young earth creationists, Woodmorappe's study supports the survivability of the ark during a local flood, not a global flood. Thank you for confirming our old earth beliefs!

Misrepresentations of Noah's Ark's Cargo (page 272)

Polar bears...not that important, as it can be argued adequately from both directions. Concerning fitting all the animals on board (page 274), please take note of the reasoning behind the YEC claims. They take the evidence (species), and boil it down to the "kinds of animals" argument. Essentially, they try to make all the species fit into the ark so that the young earth model will float. However, when an old earther tries this tactic (to make the evidence fit the facts of the Bible) they say we are compromising Scripture! What makes it right for young earth creationists and wrong for old earth creationists? Obviously the young earth creationists are living by a double standard.

In addition, Sarfati once again appeals to Woodmorappe's study, which also proves flawed in the area of space onboard the ark. He does not subtract the space inside the ark that is occupied by support beams, timbers, etc, which is probably at least 10 percent, if not more, of the total volume of the ark.

Caring for the Cargo (page 275)

Sarfati claims, "...it is definitely possible for eight people to have cared for, fed, watered, and removed daily waste from 16,000 animals – and still had time left over in the workday for other tasks. And all this is under low-tech, non-miraculous conditions." Let's look at the mathematics of this claim.

Each person would care daily for 2,000 animals. Assuming that Noah and his family slept 8 hours, and fed themselves for one hour, that leaves them 15 hours to care for the animals. Since nobody can work 15 hours straight, let's give them four 15 minute breaks, bringing them down to 14 hours. Subtract one more hour for "other tasks," bringing us to a total of 13 hours. There are 780 minutes in 13 hours. This equates to 23.4 seconds per animal. Does this seem feasible? You can imagine that just removing the waste alone would take up all your 23.4 seconds. Also keep in mind the fact that it was low-tech...there's no plumbing taking water to the various parts of the ship. You could probably carry water in a wheelbarrow or some other device, but every 5-10 animals, you would make a trip back to the water tanks, which would surely take several minutes.

Limits to the Earth's Biomass (page 277)

Sarfati shows that Ross states that biomass is limited by solar energy. Sarfati shows that it depends on temperature and moisture, thus apparently chiding Ross for getting it wrong. They are both the same thing! In areas of high temperature/low moisture, there is high solar energy. It all depends on your perspective (or, apparently, your old earth / young earth orientation). Sarfati is smart...he knows exactly how to twist the evidence to support his cause! (From his biography, he appears to be a genius...which is exactly the type of person you have to be cautious with...they can manipulate the information to suit their causes with ease...even though it may not be the truth.)

Yes, it's true that you can raise the biomass of a desert area by irrigation. This is also dependent upon your water source. You could, in the process, take water away from other areas, and decrease their biomass capability.

Global Flood Too Violent (page 278)

Sarfati dismisses this subject, saying it has already been answered by others. Unfortunately, it hasn't. This goes hand-in-hand with the mistaken belief that the ark would merely have to float, and not be seaworthy. Young earth scientists Baumgardner and Barnette, in an effort to prove the flood could erode/build the rock layers, showed that the flood produced currents of 194 mph (Patterns of Ocean Circulation Over the Continents During Noah's Flood). These currents were centered over the continental land masses. These currents would strip any vegetation, thus, no olive branch for the dove to return to the ark. The studies that Sarfati alludes to do not take this into consideration.

Vapor Canopy (page 278)

Even when Ross agrees with Sarfati, he still finds something to point out Ross's shortcomings!

Earth Would Still Be Ringing? (page 278)

I haven't a clue on this one...Dr. Ross will have to explain it when he sees fit to do so. (The reference is to The Genesis Question, page 149. I must have a different version (hardcover vs. paperback), because I can't find this item).

Fossil Species Numbers Exaggerated (page 279)

Dr. Ross errs on the high side, looking for the most favorable number to support his position. Sarfati, being a young earth creationist, does the same, but on the low side. Sarfati is correct in that we cannot know the exact number (something Ross would also say). This only goes to show that you will find numbers to support your position.

Dinosaurs on the Ark (page 281)

At last, one of my favorite subjects! Why? Because dinosaurs prove conclusively that the earth is old! More on that later.

