


# Creation Science Defense



## Tom Carpenter

Based on his lecture, given at

Rock Hill Baptist Church  
605 Rock Hill Road  
Lexington, TN 38351

Tuesday, Day Three

for further information, contact our pastor,

Pastor David E. Buffaloe  
online at [www.bibleteacher.org](http://www.bibleteacher.org)  
731.845.6104

I want to begin tonight by reemphasizing the monumental problem for evolution that I talked about last time, and that is the inability for mutations and natural selection to empower evolution. I want to do it by talking about what some evolutionists call (note: these are quotes from evolutionists), they call it “*a huge paradox,*” “*the queen of problems,*” a “*puzzle not yet solved,*” “*a mystery to researchers,*” and “*a circular argument which completely begs the question of what makes evolution evolve.*” This is the problem of – gender, male and female.

Why would nature select for sexual reproduction time and time again? What adaptive advantage is there? It is an elaborate and expensive way to reproduce and should be out competed by nonsexual reproduction. In sexual reproduction there is a selective disadvantage of at least 50% and it requires an intricate process to split and an equally intricate process to recombine and rejoin the information during fertilization. Yet, sex occurs in all major groups of life. Another evolutionist said, “when it comes to sex, we inhabit a mystery.” Regarding mutations as the driving force behind the evolution of sex a prominent evolutionist Grasse said, “*There is no law against daydreaming, but science must not indulge in it.*”

These arguments against natural selection and mutations are overwhelming and I could give many more examples. So then, what do evolutionists say that are honest enough to admit this dilemma? Two explanations are prominent.

(Really, it is almost funny that grown-ups actually believe this stuff.) First there is punctuated equilibrium popularized by evolution evangelist Stephen J. Gould who died recently. Punctuated Equilibrium basically says that species stay in a state of equilibrium or stasis or stability, that is, they don't change for long, long periods of time. Then, for some unknown and unexplained reason, they evolve rapidly. If this idea were true, and its not, but if it were any pregnant women should be terrified. Because, according to this fairy tale, any women delivering a baby may just deliver the next step in our evolutionary process.

However, packaged in scientific jargon and endorsed by science textbooks and leading scientists it is being believed by many. Interestingly, it was invoked to explain and allow for evolution in the absence of fossil transitional forms.<sup>1</sup> Sadly, it doesn't provide *any* answers to the admitted problem that transitional forms do not exist; this process still would require the addition of *new* information to the genetic code. This has NEVER been observed to happen in ANY fashion in ANY living organism. But it's the perfect explanation because it completely isolates itself from any sort of testability. Henry Morris summed it up well when he mockingly said, "*In the present it goes too slowly, in the past it goes too fast!*"<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> John Morris, *Young Earth*, p. 11

<sup>2</sup> Henry Morris, *Biblical Evidence for Creation*, video

The other popular idea that evolutionists have come up with to explain the insurmountable problem they have with natural selection and mutations is much more credible and believable. In fact, it is endorsed by none other than Francis Crick, co-discoverer of the double helix DNA. It is panspermia: life on earth has been seeded from outer space. (Pause) Your tax dollars are funding this idea. I read that NASA has decided to resume funding for the SETI project that is involved in looking for life in outer space.

I won't spend any more time talking about this; I've written about this and you can read more details on both punctuated equilibrium and panspermia, but it reminds me of Romans 1:22, "22 *Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools...*" It also reminds me of something I heard someone say recently, "*It's amazing what nonbelievers have to believe not to believe.*"

**Big bang:** Before I discuss my main topic tonight I want to discuss one more thing that people always have questions about: the Big Bang. The Big Bang theory is just a dud. But, this is the most popular explanation for cosmogony—the origin of the universe. The Big Bang theory states that a random explosion that happened 15 to 18 billion years ago started everything. The term "Big Bang" was actually a disparaging term astronomer Fred Hoyle coined for the theory. It is said to have a beginning point of a "primeval atom" or "cosmic egg." (By the way, where did this cosmic egg come from? A cosmic chicken.) But the Big Bang theory has many

insurmountable problems. The biggest of which is that explosions *never* cause and increase in order, but a *decrease* in order and an *increase* in chaos. Then there is the problem that you have to start somewhere and that's really bad when you consider that there is design in the most basic element—hydrogen and not only that but also energy is needed to hold hydrogen together.

