

Q&A with Dr. Andrew Snelling

By Dr. Andrew Snelling

sermonaudio.com

Preached on: Tuesday, November 15, 2022

Truth Community Church

4183 Mt. Carmel Tobasco Road
Cincinnati, OH 45255

Website: truthcommunitychurch.org

Online Sermons: www.sermonaudio.com/tcomm

Well, a number of questions have come in and the beauty of doing it online is that we don't tell you tonight who asked what question; people can ask their questions privately by being online and thanks to Hanna, we're actually going to have the questions up on the screen which I think is a help because if I start talking you can remind yourself what the question is and also people can see over the live stream. So I'm going to go question by question and we'll see how far we get with these, but I think we've got enough to cover the evening.

Of course, I did a bit of a tease on Sunday when I referred to the waters above and the first three questions, three people asked effectively the same question, our first question and let me read to you from Genesis 1:6 through 8 again, "And God said, 'Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it separate the waters from the waters.' And God made the expanse and separated the waters that were under the expanse from the waters that were above the expanse. And it was so. And God called the expanse Heaven. And there was evening and there was morning, the second day." And as I shared with you on Sunday morning, we know that the expanse must include interstellar space because the sun, moon and stars were put in the expanse which God called heaven, and we know today that the sun, moon and stars sit out there in interstellar space. So if the waters are above interstellar space, that means the waters must be at the edge of the universe, and so the question is, I put out the teaser as to water being at the boundary or edge of the universe and three people asked that question.

Well, let me just explain to you briefly what the secular... well, it's not, it's the majority view, it's not the universally accepted secular view. Most of you have heard of the so-called Big Bang and I think you think of an explosion. Well, it wasn't an explosion, it was a sudden expansion, but as a result of that early expansion, they believe from a point of nothingness, everything suddenly expanded, there was a leftover cosmic microwave background and everywhere they look out in space they get this radiation coming in. They call it three degrees. It's actually three degrees above absolute zero; in scientific terms, they use the scale Kelvins for temperature not Celsius, and absolute zero is actually minus 273 degrees Celsius, and the three degrees background radiation that's supposed to be the leftover glow of the of the so-called Big Bang is three degrees above absolute zero.

Now the interesting thing is that they just launched the the James Webb Telescope and deployed it and they're expecting as they look further out to the boundaries of the universe that the further out they went they would expect to find younger and younger stars and younger and younger galaxies. Well, to their absolute dismay what they've discovered is that the galaxies the further out they are are just as mature looking as all the other galaxies, and it's really caused a lot of consternation in the secular astronomy community, but from a biblical perspective, that's exactly what we'd expect to find, that God made everything uniform through the universe, and they don't like to admit it, but it does appear that the earth is roughly at the center of the universe. Surprise, surprise. Because it's to this earth, to earth that God sent his Son to die for the pinnacle of his creation, man, and they don't like to acknowledge the centrality of the earth.

Well, where does this lead us? Well, most people don't realize that most chemicals, including water, the the atoms, water is H₂O, that is two hydrogen atoms with an oxygen atom, and with depending on the temperature, those atoms will move or vibrate. They will vibrate, so the the warmer the temperature the more the energy they have to vibrate. Well, it so happens that if there's water out there at the edge of the boundary of the universe, that those water molecules would still be vibrating and it would appear that the vibration of the water molecules around the outer expanse of the universe would emit radiation uniform three degrees Kelvin background radiation from the vibrational water molecules. So effectively that potentially explains if we take this biblical passage literally that the waters are at the edge, the boundary of the universe, the motion of their molecules is generating that three degrees background radiation that's uniform. They didn't expect to find it uniform. They think it shouldn't be uniform, but it is. And so for us, it's not a surprise as well that they're finding that the galaxies and the stars are very similar everywhere you go looking out because they're thinking they're going back in time but they're not, they're just looking out through the universe with the vast distances. Remember what I said? You know, they think they look out there and they're looking back in time. No. They're looking at what God created all at once 6,000 years ago. So that's an interesting sidelight.

Now the next question was what is the significance in the physical or spiritual sense of separating the waters from the waters? This is not a question I've thought much about. I don't think there's any spiritual sense involved. Why did God separate the waters from the waters? We're really, frankly, not told. There's a lot of details in the text where we don't know why but God in his wisdom, certainly we can take it that it's by his design and plan. He put those waters at the boundaries of the universe, if that's where they are, and it would seem to be the case, for a very good reason, to mark out the boundary of the universe, I guess, and separate that, form a boundary and a separation from whatever else is out there, and we can only speculate. But the universe is here and wherever God is around that through it, he has set those boundaries. That structure must be ideal for the operation of the universe as he designed it. Remember that initially it was designed, designed to not wear out. We remember that the reason why Adam and Eve were cast out of the garden of Eden and the cherubim was put at the boundary at the gate of Eden, was lest they eat of the tree of life and live forever. So they were designed to live forever by eating of the tree of life, and hadn't been for their rebellion, it would have potentially

been a different story, but God in his foreknowledge knew all that. So there had to be some physical significance in God's plan. I don't know whether there's any spiritual sense in this separation of waters. I think we have to be very careful not reading in too much into the text on some of these issues.