Sarfati uses the standard young earth model of “kinds”, and argues for perhaps 55 pairs of dinosaurs, which are juveniles, in order to fit them on the ark. Sarfati does damage to his own credibility by comparing dinosaurs to cold-blooded reptiles, when ample scientific evidence says they were warm-blooded. That said, there may be truth in the theory that they kept growing until they died, but there is not enough evidence to support this one way or another.

Ross’ Bait and Switch (page 282)

Again, each side chooses numbers favorable to their side. However, Sarfati makes one claim that needs correcting. He says that God told Noah to take the land animals on the ark...correct. He then claims that marine animals did not need to be on the ark to be saved from a flood. This is only true if it were a local flood. A global flood would kill the marine lifeforms.

For proof, once again we turn to Baumgardner and Barnette’s study of ocean currents. During a global flood event, with ocean currents of 194 miles per hour, many marine lifeforms could not have survived. With the high velocities centered over the continents (and thus, over the shallow water continental shelves), shallow water dwellers would not have survived. The only relatively calm water would have been in the deep ocean basins. However, these waters would be so full of suspended silt and sand as to make life for the bottom-dwelling Trilobite, or any other animal, impossible.

The Ice Age (page 283)

Young earth creationists point to their being one single ice age. They use the argument that ancient ice age deposits can be interpreted as underwater turbidite flows. They claim this because this is the closest thing they can find that mimics the characteristics of glacial features. To be honest, they have found one ancient ice age deposit, which looks similar to a turbidite flow, and then made the assumption that all previous ice ages can be explained this way ([click here for more](#)).

Conclusion

Now that we have looked at this chapter, it is time to consider the evidence for dinosaurs and the Flood. By the young earth model, all the horizontal layers of rock in the Grand Canyon are laid down by the Flood (see the YEC book *Grand Canyon: Monument to Catastrophe*, Fig. 4.1). That’s over a mile of rock in the canyon alone. The problem lies not in the Canyon, but above it. The layers of rock which contain every dinosaur fossil in the world are stratigraphically above the Grand Canyon rocks. Therefore by the young earth model, the dinosaurs treaded water for a couple hundred days, until the waters subsided, then they began breeding, laying eggs, hatching, feeding, pooping, all in the span of a few days. Then, the waters had to rise again, and cover the

dinosaurs and kill them all (except for the ones on the ark). Why could they not simply tread water a few more days, and have survived the flood? The facts in the fossil record simply do not fit with a global flood and a young earth.

Another problem is with food supply. There was the “T-rex” kind, the “raptor” kind, and several other meat-eating dinosaurs on the ark. The young earth model stops after Noah departs the ark...but that is only the beginning! What did T-rex and the raptors eat after they departed the earth? It would have to be the other animals on the ark! Extinction would have come very quickly for the animals Noah saved. And this does not even consider the other carnivorous animals...lions, tigers, etc.

Finally, the issue of food brings to light another problem with Woodmorappe’s study of the ark. He does not take into account the fact that the ark would have to carry food for the animals for at least a year after they departed the ark. During the flood, the 156+ mile per hour currents would strip the land of all vegetation, deposit new layers of rock, and leave the land completely desolate. There would be no food for the animals to eat after they got off the ark. It is interesting that the dove Noah sent out came back with a olive leaf. Using the young earth model, no tree would have survived to yield this leaf! However, in the old earth local flood model, the leaf would be easy to come by...there would be no animal food shortage...there would be no dinosaur problem...in fact, there are no problems at all!

Chapter 9 – The History of Mankind

Pages 287-297

Not much of relevance is presented here. Sarfati discusses the original Hebrew text, and goes into length about gaps in the genealogies. There are demonstrable gaps in the genealogies of the Bible. This does not mean that all genealogies have gaps, though. It is significant to note that Ross needs 250 missing generations to cover about 10,000 years. Since he claims the creation of Adam would possibly be up to 60,000 years ago, this would equate to roughly 14,000 missing generation from the genealogies. If this is true, then consider this...if God had chosen to include all these generations in the Bible, with their histories, the Bible would probably be at least twice as thick! God chose relevant stories to show the history of mankind. We did not need to know about everyone that lived in the Old Testament before (or after) the flood. What is important is that the Bible clearly lays out God’s plan of redemption, and shows the difference between the time after Christ (New Testament) and before Christ (Old Testament). Adding the history of an extra 14,000 people would have done little to clarify His plan, or mankind’s journey through time. We have everything we need to know in the Bible.