Nevertheless, the Big Bang is a very *powerful* explanation because it exercises such a hold on the imagination. But it is nonsense, it is a nonsensical explanation.

Now, we can move on to something a lot more believable: human evolution. This basically says that if you go back far enough your grandfather is an ape. I apologize for being cynical because the teaching of human evolution is a very serious problem. Almost every week there is a new claim in the news about a missing link between men and apes.

The character of the God of the universe, our God is directly attacked by this claim that man is an evolved animal. Ultimately, human evolution gives birth to a self-centered philosophy in which man he has no obligation to value human life. Animal life is elevated to equality with human life causing some to consider chicken farms to be no different that the concentration camps of the Holocaust. More importantly, redefining man as an animal and simply as the product of millions of years of death, bloodshed, disease, suffering,

mutations and extinctions redefines God. The character and nature of God is changed from a loving God who cares for His creation to a wasteful, careless and indifferent God.

To understand the immensity of the problem of this wrong view of God let's just step back a minute and consider how God is relentlessly affirmed and defined as Creator in the Bible. In Isaiah 42:5-6a: "*Thus saith God the LORD,*" (Who?) "*He that created the heavens and stretched them out, He that spread forth the earth and that which cometh out of it, He that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein;...*" Also, in Psalm 148:1-5 "*Praise ye the LORD! Praise ye the LORD from the heavens; praise Him in the heights!2 Praise ye Him, all His angels; praise ye Him, all His hosts!3 Praise ye Him, sun and moon; praise Him, all ye stars of light!4 Praise Him, ye heavens of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens!5 Let them praise the name of the LORD,.*" (Why is He worthy of such overwhelming praise?) Well, let's look at the rest of the verse: "*... for He commanded and they were created. He hath also established them forever and ever.*" Revelation 4:11 proclaims, "*Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power;*" (Why?) "*for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are, and were created.*"

We must consider the Bible's claim that man was created in the image and likeness of God and is *not* an animal. "And God said, "*Let Us make man in Our image, after*

*Our likeness;... ” Genesis 1:26. This phrase created “in His image” is repeated four times. This gives man uniqueness apart from the animals. Mankind was therefore made on a divine pattern, which is not true of other animals. Theologian Douglas Kelly wrote, “The astonishing teaching of this verse is that for man to be in the image of God is to be like Him in certain definite respects.” This specialness, transcendence and uniqueness of man is something that could not have evolved. This is the part of man that cannot be reduced to a chemical formula and does not appear in the DNA. Kelly explains, “The Hebrew word for ‘image’ (tselem) appears to have meant ‘to carve’ or ‘to cut off’... In other words, man was shaped or formed to fit into the image of God.” Thus, this “image of God” in which we were created gives us significance and the ability for relationship. By the way, imagine if this was taught in public schools. There would be no need for classes in self-esteem. All prior creative acts before man's creation was to “set the stage” for the creation of mankind. “18 For thus saith the LORD that created the heavens, God Himself that formed the earth and made it--He hath established it, He created it not in vain, He formed it to be inhabited: “I am the LORD, and there is none else.” Isaiah 45:18.*

The belief in human evolution attacks the dignity of man and the character of God in whose image and likeness man was created. All people (if you prefer to call us *Homo sapiens*), according to Genesis must be descendants of Adam and Eve. Eve is called the

*“mother of all the living” (Genesis 3:20). God has given man value above the animals by relating to him in a personal way. In contrast, in order for a student in the United States to answer correctly on a standardized test he or she must answer man that is an animal. Redefining man as an animal destroys the meaning and value that God has placed on human life.*

The evolution argument presented in classrooms can be best described as one that “begs the question.” An argument is said to beg the question when it assumes to be true the very thing it is trying to prove. Thus, the illusion is created that science proves evolution by first assuming that evolution is true. This required teaching of human evolution by begging the question is one of the best-kept secrets in this debate.