So I think I'll leave it there but the the next question is the first chapter of Genesis, except for day 2, and someone was very perceptive, the person that asked this question was very perceptive because you may not have noticed that when we read that through the text of Genesis 1 and look at those each of those days, and I highlighted that at the end of each day God said that the creation was good except day 2, and this is what the questioner has pointed out, that day 2 God never said that it was good, yet at the end in verse 31, he said everything that he'd made was very good. So the "very good" at the end of the passage certainly covered what he'd done on day 2 even though he didn't specifically say in the text here, "and it was good." And so is there any significance in the break of this pattern? For example, is there a connection between the future flood and day 2? Well, I'm not sure why God broke his pattern. It may well be that God knew the waters would become the means of judgment at the time of the flood because remember, God already knew that Adam and Eve were going to fail the test, he already knew that there would be need for a flood, he already knew that his Son, the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world, he knew all that. In his wisdom, he planned things accordingly. It may well be, as the questioner has asked, that God didn't say it was good in verse 2 for the waters because they were going to end up being a means of judgment that he would use. That's possible. Certainly there is a connection. There is a connection.

Now the Hebrew scholars like to point out that when you get to the flood account, what's happening is in effect God is uncreating by destroying the old earth, he's uncreating what he did and the earth returned to being totally covered both by water as it was on day 1, okay? At the height of the flood when the whole earth was covered in water, it was back to the condition. It had been uncreated, in effect, and returned to its watery covering that it had at the beginning of day 1 of the creation week. And then of course, as the floodwaters recede, God is going to cause the recreation of the earth, and the repopulation of the earth with the animals coming off the ark and man. And so there are parallels here, and the questioner has been perceptive in picking that up, and so it may well be, we can only speculate, we're not told exactly that that's the reason why God didn't use the phrase "and it was good" on day 2, but as I said before, he does, God does cover that at the end of the chapter, verse 31, "And God saw everything he had made and, behold, it was very good." It's obviously referring back to the waters and the expanse that he had put in place on day 2. So it was covered but it's interesting that on that specific day God didn't follow that pattern, and it may well be, as the questioner has asked, that it's because the waters were going to be the means that God was going to use to judge the earth. And of course, we're promised the next time there won't be water, there will be fire.

And so we move on. The next question is interesting because it's true, the observationally evidence does indicate that Mars was once covered with water. All the imagery we're getting from Mars indicates that is the case. You can look at features on Mars which are parallel to features on the earth that have been carved by water. You can see on Mars

there are sedimentary layers. And so in fact, the secular scientists because they like to look at the history of like they divide up the development of the earth in their timescale, they've done the same sort of thing on Mars. They're figuring out which layers were early and which were later, and how it all... Well, they actually have a period in Martian history when this flood occurred and they call it the Noachian, and so they're actually alluding to the biblical text and the flood. And here's the interesting thing: on a planet, okay, that they say once had a global flood on it but now it is totally dry, they accept that but on the planet earth, which is still 70% covered in water, they deny that there could have been a global flood. So you see that even though we've got the parallel evidences, the very evidences they use on Mars for a global flood on Mars are present on the earth in superabundance.

So yes, I do agree that the observational evidence does indicate that there was a flood on Mars. When did that occur? Well, the interesting thing is, I think there's a lot of evidence that the flood event on the earth didn't just affect the earth, it affected other parts of the solar system. There's evidence on Venus, there's evidence on the moon, there's evidence on Mars, that they too have suffered from catastrophic events, and it may well be that it was all partly linked to the flood. Why do I say that? Well, we've got evidence, for example, of meteorite impacts on the earth during the flood and after the flood. And so we look at the moon and we see meteorite impacts on the moon, we see meteorite impacts on Venus, on Mercury, we see them on Mars, and so it's quite possible that there was quite a judgment beyond the earth that affected the whole of man's abode including the lesser light and the moon, and some of the other bodies are around us.

So it's possible that Mars was flooded during the same time as the earth was, the water coming from inside Mars, just as water came from inside the earth for the flood here on the earth. Most people are unaware but there's been several secular studies in the last decade and they keep coming out with another study every couple of years, when diamonds are brought to the earth's surface. Diamonds are actually formed and we'll come back to diamonds later tonight, diamonds are actually formed 400 miles down inside the earth and they blasted to the earth's surface through volcanic eruptions, and they bring up with them pieces of the rocks that are down there at that depth. Sometimes there's inclusions in the diamonds, sometimes holding the diamonds, and so we can study the rocks that go down to those depths and the minerals, and it just so happens that the major mineral that makes up the internal rocky mantle of the earth below the outer crust, the major mineral, olivine, which the gem variety is peridot, some of the ladies might have heard of that, but it contains, it can fit water molecules inside its crystalline structure. And so the studies have shown that even today there's between 10 and 16 times the volume of water in the present oceans still inside the earth's mantle. So there's plenty of water capable of coming out at the time of the flood, the fountains of the great deep. So the same on Mars. The evidence is that there was an outbursting of water. Where did that water go? Well, Mars doesn't have an atmosphere like the earth. It has a different gravity, etc, and it probably got sucked out into space fairly quickly after it flooded over the planet. So remember Mars, Earth, Venus and Mercury are called the rocky planets. They all have similar structures. The moon is rocky and then you go out to Jupiter and Saturn, they're gas giants, and they're gaseous and so on. So you look at the varieties of

stars, you look at the varieties of planets, you look at the varieties of plants, you look at the varieties of animals and you realize, you know, God is awesome in that he just loves variety and he made so much variety, and it brings him pleasure as the Creator to do that for our benefit and for our enjoyment. So I would say that the water was removed, that the the flooding of Mars was probably at the time of the flood on the earth, and that the water was removed at that time very rapidly after the event and it went out into space.