Jesus and the Age of the World (page 297)

Sarfati says that the old earth timeline “puts people at the ‘end’ of creation, almost as an afterthought.” Need I mention that even in the young earth creation science model, man was the last creation, just like in the old earth model...what’s the difference? None. Sarfati then mentions yet another evolutionist claim. The theme of evolution and Ross is

woven in this book, despite the fact that Ross does not believe in evolution. However, it provides a simple, effective way for Sarfati to show Ross in a bad light.

Next, Sarfati quotes Mark 10:6,

But from the beginning of creation, God made them male and female.

He attempts to make the case that this contradicts old earth belief; however, it also contradicts young earth belief, as man was not created on Day One in either belief system. Clearly it means that from the creation of man, they were created male and female, as this is the only possible explanation. The whole point can be summed up from Sarfati's last sentence in this section on page 299, "...this rules out mankind being created billions of years after creation." Old earth creationists do not say mankind was created billions of years after creation, but at the end of the creation events (just like young earth theory). Man was the last thing created in both old and young earth views, but in both systems, they are clearly during the creation events. Sarfati tries to draw the creation of man outside of God's creative events, but this is clearly not true in old earth belief.

Human Longevity (page 299)

Sarfati criticizes Ross for putting forth a believable theory about how God shortened the lifespan of humans. I don't know how God did it, but it doesn't matter! Ross may or may not be right...who cares how God did it. It was done...that's all that matters.

Origin of Races (page 301)

This is another non-issue with the age of the earth. You may choose either Ross' explanation or Sarfati's...both are OK with old-earth belief.

Does Ross' Chronology Allow Aborigines to be Non-Human? (page 304)

Sarfati seems to have a valid point in this section. Ross' dates do appear to conflict as he changes them to reflect more current research. This is what happens when you are a scientist. As new data becomes available, you adjust your theories/conclusions. This is not wrong...in fact, it shows that Ross is performing science the proper way.

Apemen (page 305)

Dr. Ross believes that pre-Adamite man was soulless, and was thus like an animal. At a certain point, God chose Adam to be the first with a spirit. In this framework, previously discovered hominids are not human in the sense that they did not have an eternal soul. Young earth creationists differ here, claiming that they were all humans, after Adam. This includes the Neanderthal.

The number of fossil claims that each side makes are irrelevant here. Yes, some evolutionists have pieced together whole beings from a single bone, but that is not the

issue. The most important thing to discuss here is the most recognized of the cavemen, the Neanderthal.

Sarfati mentions the DNA study done on a Neanderthal. This study concluded that Neanderthal and Humans are distinct species. However, Sarfati claims, “this mtDNA evidence he (Ross) quotes has never been critically re-evaluated, and is of very questionable validity. It is statistically dubious to base so much on only a single specimen. First, it is very questionable if you are a young earth creationists...other scientists accept it. Second, there are now two studies that reached the same conclusion (click here for a brief report on the other study).

In addition, a study of the Neanderthal and human brain casings also revealed the high probability that they are separate species (click here).

Naturally, the young earth creationists will dispute this, as it destroys their theories. I for one can't wait for more DNA studies on Neanderthals! May the truth finally be known!

Chapter 10 – Biblical Old-Age Arguments

Billions of Years is a Better Illustration of God's Eternality? (Pages 322-323)

Here Sarfati generalizes this argument, showing that Ross' train of thought actually supports a young earth as well. No problems here for old-earth belief...

Biblical Old-Age Words (Pages 323-326)

Put a hundred Hebrew scholars in a room, and they will disagree as to the meaning of Hebrew words. Yes, you can find Hebrew and Greek scholars that say the words of the Bible support only a young earth...just as you can find equally talented Hebrew and Greek scholars who support an old earth, with the exact same words!

Just because a young earth creation science scholar (a biologist at that (Sarfati)) says the words show a young earth, does not make the earth young. Conversely, just because a scholar says the words support an old earth (an astronomer (Ross)), this does not make the earth old. Rather, we have the evidence from science to consider. Since science conclusively says “old,” then the scholars which say the Bible can represent the earth as old must be correct.