Professor Marvin Lubenow in his book *Bones of Contention* points out the problem with claiming that fossils support evolution: *“Just for the fun of it, let's grant the evolutionist his point. Let's assume that there is something very bad about telling a student that the oldest human fossil ever discovered supports Special Creation. As bad as that might be, I can think of something even worse. To tell a student that the oldest human fossil ever discovered supports evolution. Because that would be a lie.”* As one pastor so aptly put it, *“Man becomes just a big blob of protoplasm waiting to become manure.”*

**\*OH Phylogentic Tree:** Teaching that humans evolved from something else is somewhat like performing a magic trick too. The magic wands used to pull off this illusion are words like "common ancestor" and "hominid." The term common ancestor explains nothing; it is a fancy-sounding word used to avoid explaining missing missing links. For example, an evolutionist might argue that man did not evolve from an ape but that they both had a common ancestor. What does that mean? It proves nothing; it explains nothing. In addition, the concept of a common ancestor is inconsistent with the observable facts; there is no physical evidence to support it. By the way, remember the phrase, "*After its kind*" used so much in Genesis 1? This does not allow for a common ancestor in any way.

Also, the word "hominids" is a word that has come to mean humans and their evolutionary ancestors. Therefore, to the creationist, it is a meaningless term. Humans are all descendants of Adam. Thus, the use of such a word necessarily excludes the creation model of origin.

Do not assume that the science behind the discoveries of these ape men is good either. The scientific problem with human evolution is that it is built upon the weak science of paleoanthropology. Even one of the most orthodox evolutionist evangelists Richard Leakey admitted, ". . . *I often felt that paleoanthropology was more of an art than a science.*" Sir Peter Medawar, a

Nobel Prize winner referred to paleoanthropology as, "*a comparatively humble and unexacting kind of science.*"

What about missing links? Missing links, transitional forms, in-between forms have become the Holy Grail of the evolutionist. If evolution were true, you would expect to find in-between forms, transitions, missing links of something—apes to men, single-celled organisms to multi-celled organisms, etc. *They just do not exist!* The missing links are still missing. They are like the energizer bunny—it keeps going and going. So it is with missing links; they keep missing and missing.

There is one exception. Discovered in a fast food restaurant, somewhere in the United States the missing link was found between the fork and the spoon...the spork. I have one right here; it even comes with its own glass case.

Well, here is an overview of some of the more common claims for the missing link between man and ape. But, before I do this, I guess I should start at the true beginning...hydrogen. According to evolution hydrogen can be defined this way, "*A colorless, odorless, tasteless gas if given enough time becomes man.*"

Here we have Lucy, Australopithicus, Neanderthal man and, oh yeah, what's this one? Oh yes! Jazz man. Of course, this is the missing link. Alright, lets go over just a few of the common ape men. I like to call this my "Most Wanted List."

## 1. **Lucy** (*Australopithecus afarensis*)

- ❖ *Australopithecus* means “Southern ape.”
- ❖ It was found in Africa; named after a Beatles’ tune that was playing over the loud speaker when it was discovered by Donald Johanson.
- ❖ It is just an extinct ape.
- ❖ Although the St. Louis Zoo contains an incredible model of Lucy, only 40% of the skeleton was found. This full-scale reproduction show she walked upright and had hands and feet that were human-like. However, scientists agree now that the evidence indicates her arms were even longer than some apes and there is *no* evidence she walked upright or had human-like hands and feet.
- ❖ When asked to change the incorrect display the museum leaders denied claiming it would cost too much money.

## 2. **Neanderthal Man**

- ❖ First found in caves in the Neander Valley near Dusseldorf, Germany. Ironically, this valley is named after Joachim Neander, the author of Hymn #10 in the Baptist Hymnal. Great song, powerful song with great words.
- ❖ Neanderthal men were just men who lived in caves.
- ❖ They were depicted as beetle-browed, bow-legged, barrel-chested brutes.
- ❖ They suffered skeletal abnormalities due to lack of iodine and sun-induced vitamin D not because they were our common ancestors.

- ❖ But the evolutionists saw these physical problems they saw a missing link due to their presuppositions. (Remember my hand?)
- ❖ You know the phrase, “I wouldn’t have believed it if I hadn’t seen it.” When we consider all this the motto for the evolutionist should be, “I wouldn’t have seen it if I hadn’t believed it.” However, now evolutionists have been forced to admit that Neanderthals were fully human.