Okay, the next question is I'll do a bit of background explaining here: how does the Cambrian explosion fit with the framework of young earth creationism? Well, what is the Cambrian explosion? Most of you are probably scratching your head and have no idea. Well, the geologists have their geological timescale with a rock record, and the level at which all the major animals start to appear in the fossil record is called the Cambrian. It's named after a tribe in Wales. When the rocks were being named and grouped, a lot of the work was done early in England and Wales. William Smith, who was a surveyor and building canals for the Industrial Revolution, which we'll come back to at the end of tonight, he started mapping England and his map in 1815 that was published in 1815 is virtually identical to the modern maps. The Cambrian is the lowest of these layers and below that is the so-called Pre-Cambrian. Between them, in the Grand Canyon for example, there's a massive erosion surface where thousands of feet of rock has been eroded away. Suddenly you go from the pre-Cambrian where you've got no fossils of any major scale, you may have microscopic fossils, it's feasible to form some fossils in the pre-flood world of microscopic creatures. For example, the major fossil in the pre-Cambrian is a fossil called a stromatolite and what they are is mats of blue-green algae, slime, grew on the surface of the sand in the intertidal zone, and the tide brings in sand grains that cover up the slime, the mat, so the mat grows back up on top of the grains and then more comes in and it builds up these structures and they're called stromatolites and so the oldest fossils are these stromatolites.

Now the tides were coming in and out in the pre-flood world, so these stromatolites are perfectly reasonable to explain as pre-flood fossils but that's all you get in the pre-flood world, and then suddenly once you cross that erosion surface which we would say is the beginning that marks the beginning of the flood because that's what you expect the fountains of the deep broke open, God said he was going to destroy the earth with man, so the waters come rushing in out of the earth and start earthquakes and causing tsunamis and massive tides and currents starting ripping, ripping off everything that's on the pre-flood land surface. And then what we find in the Cambrian suddenly, suddenly you get all these creatures are fossilized. All these creatures are fossilized. In fact, this is one of the biggest problems for the evolutionist because in the Cambrian rock layers you get every body plan of every creature that you find thereafter and alive today. Every body plan.

I remember my friend, John Whitmore, who's a senior professor of geology at Cedarville University, he went along to a lecture given by Stephen Jay Gould, Harvard professor and arguably the greatest evolutionist of the 20th century. He went to Antioch College in Yellow Springs, by the way, just up near Dayton; that's where he did his undergraduate work. And he was back there giving a talk, and he'd written about the Cambrian

explosion, and at the end of the lecture they had a question and answer time and John went to the microphone and said, "Professor Gould, can you explain the Cambrian explosion?" There was silence for about 30 seconds and then he said, "Next question, please." He refused to answer the question because it's such an enigma for them because they're expecting all these complex body plans that suddenly appear, wouldn't you expect to find all the evolutionary transitional forms leading up to them? You don't find them. But from a biblical perspective, it makes perfect sense because if this marks the beginning of the flood, you've got the erosion surface where the old world is destroyed and all the creatures that are swept away and now going to start to be buried in the sediments that have been ripped up and in the layers that then start sticking up.

And so the Cambrian explosion, per se, is perfectly expected from a biblical worldview of the flood coming and destroying the earth. These are creatures that lived in the pre-flood world that were destroyed by the flood and they show all the hallmarks of God's intelligent wisdom in design. I often talk about one of those creatures is the trilobite trilobite. It looks a little bit like a crayfish or something like that. It had complex multiple eyes. It had multiple lenses in its eyes and we can actually study the lenses of these because the lenses, they weren't organic tissue like our lenses in our eyes, these were made-up of lime or calcium carbonate, and there's hundreds of them in each eye, and they can't explain the complexity as to where it came from because there's no hint of any ancestors in the layers below. But it's perfectly reasonable. Why? Because this creature, which we think is extinct, lived on the ocean floor and it needed multiple lenses to be able to see 360 degrees for predators and also to be able to adjust according to the distortion in the water. And so they were perfectly designed creatures, and they appear suddenly in the fossil record in this Cambrian explosion but they're not the only ones. So that's what we mean by the Cambrian explosion.

Okay, the next question and we're doing very well here, the next question is were the trees and plants at a mature age when created on the third day, and do we have any examples in existence that would validate mature plants on the third day other than the timeline given in scripture? Well, let's remind ourselves what the text says. It says in verse 11 of chapter 1, "And God said, 'Let the earth sprout vegetation, plants yielding seed, and fruit trees bearing fruit in which is their seed, each according to its kind, on the earth.' And it was so. The earth brought forth vegetation, plants yielding seed according to their own kinds, and trees bearing fruit in which is their seed, each according to its kind. And God saw that it was good. And there was evening and there was morning, the third day." Notice the text specifically says the trees would be bearing fruit. So they were mature trees. They had to be because Adam and Eve needed to be able to eat the fruit of those trees because they were commanded to eat the fruit on day 6, and so if they were just seedlings they would have gone hungry waiting for things to grow. And that's exactly the parallel. Do we have any parallels? Yes, we have the parallels in Jesus' miracles, several of them. For example, we talked about on Sunday the water being made into wine. There was an immediate need, they'd run out of wine, so Jesus didn't tell the servants to go and pick grapes and he would crush them and, you know, we'd make some wine. No, he did a miracle of creation in turning the water immediately into ready to drink wine because they needed it right then at this marriage feast. And then of course,