(NOTE: Once again...notice that we have a BIOLOGIST (Sarfati) and an ASTRONOMER (Ross) arguing about Hebrew and Greek!)

Why Weren't Vast-Age Words Used in Genesis 1? (Pages 326-328)

More word arguments that could be taken either way. Sarfati's claim here does not rise to the level as to overturn Ross' claims.

God is a Master Craftsman So Would He Take a Long Time? (Page 328)

Ross' argument is sound in principle, but as Sarfati points out, is shallow. I myself prefer to think that Ross is correct. God loves His creation...he knew billions of years ago that the final creation would be man. He loves man so much that he spent billions of years crafting the universe for us. Thank You Lord for being a God of great detail and artistry!

“Fear of the Millions” (Pages 328-329)

Ross is completely accurate! Sarfati shows that young earth creationist Gish said that evolution would not happen even in billions of years. Ross and I agree. Why is it then that young earth creationists oppose old earth creationism? Sarfati fails to answer the mail on this one. Ross and others have plainly shown that you can be an evangelical, fundamental Christian and believe in an old earth...so what do they fear? Why don't they accept old earth believers as a valid alternative, and join us united in an effort to oppose evolution and reach the world for Christ? Their opposition is mind-boggling to say the least.

Conclusion

Sarfati's claims in this chapter are very weak, and present no serious evidence for us to consider.

Chapter 11 – Science and the Young Earth

Sarfati tries to use standard young earth creation science arguments as evidence for a young earth. Most of these are already rebutted by this web site and others.

[Click here](#) to see the many rebuttals of young earth claims.

Chapter 12 – Refuting Old-Earth Arguments

Sarfati tries to disprove some arguments that geologists and others have pointed to as showing vast ages for the earth. Since many of these arguments have already been rebutted in the rebuttal section of this web site, there is no need to go into them individually.

[Click here](#) to see the many rebuttals of young earth creation science claims.

Some claims have not been addressed yet on this web site. For instance, on page 375, Sarfati mentions the old earth claim, “Some modern coral reefs are extremely thick and must have taken millions of years to grow.” To this he responds, “Actually, what was thought to be coral “reef” turns out to be thick carbonate platforms, most probably deposited during the Flood.” His reference for this is an article by Michael Oard, a young earth creationist, which appeared in a young earth creation science magazine. There has been no proof the claims of Oard are true...Oard is merely giving a possible young earth explanation for this evidence.

Many young earth claims are like this...they say “This has been proved!” But if you look at the references, it is young earth scientists doing the work, which appears in young earth publications. There are no peer-reviewed articles, and no reputable scientists have accepted these claims. For their young-earth audience, they take this at face value and believe it to be true. However, in the real world, it does not stand up to scrutiny.

Conclusion

If you are used to taking the claims of young earth theorists as truth, without investigating them, then you will naturally agree with Sarfati. However, if you are used to looking at the evidence from both sides, you will probably agree with the other 99.9 percent of scientists who say that the earth is old. In this respect, there is no way of getting around this subject...there is a word for people who blindly follow a belief...it is called brainwashed. I’m sorry that I have to use that term, but I cannot deny the truth.

Is there harm in this “brainwashed” young earth community. No, not within the community itself. The harm that is done is to the church as a whole. By painting themselves in a corner, they make outsiders view the church in a negative light, and drive away prospective lost souls. How are atheists born? They see the church, and they see modern science, and see a conflict. Since hard evidence (science) is irrefutable, they leave the church and become atheists.

If someone believes in evolution...great, we can still reach them for Christ. You can be a theistic evolutionist and a fundamentalist, inerrant Bible believer at the same time. If someone doesn’t believe in evolution but knows the earth is old...great...you can be a fundamentalist also!

We need to realize that we need to reach these souls for Christ. Old earth belief (and Evolution) is not the enemy of God...unfortunately, we Christians are our own worst enemy. Let’s focus on Jesus, not on creation, and make the church respectable in our communities once again. There is room in the church for both old earth believers and young earth believers, and there is no reason that we can’t both be in the same church! Yes, you can believe in an old earth, and be a Bible-believing Fundamentalist! Brothers, let’s get to work for Christ! God Bless.