## 3. **What about Piltdown Man** (*Eoanthropus dawsoni*)?

- ❖ Found in 1912, it appeared in textbooks for years.
- ❖ For over forty years this discovery was heralded as a human ancestor and over fifty doctoral theses were written about him. However, in 1953 it was revealed to be a complete fraud, a hoax.
- ❖ They fraudulently placed a human skullcap to the jaw of an orangutan. The jaw was filed down to match the skull and even stained to make it look like it fit and make it look aged. People wanted to believe in evolution, so people saw what they wanted to believe.
- ❖ “I wouldn’t have believed it if I hadn’t seen it.”

## 4. **Nebraska Man** (*Hesperopithecus harold cooki*)

In 1922 geologist Harold Cook found a single molar tooth in Nebraska which became know as "Nebraska man." An imaginative drawing of Mr. and Mrs. Nebraska Man appeared in the *Illustrated London News*, which had worldwide distribution. This image of a genuine missing link was firmly fixed in the minds of

Americans just in time for the Scopes trial. With much less fanfare, however, in 1928 it was discovered that a mistake had been made. The tooth was not that of an early human, but that of a pig or a peccary. I have heard it said, "*They tried to make a monkey out of a pig, but the pig made a monkey out of them.*" "I wouldn't have believed it if I hadn't seen it."

Well, I could go on and talk about Rampithicus, Java man, *Homo habilis*, Cro-Magnon, Peking Man, Rhodesian Man, *Australopithecus robustus*, Heidelberg Man, KNM-ER 1470 and on and on and on... But it's the same thing, conjecture, fraud, dating games, etc. By the way, at one point there was quite a debate about the date they were trying to come up with for Lucy. It drew a lot of publicity because there were discrepancies with the dates different evolutionists wanted to assign to Lucy. The headlines of one paper read, "Lucy, the problem with dating older women."

So again, as we examine evolution as a model of science, we see that human evolution demonstrates how the model of evolution must again bend and twist to accommodate every new discovery.

Finally, as I end this discussion of human evolution consider Jesus' words in Matthew 19:4 and Mark 10:6, "*from the beginning of the creation, 'God made them male and female.'*" Obviously, this allows for no evolution of man though ape men; mankind was created "*from the beginning.*"

I would like to discuss a subject that has been used to epitomize evolution—dinosaurs. Children are being convinced that they cannot trust the Bible today because dinosaurs died out 65 million years ago. Many questions probably pop up in your mind and your children's minds about dinosaurs. Here are four books I highly recommend to answer your questions and your children's questions, "*Dinosaurs by Design*" by Duane Gish, "*The Amazing Story of Creation*"—excellent book about other topics too, also by Gish, "*The Great Dinosaur Mystery Solved*" by Ken Ham and finally "*A is for Adam*" and "*D is for Dinosaur*" by Ken and Mally Ham; these are for the younger children.

Let me just try to answer some common questions about these creatures: First, did dinosaurs become extinct 65 million years ago? Well, first of all, nobody can ever say that anything is extinct. Unless we have a person standing on every point of the earth at one time, and they are an excellent observer, we cannot say, for sure an animal is extinct. Cryptozoology is the field of study of animals that were once thought to be extinct. For example, you may have heard of the fish, the coelacanth, that was once thought to be extinct but has now been found in deep waters off the coast of South Africa.

Nevertheless, dinosaurs probably are extinct. But there is much evidence that suggests that they did not go extinct until recent history: drawings by the Indians;

pottery with dinosaurs and men living together; records of dinosaurs in the Anglo Saxon Chronicles, etc.

Did I say dinosaurs and man lived together? Of course they did. Yes, we know they did because the Bible says the land animals and man were created on the same day. Now maybe your thinking why didn't they call them dinosaurs. Sir Richard Owen coined the word "dinosaur" in 1841. It means "terrible lizard." Before then, there had to be a word to describe them. That word was probably "dragon" or "big lizard."

Stories about dragons are found in almost every culture of the world. Descriptions of these dragons are very similar to what we find in the fossils of the dinosaurs. Dragons are also mentioned in the Bible. They could very well refer to dinosaurs. Again, the present version of the English Bible we use was translated in 1611. The word dinosaur was not even invented until 1841.