there were two occasions where he fed 5,000 men plus women and children and 4,000 men plus women and children, and what did he do? He broke bread and he broke fish, and he created more bread and he created more fish. He didn't tell the disciples to run along and get a ton of flour, and we're going to bake some bread and everything. No, the people were hungry, he had to do something to meet their needs straight away and so he created fully prepared, ready to eat bread and fish from what was there originally. It was a miracle of creation. And they watched, the disciples were watching with their eyes, and on one occasion of course, at the end they went around with their baskets and filled the 12 baskets full of scraps leftover at the end. Jesus supplied in abundance and God supplied in abundance in his creation. So yes, God did create the trees and the plants in mature condition.

Now we think in terms of the timeline in which we live, that we are bound by time, and so our experience is normally that we expect to plant a seed and we water it, and we expect it to grow and it takes a few years before it will develop and mature and yield fruit. But God doesn't require that. He's perfectly at liberty, in his mind he knows exactly what he wants and he can create exactly what he wants and he knew that there was a need. And so in everything here he creates a mature, fully formed, fully functioning operating system, interlinking systems with animals and plants and eventually man as well.

So there are some of the examples if we look at Jesus' miracles. As the Creator he was demonstrating his power as the Creator and his methodology as the Creator when he did those miracles, and that's exactly what he did in those occasions. He created ready to fulfill a function immediately, and so I don't have any problem there in Genesis 1. As I like to say to people, we can't explain how Jesus made that bread and made that fish as he kept on breaking it. There's no way we can scientifically explain it, therefore, I tried some of my colleagues who try to explain what God was doing in chapter 1 of Genesis in terms of present-day processes because they're not present-day processes that were operating there in Genesis 1. God finished his work of creation and he became the sustainer of the universe and he put in place the laws that operate and sustain the universe as a consequence after he'd finished his work of creation.

Okay, now we get to a curly question: can we discuss the Nephilim in Genesis 6:4? Well, let me just say so that you will understand what the questioner is asking, let's turn to Genesis 6 and let's read the first four verses here and then you'll understand what the questioner is asking. Okay, we're looking at the history of Adam and we're moving on to Noah who's introduced at the end of chapter 5, and we're leading into the corruption that brought the judgment of the flood. And so we read in verse 1, "When man began to multiply on the face of the land and daughters were born to them, the sons of God saw that the daughters of man were attractive. And they took as their wives any they chose. Then the LORD said, 'My Spirit shall not abide in man forever, for he is flesh: his days shall be 120 years.' The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of man and they bore children to them. These were the mighty men who were of old, the men of renown." And the the word here for Nephilim is actually giants and it's worth noting that there were giants after the flood

as well, there was Goliath, the sons of Anak, and so there were giants after the flood as well, people of high stature. But the question is who were these Nephilim or what were the identifications here of the sons of God marrying the daughters of man?

Now there's been two views that have been put forward, and the sons of God if you do a word study through the Old Testament, the sons of God generally refers to angels. To angels, and so one view is that these were fallen angels, fallen angels, and they came to earth and started to corrupt the creation by marrying some of the daughters of men. This is one major view that's held by a lot of people. Now Jesus made the comment that the angels aren't given in marriage, but it doesn't say they can't procreate. And so it's quite likely, and that's the view that that Dr. John MacArthur has in his study Bible, that these were the sons of God were fallen angels, they are out to corrupt God's world, and they may have inhabited, they may have indwelt as evil spirits men and used their bodies to cohabit with the daughters of man. But the end result were these mighty men, these giants. This was part of the wickedness that that God saw developing. Things were going haywire if evil spirits, fallen angels were were starting to get involved with humanity. It was time to call a halt to everything and that's why God pronounced the judgment. So that's one view. The other view is that the sons of God may be a reference to the Seth line, and the daughters of men to the line of Ham. And so the Godly line intermarried with the the ungodly line.

And so scholars are divided on this issue. They're not uniform in determination in this area. So it's always a curly one that comes up and people will argue one way or another from various biblical passages from the Hebrew, etc. And so you can choose. We're not limited to what view we take, but it's quite clear that something abnormal was happening here, and that's why many would take the view that these were the sons of God referred to angels because you go to the book a Job and the sons of God shouted for joy when God laid the foundations of the earth, a clear reference to the angels, and these were fallen angels, and they came down and started to mess with humanity, and things could well have truly got out of hand. And that makes sense, then, that we read the next verse, verse 5, that God "saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every intention of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." Things had really gotten out of hand and God had to intervene.

By the way, I'm surprised I didn't get the question, I didn't get it and I might as well interlude here most people seem to think, well, ask the question, "Well, when were the angels created and when did Satan fall," etc. Well, first of all, the angels were present when God laid the foundations of the earth, you read that in Job. So the angels, of course, were ministering spirits, and they may well have been there in eternity with God, ministering to God, and have been around for some time before the physical creation of the earth. As for Satan, remember, in Genesis 1:31, it says God looked at everything that he had made and, behold, it was very good. So that implied that Satan hadn't yet fallen. Satan probably rebelled against God after everything was created and it can't have been that long before he came and tempted Eve. Why? Because God commanded Adam and Eve to be fruitful and multiply and yet Eve didn't bear her first son until after the curse. And so it may well be that Satan was cast out of heaven within days at the end of the

creation week, and within days he was down here on the earth trying to get Adam and Eve to join him in his rebellion against God. So Satan has been God's arch foe, and certainly it makes sense with the Nephilim that potentially that the sons of God referred to here were evil spirits that came and were involved in starting to mess with the human lineages and thus generate more evil on the earth which led God to wanting to step in and wipe everything out. If left unchecked, everyone would have been corrupted. The reason why Noah had to be protected and go on the ark is, remember God's promise of the Redeemer who would come, and he had to protect that lineage and keep alive the promised seed, the lineage of the promised seed. And so Noah becomes the ancestor of Jesus as a consequence of his faithfulness to God.

Okay, we'll move on. Now we're getting into some more heavy scientific topics. Okay, the question here is can I share some of the drawbacks and fallacies associated with carbon dating, isotope technologies, etc. that are used by scientific communities to support old earth hypotheses? Okay, let me say here and now that every dating method that you try to use has the same flaws and fallacies and that applies to methods that we might use to show as evidence for a young earth. Every method has to have certain assumptions, okay? You have to assume the starting conditions, you have to assume the rate, and you have to assume that there's been no contamination of the system. Okay, let me let me break this down a bit more carefully here.

So if we're talking about radioactive dating, uranium decays by radioactive decay eventually to lead, and so the scientists will measure how much lead and uranium is in a rock and they'll make certain assumptions, and one of those major assumptions is that the rate of decay of uranium has been constant at the rate at which we measure it today. That's a huge assumption, okay? And this assumption is the same for every method, radiocarbon, for example, as well, and by the way, don't be confused here but some people say, you know, radiocarbon is used to date rocks. No it isn't because most rocks don't have carbon in them. And radiocarbon has a very rapid decay. The measure of the decay rate is called the half-life. So if I start with a pound of uranium here, in 4.5 million years, so we're told, they will only be half a pound left. That's called its half-life. Okay, the time taken for half a given quantity to decay. Well, carbon, radiocarbon has a half-life of only 5,730 years. It's very short, whereas uranium is 4.5 billion years.

So there's a big difference and most rocks, a lot of rocks have uranium in them and potassium that's radioactive and rubidium that's radioactive, and so they use these as clocks. Let me give you an example. Imagine you have one of these hourglass clocks. Do you remember the old hourglass clock with a glass ball here and a glass ball there, and you put all the sand grains at the top and it takes one hour for all the sand grains to fall down the bottom. Okay, so this is how it works. Okay ladies, you're in the kitchen, you've just mixed your cake mixture and you put it in the oven and you set your oven and you want to cook it for half an hour, so you get your hourglass clock and you tip it up so all the sand grains are at the top and they start falling. So you leave the room, you come back, what do you do? You look at how many sand grains are still at the top, how many sand grains are down the bottom, and when the half is at the top and half is at the bottom, how long were you out of the room? Half an hour, 30 minutes, okay? So this these clocks

work the same way. The geologists measure how many atoms are down the bottom, that's the lead. They want to measure how much uranium are still there. They know how and they back calculate how long did it take for uranium to decay to produce the amount of lead that we found in the rock. "Oh, that must be when the rock formed." Okay and that's the way they do the calculation. But as I said, they're assuming the falling rate has been the same. I mean, what happens, lady, if while you're out of the room if your mischievous 10-year-old lifted up the lid and put a bit of water in there. It's going to clog up the hole where the sand grain is falling down and your clock is useless because it's slowed down. Okay? And they've also assumed that there's been no contamination. What if you're outside out of the room and your mischievous 10-year-old came in and put up another bucket load of sand at the top and you come back in and there's still plenty of sand at the top, and you're blithely, your cake is getting burnt because you happen to think that it's not 30 minutes are up yet.

So this leads to the question how do the scientists know that the decay rates have stayed the same? They don't know. We've only been measuring the decay rates for just over 100 years. In actual fact, I did a study some years ago looking at the methods that they used and the results that they got to show that they haven't been uniformly the same over the periods that they've been measuring it. And that's quite simple. It's quite simple to do, actually. You get a pound of uranium and put it on the counter here and the chemists know that there's a certain number of atoms called Avogadro's number, 6×10^{23} , in a mole, which is a measure of a quantity of uranium, and so you can work out how many atoms you've got of uranium in that pound that's sitting on the bench there. You put a Geiger counter there and you get the tick, tick, tick, tick, tick, tick, tick and you record how many ticks, each one tick is a decay, and after a year you know how many ticks have occurred, how many atoms have decayed, and so you can work out the rate because you know how many you started with and how many you now have got. And so it's not that difficult in principle but you've got to make assumptions that that's been the rate of decay back through millions and billions of years and those scientists were there to measure it.