In addition, Job 40:15-24 describes "behemoth" as a great beast that fits the description of what we know as a *Brachiosaurus* perhaps. ¶ *"Behold now Behemoth, which I made with thee; he eateth grass as an ox.16 Lo now, his strength is in his loins, and his force is in the navel of his belly.17 He moveth his tail like a cedar; the sinews of his stones are wrapped together.18 His bones are as strong pieces of brass; his bones are like bars of iron.19 He is the chief of the ways of God; He that made him can make His sword to approach unto him.20 Surely the mountains bring him forth food, where all the*

*beasts of the field play.21 He lieth under the shady trees, in the covert of the reed and fens.22 The shady trees cover him with their shadow; the willows of the brook compass him about.23 Behold, he drinketh up a river and hasteneth not; he trusteth that he can draw up the Jordan into his mouth.24 Will any take him with his sight, or bore his nose with a snare?"*

Note, he had a tail like a cedar tree. Some notes in Bibles say this was an elephant. I don't think so. Some say he was a rhinoceros. I don't thin that fits either. How about the brachiosaurus? It looks like a perfect fit. It also says his strength was in his loins and force in the navel of his belly. Any animal with such a long neck and long tail needed to have his strength in this middle area.

Job 41:18-21 describes another creature "leviathan" with smoke going out of its nostrils. It is very possible that a dinosaur could breathe fire. The bombardier beetle has chambers in the rear of its body where it stores combustible chemicals. It can eject the explosive gases at 212 degrees Fahrenheit. The *Parasaurolophus* dinosaur has a bony crest on its head above its nostrils. Possibly it could do the same thing.

So these could very well, have been dinosaurs the Bible talks about here. We don't know for sure, but we do know they were real creatures that we don't see much anymore.

Another thing, much of what is taught about dinosaurs is conjecture. Were dinosaurs purple with green dots? We don't know. If we dug up a fossil of a zebra and had never seen one before we would ever guess it had stripes.

Also, did you know most museums do not contain actual dinosaur bones? I give tours of Atlanta's big natural history museum—Fernbank. (By the way, I am not associated with Fernbank, I just pay my way in and talk with the group that comes with me.) They have a huge *Argenteneousaurus* dinosaur in their atrium. None of it has actual dinosaur bones in it. They are just castings. By the way, I asked them recently how many actual bones of this dinosaur had been found. You know what they said? Eight. In all the times I have been there, there has only been one time when they had some small fragments of a *Miasaura* dinosaur bone in a special exhibit. I, on the other hand, have right here a sliver of a dinosaur bone, *Miasaurus* **bone** right here.

**Dino on Ark:** One last question about dinosaurs: Did dinosaurs go on the ark? The answer, if we start our thinking with the Bible is, "Yes." In Genesis it says that Noah took at least two kinds of land animals on the ark. Were dinosaurs land animals? Yes. Well, weren't dinosaurs too big to fit on the ark? No. The average size of a dinosaur was the size of a sheep.

Once, I was at Fernbank before they had that huge dinosaur in their atrium they had a picture of it with a nest of its eggs. The paleontologist was there and I

asked her: (I knew the answer), I asked, "*How big were the eggs, about the size of a football?*" And she said, "Yes." Therefore, here we have a dinosaur that could have grown to 100 feet and weighed 100 tons that was once small enough to hold in your hands. Sure, Noah took dinosaurs on the ark; he just took young ones.

**2Pt:** Next, let's consider the truthfulness of Noah's Flood. This is much more important than you might think. In 2 Peter 3:5-7. Peter states that "*in the last days scoffers*" will come and "*For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished. But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.*" This is saying that the God who is capable of instantaneous creation is also capable of instantaneous dissolution. He will uncreate as thoroughly as He created. Peter not only uses the Flood as a comparison of the future Second Coming but also warns that just as there was a denial of the Flood a time will come when people will not think seriously about the Second Coming as a universal cataclysmic judgment.