You've also got to know the starting conditions. Do we know that there was no lead in the rock to begin with? No, we weren't there. What if most of the lead that we now measure in the rock was actually there when the rock formed? And we know that can be the case because, for example, you'll get, say, an eruption in the Canary Islands or in Hawaii, and you can take the lava and you can analyze it for lead, and you can date it with uranium lead and guess what? Some of these recent eruptions give you ages of between 1 and 2 billion years, and that's because they brought up lead atoms with them from deep inside the earth. They inherited that composition to begin with.

Now I'm saying these things because it's relevant to what's coming up as well, and so that you don't know the starting conditions for sure and what about contamination? A lot of these elements are very soluble in water and, you know, they can be leached out of rocks and they can be moved, and so we can't be sure that there hasn't been contamination. You would be surprised to know that the effects of weathering at the earth's surface you can actually find those effects that in some places go down a mile. When you go down into a

mine, you can actually still see the effects of weathering at the surface, so weathering has quite an impact on these rocks.

So these are the fallacies. Carbon dating is different, by the way. The uranium method is based on uranium being in the rock when the rock forms, but Carbon-14 is not intrinsically formed in the earth, Carbon-14 is actually produced up in the atmosphere. So what happens is that cosmic rays coming in from outer space, and thankfully God put a magnetic field around the earth to help protect it from incoming cosmic rays, and fast-moving particles will strike nitrogen atoms because most of the air, 2/3 of the air is nitrogen, the nitrogen atoms are struck and they turn into Carbon-14 atoms and those Carbon-14 atoms come down into the atmosphere. It's in the air we breathe. It's in the food we eat because that goes into the plants and it goes into the animals. It goes into the food. You ate Carbon-14 at dinner tonight with some of some of your food. And so Carbon-14 works on the principle that in this room if we'd do a test of everybody, we'd have roughly the same amount of Carbon-14 in our bodies. But do you know what? When you die, you stop eating, so you stop taking in Carbon-14 to replace the Carbon-14 that's decaying away. And so we could go to the cemetery, the graveyard, and test the bones of your great grandmother just to check whether the tombstone has the right date, and we'd discover how much Carbon-14 is still left in her bones, she stopped eating when she died. okay, so we know how much is in her bones compared with your bones, we know how quickly Carbon-14 decays, so we can calculate how long ago she died because we know the rate at which the Carbon-14 gets depleted.

That's how the method works with Carbon-14. It's only used for young materials, and it's actually archaeologists have a lot of problems with it. Why? Well, because the dates they produce are based on the assumption that the production of Carbon-14 in the past has been always the same as what's happening today, but what they're ignoring is that the evidence indicates the earth's magnetic field was twice as strong as what it is today 1,400 years ago. So the magnetic field being twice as strong shields the earth from cosmic rays and less Carbon-14 would be produced 1,400 years ago compared to now.

So they've assumed a constant when in actual fact it wasn't the same back in the past. Why is that relevant? Well, the next question involves a project that I was in between 1997 and 2005. The Institute for Creation Research set up a project called the Radioisotopes Age of the Earth Project, Research Project. Acronym was RATE, Radioisotopes and the Age of the Earth, RATE. And the question we were looking at was what was the evidence, you know, what was the evidence for the earth's age? How did these methods work? And was there evidence that would fit with the scriptures that would help us to understand these billion-year ages for the rocks?

Well, we did a number of different projects and one of those projects concerned radiocarbon, and I'd already started doing work in that area. I'd been collecting fossil wood samples from different levels in the geologic record, and I'd send them to radiocarbon labs without telling them where the samples came from because if they knew that the samples had come from a coal bed 250 million years old, they wouldn't want to date it because they would believe that there should be no radiocarbon in it, okay? That's

the reason why they don't radiocarbon date dinosaur bones. They believe the dinosaurs died out 66 million years ago and radiocarbon decays so quickly that if every atom of the earth was radiocarbon, within a million years it would all be gone. And so you wouldn't expect to find radiocarbon in dinosaur bones if they were 66 million years old. Well, we already knew that there was a change in technology for measuring radiocarbon in the early 1980s, and this technology they wanted to test their equipment, and so they put into their detectors materials that they thought shouldn't have any radiocarbon in them, and whether they chose coal, oil, limestone, natural gas, dinosaur bones, anything like that that they stuck in, they always found that there was radiocarbon in them and they just said it was contamination. Well, it's not. It's real radiocarbon, and so that's what I was finding with these fossil wood samples.

Well, in this project at Penn State University, the Department of Energy stores coal samples from every coal mine in the United States and they have it under sealed conditions to preserve them, and you could apply for pieces for testing for your research. So we applied for 10 samples of coal from coal beds around the United States from supposedly 40 million years old up to over 300 million years old and we sent them to a lab for radiocarbon dating, not telling them where it came from. Well, the interesting thing is they essentially all came back with the same radiocarbon age, okay? It was inflated. It wasn't 4 ½ thousand years, but it was 48 1/2 thousand years, but that's based on the assumption of the constancy of the rate. If you take into account that the rate was slower in the past, then that inflated the numbers. But why would coal that was 40 million years old and coal that was supposedly 300 million years old give you the same radiocarbon date? Because they're all trees, vegetation, that lived at the same time, the day before the flood and got wiped out by the flood. So you'd expect them to have the same radiocarbon age. And so that's interesting.