So, let's examine exactly what the Scripture says about Noah's Flood. Genesis chapter seven describes the event of a catastrophic worldwide flood used by God as a judgment for the wickedness of man in the days of Noah. The Bible teaches that the entire world (including the

mountains) was covered in water in Genesis 7:20 and this is also mentioned in 2 Peter 3:6 here and Isaiah 54:9. The Bible tells us that it rained for forty days nonstop in Genesis 7:11-12 and water continued to rise higher until the mountains were covered in verse 20 for a total of 150 days in verse 24. Therefore, even though it only rained for forty days, the waters continued to rise for a total of 21 weeks.

We are told that after Noah remained in the ark for an additional 23 weeks. During this time the waters receded.

**Ps 104:** A change in the overall topography of the earth after the Flood would also account for the water of the Flood. This is exactly what is suggested in Psalm 104:8, *"The mountains rose; the valleys sank down to the place which Thou did establish for them."* This verse in the context of verses 6-9 must be referring to the events of Noah's Flood. In verse 9: *"Thou didst set a boundary that they may not pass over; That they may not return to cover the earth."* This must refer to God's promise not to flood the entire earth again after Noah's Flood. The Psalmist exalts God's power in this awesome Psalm in verses 6 and 7. *"Thou didst cover it with the deep as with a garment; The waters were standing above the mountains. At thy rebuke they fled; At the sound of Thy thunder they hurried away."* Thus, God simply rebuked the waters that covered the mountains and they went to their "established place" as the mountains rose and the valleys sank.

Many today are trying to convince you that Noah's Flood was a **local flood**. But this is a wishy washy argument. Pun intended. First of all, Genesis 7:19-20 records that *"all the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered.20 Fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail, and the mountains were covered."* Note the word "all." Water seeks its own level. Certainly a local flood could not have covered all the high mountains everywhere and leave the rest of the world untouched.

Furthermore, in verse 23, *"And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man and cattle, and the creeping things and the fowl of the heaven, and they were destroyed from the earth. And Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark."* It cannot be clearer in this verse that the Flood was global in impact on every living creature.

Jesus Christ confirms the universal nature of the Flood by referring to it destroying "all" mankind: Matthew 24:37-39 *"But as the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be.38 For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark39 and knew not until the flood came and took them **all** away, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be."* A local flood would indicate partial judgment and in these verses it is obvious that Jesus based His teaching of a coming judgment on

*all* mankind on the judgment "on *all* mankind" by Noah's Flood.

Also, if the Flood were not worldwide then God is a liar. Genesis 9:11 states, "*And I will establish My covenant with you: Neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood; neither shall there any more be a flood to destroy the earth.*" Then in verse 13 God establishes the rainbow as a sign of this promise: "*I do set My rainbow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between Me and the earth.*" If the Genesis Flood were a local flood then every time there is a local flood then God breaks this promise.

Also, if it was a local flood then why did God have Noah build such a large Ark? Is this really what the ark looked like? Well, this is certainly how it is depicted in many churches and Christian bookstores. This is what the ark really looked like. Most people do not stop to think of the massive size of the Ark. It was about 430 feet long, 43 feet high and 75 feet wide. Interestingly, it was not until 1884 that a ship was built, the *Eturia*, that exceeded the size of the Ark. To believe that God would require such a large vessel for the purpose of escaping a local flood is unreasonable.

Why was there a need for an ark to carry the animals to escape death? Why not send them to a safe place to escape the Flood? The same goes for Noah and his family. They could have just gone elsewhere and missed it and saved a lot of work in building the Ark. Also, if

the Flood was local then why did birds go on the ark? They could have flown to a different part of the earth. The entire story of Noah begins to lack credibility and borders on the ridiculous if it were a local flood.

Noah's Flood was a relevant. There are over 130 flood accounts have been recorded throughout various cultures all over the world! This is exactly what would be expected if the Flood were a true event and the Tower of Babel dispersed people (with the knowledge of the Flood) all over the world. The different people groups would have take their view of the Flood to their culture and region of the world. As it was passed down through the ages it would change in different ways in different cultures.

A worldwide catastrophic event like Noah's Flood would explain the fossil record. Ken Ham explains it this way: If Noah's Flood was real, what would you expect to find? Billions of dead things, buried in rock layers, laid down by water, all over the earth. What do we find? Billions of dead things, buried in rock layers, laid down by water, all over the earth. If Noah's Flood was global and not local what would you expect to find? Billions of dead things, buried in rock layers, laid down by water, all over the earth. What do we find? Billions of dead things, buried in rock layers, laid down by water, all over the earth.

The teaching of a local flood is a harmful one because it brings into question so much of the Bible. The teaching

that the Flood was worldwide could not be clearer in Genesis and is confirmed by the apostle and by Jesus Christ Himself. Noah's Flood was a real catastrophic worldwide event. If it was not real, then what else in Genesis is not real? What else in the whole Bible is real? Who or how do you determine these answers? Everybody's opinion counts. Finally, notice Peter says in 2 Pt 3:5-6, "*they are willfully ignorant: that by the Word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water,6 whereby the world as it then was, being overflowed with water, perished.*" that they are "willingly ignorant. In light of the overwhelming evidence for the Flood I believe Kent Hovind's translation of "*willingly ignorant*" is the best, he says it means, "*dumb on purpose.*"

Finally tonight I want to talk about something that is really exciting to me—granite. Yes, that's right, rocks. You should never take granite for granted. East of Atlanta, just north of where I live, is a granite mountain called Stone Mountain standing about 900 feet about the surrounding landscape. Who, in here, has ever heard of or been to Stone Mountain. Well, around it and on it is Stone Mountain Park with all kinds of family entertainment including a laser show on the side of the mountain nightly during the summer. Also, on the face of the mountain is a huge confederate memorial carving of Stonewall Jackson, Robert E. Lee and Jefferson Davis.

If you are ever in Atlanta, look me up and I will take you out there. But I get most excited by the geology there, not the other things. I have written a field guide entitled "*Don't Take Granite for Granted.*" In it I have retooled the research of creation geologist Carl Froede. Here he is with me and Dr. John Morris. Dr. Morris is in my opinion one of the most important geologists in all history. (Pause) He is president of the Institution of Creation Research and he and his father Henry Morris have done more to advance the cause of biblical creation than any other two men in recent history. Anyway Carl Froede demonstrated many reasons to believe that the creation model he proposes provides a much better explanation of the origin of the mountain. The evidence supports a recent formation (about 4000 years ago), rapid cooling and evidence of water involvement during its formation. All this is explained well considering the events of a catastrophic flood.

For example, here is a piece of granite from Stone Mountain with a tourmaline cat's paw in it. The existence of these cat's paw (which are all over the mountain) supports rapid cooling because if the tourmaline was in a semi-molten state for a long time it would coagulate much more than this. Thus, we should not "take granite for granted" because within Stone Mountain granite is the physical evidence that reveals the incredible power and awesome energy that only God can provide. I also serves as a reminder of what God can do in judgment.

In conclusion, there is no way to reconcile the clear teachings in the Bible of human origin and a worldwide Flood with the teachings of evolution. It is critical to understand ourselves as created in the image of our Creator with the ability to relate personally. Also, the events of a worldwide catastrophic Flood are confirmed in the physical evidence; the Bible is scientifically reliable. Tomorrow I will discuss the age of the earth in more detail and how the compromise views of origin are faulty. In addition, I will explain how the issue of origin affects evangelism. But, I want to leave you tonight with Colossians 2:8, *“Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, following the tradition of men according to the rudiments of the world, and not in accordance with Christ.”*

**Rock Hill Baptist Church is located between Parsons and Lexington, Tennessee, on Highway 412. Look for our sign! We have services on Wednesdays (Adult, Youth, and children's Bible studies) at 7:00 PM, Sundays at 10:00 AM and 6:00 PM. Rock Hill is a family oriented Bible believing Church - Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever! Our Pastor, Brother David Buffaloe, will answer any questions you have about our Church if you contact him at 731-845-6104, or through his website at [bibleteacher.org](http://bibleteacher.org); or e-mail him by writing [webmaster@bibleteacher.org](mailto:webmaster@bibleteacher.org). Rock Hill is an independent Church affiliated with the Tennessee Baptist Convention, the Southern Baptist Convention, and is a regular contributor to missions through the Cooperative Program.**