We also have tested diamonds and diamonds come from deep inside the earth, as I said before, and nobody had really tested diamonds for radiocarbon, that diamonds are very pure carbon can't be contaminated externally or internally, and so we got diamond samples. It's possible to do that for research purposes, and we sent them off for dating and sure enough they all had radiocarbon in them. Even though they're supposed to be between 1 and 3 billion years old, they all had radiocarbon in them. And so this was quite amazing because it indicates that materials aren't as old as what they claim to be. By the way, corollary to that is that at the present time a colleague and I are working to extend that work and we've taken delivery of another 20 diamond samples that we'll be getting radiocarbon datings shortly.

Well, what else did this RATE committee find? Well, most times geologists only use one dating method on a rock because they believe all the dating methods should give you the same result. It's like having a series of these hourglass clocks, some have larger sand grains, some have smaller sand grains, they might fall at different rates, but if you set the clocks at zero when the rock forms, they sure all should give you the same age, same date back to when the rock formed back to the present time. So we decided that we would test this because the textbook said if you use any method you'll get the same result. So we collected samples, a number of samples in the Grand Canyon, for example, and that

involved quite a bit of field work, and we sent them away to labs not telling them what we're doing. And lo and behold, in many instances we got dates that were totally disparate. For example, in the eastern Grand Canyon in lava flows and the potassium age for these was 516 million years. The rubidium age was 1,100 million years. And the samarium age was 1,500 years, something like that. So the huge disparity between the ages. And another rock unit, again, all four methods gave totally different results.

Now the only to reconcile that was to assume, because after all the clock started ticking in the rock at the time the rock formed, and so what we are measuring is the time between when the rock formed and today with these clocks. So that means they're assuming the clocks should all tick, should give you the same age. What would it take if they gave you a different age? It would mean that the clocks had ticked at different rates in the past, that while the potassium clock was ticking through 500 million years, the rubidium clock was ticking through 1,100 million years, and the samarium clock was ticking through over 1,500 million years in the same real time period. So that means that decay rates must have been accelerated at a rapid rate at some event in the past.

We had other evidence. We wanted to know whether this was actual real decay, and so we were looking at the damage in the rock crystals as a result of the radiation because it does damage the raw crystals, to see if there was real evidence for the quantities of radiation damage that matches the supposed age. And sure enough, there was, and it was systematic through the rocks. And so we came to the conclusion that during the flood, during the flood decay rates were speeded up as part of the catastrophic processes during the flood. And in a sense, that makes good sense because a byproduct, a byproduct of radioactive decay is heat and heat is what drives geological processes. I referred to the supercontinent, supercontinent before the flood that broke up at the time of the flood. And so you've got to move, you've got to move parts of the earth thousands of miles in a year. That takes a lot of energy, a lot of heat, and all God had to do is somehow start this rapid radioactive decay which generates a lot of heat, bursts open the fountains of the great deep, breaks up the earth's crust, heats things up, things move around quickly and then shut it down and everything gets to the present level. So it makes a lot of interesting sense and so we published two technical volumes on that research and there's various web articles at a lay level on that particular issue.

The next question is I talked about God created the earth with, I do not like the phrase God created the earth with an age. No, I prefer to talk about God creating the earth fully mature, fully functioning. It had it all together. He put everything in place and it was ready for man's abode. We assign an age based on our experience of time. We live in time and we look at something and we try to date it and we try to figure out how old it is. You know, we could have gone into the garden of Eden on day 8 and looked at Adam, and we'd say, "Hm, he must be 30 years old." No, no, God had only created him two days earlier because he'd made him a fully grown man. He wasn't a baby crawling through the garden of Eden. He was a fully grown man. And so we're the ones that impose, put an age on things, labeling things by our everyday experience and so I don't like the term that God created the earth with age. No, he created it with a composition that we've interpreted as an age, so it's entirely possible that just as God created all the different

varieties of elements, he created all the different types within those elements of what we call isotopes and they're all present when he created. So a lot of the lead that's supposed to have come from uranium decay that we measure now God may have put there as part of the variety in his initial creation. We've come along and we assume that that lead has come from radioactive decay, and so we assign a great age. And so I think in the light of Jesus' miracles, in the light of the text in Genesis 1 where God created everything mature, fully functioning, that those are the words that we should be using to describe the earth and God's creation, and so I don't like the idea that people some have said that God created the earth with an age. No, God wasn't out to deceive us. God has told us, he's given us the earth's age, he's given us the details, we're just extrapolating from our everyday experience looking at what we're measuring in the earth to come to the conclusion of an age and there's a lot more that could be said there.

Well, finally the last question and we're doing well for time here: what is the biblical response to climate change? Okay, I mentioned that briefly and remember after the flood God said to Noah in chapter 8, verse 22, "While the earth remains seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night shall not cease." It's true that climate changes. Now when we were waiting in Brisbane to move over here at the beginning of 2011, we stayed longer because my father was in ill health, and there was a massive downpour and there was incredible flooding in the city of Brisbane. Well, it's happened again in 2022, 11 years later. There's been massive rainfall on the east coast of Australia, and it's in the news again even as we speak. And the farmers who've kept records already knew that it was going to be a wet year because you can see the cyclical pattern of the climate. You go back in history, you go back to the medieval warm period around 1000 AD, and the Vikings were able to grow crops on the coast of Greenland. So it was a lot warmer than what it is today, okay? Greenland was ice free around the coast, and they actually grew crops where you can't do that today. One of the reasons why the Romans were successful in the expansion of their empire, it was also another warm period, and so there have been these fluctuations. The Dark Ages corresponded to a colder period and then after the medieval warm period there was a cooler period as well. In fact, I remember as a boy we'd go to Christmas Day service at our church and it's summer down there in Australia, my father wore an overcoat on Christmas Day, December 25th in summer because it was so cold. They were talking about we're going to go into an Ice Age. Well, that changed.

So climate fluctuates and it's been fluctuating ever since the flood. The earth is still settling down as a consequence of the flood. We're getting fewer volcanic eruptions, fewer earthquakes because those were things that were happening during the flood and they're getting less and less through time, and so we can see this fluctuation in the climate as well. So should we get alarmed? Well, first of all, looking after the environment... well, first of all, we have to recognize that God controls the thermostat, man doesn't, and it's ludicrous to think that we can somehow by changing the gases in the atmosphere we can control the earth's temperature. That is just sheer nonsense, it's arrogance to presume that. But the Christian does have responsibility. I was reminded that, you know, part of the image of man of God's image in man is God giving man dominion over the earth. God ruled the earth because he created it, and he handed over that rule to man to be his

vicegerent and, of course, Adam forfeited that when he sinned, and so there's been this war between effectively in our dominion between the environment and our dominion.

So as I said on Sunday, God was concerned about the animals, he was concerned about the land, he gave the children of Israel instructions on practices in agriculture and animal husbandry to protect their animals, so we are answerable to God for how we treat the earth, and so it is important that Christians should be at the forefront of doing things with technology to improve the quality of life, to utilize what we have to benefit the creation as well as man. And so it's not a matter of wanton waste, it's a matter of wise stewardship because we're answerable to God, but let's be careful about some of the hysterics. Now I often point out you've got some of these liberals who live in New York City who've never been into the country, with their new Green Deal that is totally absolutely nonsensical. You know, we're going to have electric cars. Well, where do you get the resources from to build the electric cars? They've got plastics. Where do you get plastics from? Coal and oil. But they don't want coal and oil. Well, you can't have the plastic for your electric car. What about the copper wire that you need for the electricity, and the lithium and the cobalt for the battery? Well, you've got to mind those but they don't want mines.

So do you see the problem? They want the technology but they don't want the means by which we get that technology, and so what the Christian has to say is, "Wait a minute. Let's be wise. Let's be wise." Remember friends, the coal and the oil was produced during the flood. The coal is buried vegetation, pre-flood vegetation. The oil is primarily buried algae. And so, as I like to point out that even in judgment God was providing us a resource that we could use in the post-flood world. Even in judgment God was exercising mercy. And look what's happened, the mining of coal fueled the Industrial Revolution in England. The oil in the US spurred the prosperity of the US. And so what God has given us how dare we call bad. I mean, it's like Peter with God dropping the sheet with the animals and saying, "Rise and eat," on the top of Simon the tanner's house in Joppa, and God says, "What God has provided, why call it unclean?" You know, sure, we can use oil more wisely, we can use coal more wisely to reduce the pollutants. Sure. Let's work to develop the technology but let's not spurn the resources that God's given us because one of the problems with this agenda is that it's going to impoverish the poorer people and put more people into poverty. It's going to make some wealthier and most people poorer and that's not what a Christian should be about. We want to provide for everyone to raise their living standards and that means we should do what we can.

I mean, solar technology, do you realize that those solar panels are only about 20% efficient? 20% efficient. A coal power station is 99% efficient, okay? A huge difference. And those wind towers, they don't show you all the dead birds, for example, and they don't show you about the leftover materials that have to get thrown out after 20 years. Each one of those towers cost over a million dollars to build and if the wind's not blowing where do you get your electricity from? They're highly inefficient. And so you know, we have to be wise and sensible about using all different means in a balanced way to benefit mankind, to help people rise in their living standards, but also to do the least damage to the environment as possible. And I know it takes a lot of skill, but Christians could be in the forefront of doing that. So that's what I'd say is our response to climate change, we

should be practicing and preaching, as it were, responsible stewardship of God's creation as part of the dominion that he has given us.

So I hope that's been helpful. I'm sure that's raised a lot of other questions for you, but thank you for those questions and anytime you want to ask me other questions privately, that's fine. So let let's just bow for a word of prayer.

Father, we thank you for this time to reflect on your word and the issues that we have questions about. Father, the world in which we live is complex but it's your creation and you've given us stewardship over it, you've given us dominion, you've given us minds and, Father, we're to worship you with our bodies and our minds and part of that worship is to use our minds to explore your world, to understand your world, to help us to use your world for the benefit of mankind. Father, we thank you that at the present time with all the hysteria when people are fearful, it's a great time to be a Christian because we have our confidence and hope in you and, Father, people's anxiety, anxieties can give us opportunities to share the good news with them that you're in control and this planet won't burn up not until you're ready for it to happen and that you're going to come again and judge this world and they need to be ready. So thank you for this time. Bless what we've shared together tonight for our information and understanding, and we give you all the praise and thanks that your word is our anchor and your word is our authority. And we thank you as we pray these things in Jesus' name, Amen.

Thanks for listening from Truth Community Church in Cincinnati, OH. You can find more church information and other helpful materials at thetruthpulpit.com teaching God's people God's word. This message is copyrighted. All rights reserved.