

**Book Review - The Answers Book
Chapter 1 – Does God Exist?**



Review by Greg Neyman

First Published 11 June 2003

Answers In Creation Website

Located at www.answersincreation.org/abc1.htm

Yes He does! For the most part, this chapter is well-written, and does not affect Old-Earth belief. However, because the basic belief of the authors is in a young-earth, their work is naturally biased. There are several points which can be discussed as it relates to the age of the earth.

Other Evidence for The Creator-God of the Bible (Page 20)

In the middle of this section, the authors make the claim that there is evidence that the universe is relatively young, and this contradicts the belief in billions of years. As you can see from the rest of the Answers In Creation website, this so-called “evidence” is full of holes, and is only accepted by the young-earth community. As such, no reputable scientist has accepted any evidence that the universe is young. It is only when you delve into the narrow-minded world of young-earth theory that you see people who accept a young universe, despite all the evidence against them.

The authors also mention the traditions of hundreds of native peoples around the world which support Biblical history. Here the authors are alluding to the many flood stories throughout the world. Old-earth theory has no problem accepting this. Since all people descended from Noah and his family, all these stories have a common source. However, as you will see in the rebuttal for Chapter 10, the flood was not global, i.e. over the “entire” surface of the earth, but it was global from the perspective of Noah and his family.

Is It Science? (Page 21)

The authors attempt to show the inherent bias that is present in science, such as the scientists religious beliefs. Yes, this is an important fact to consider when discussing conclusions. However, it is not the old-earth scientists that you have to look out for...it is the inherent bias of the young earth theorist that is flawed.

What is a young-earth “creation scientist?” Is there such a thing? Let us turn to the dictionary for a definition of a scientist.

A scientist uses “scientific methods” to examine things. According to Webster’s Dictionary, the scientific method is “...the collection of data through observation and if possible experiment, the formulation of hypothesis, and the testing and confirmation of the hypothesis formulated.” Note the scientist FIRST collects data, and then formulates the hypothesis.

However, young-earth scientists do not operate by the above dictionary definition. They have reached the conclusion (hypothesis) that the earth is young FIRST, before

they collect scientific data from the rocks. Only then do they try to match the scientific data to their pre-conceived age of the earth. Since the authors do not comply with the scientific method, they cannot rightly be called scientists, and at best should be referred to as “theorists.” Therefore, to call someone a “Creation Scientist” is to put a title on them that they do not deserve, because they do not use the scientific method.

As a result, you cannot trust the conclusions of so-called young-earth scientists. Who then should you trust? When it comes to “creation science,” one should look for Christians who objectively look at the evidences before coming to “age” conclusions. There are many good Christian scientists out there in the church. We should rely on them, and not on people who label themselves as “creation scientists” under false pretenses.

At the top of page 22, the authors make the statement that scientists that believe the Biblical record to be God’s Word, will come to a different conclusion from those scientists that disregard the Bible. This is not true. There are many scientists (Dr. Hugh Ross, Gerard Schroeder, etc) who believe the Bible, yet they believe in an old earth. The authors falsely believe that believing the Bible means you must accept a young age for the universe. There is no problem with a person believing in an infallible, inerrant Bible, and believing in an old universe. The Answers In Creation website proves this, and is a gathering point for old-earth believers.

Who Created God? (Page 22)

There is a great point here at the top of page 23. The authors recognize God as the creator of time, and as such, He is not limited by the time dimension. In the summary on page 24, they say that “God...is outside of time.” This admission opens the door to old-earth belief. Since God is not limited by time, what does “time” mean to God?

Young earther's will make a defense of the "days" of creation being literal 24-hour days. The truth is, there is no claim in the Bible that states the length of these days. The "day" as we know it didn't even begin until the fourth day of creation, when the sun and the moon were created (according to young-earth interpretations). The saying I like to use is, “If you are God, and you are in outer space, a million miles away from any stars or planets, then how do you mark the passage of time? As God, you do not sleep, you do not need rest, therefore time has no meaning.” When we get to heaven, we will spend eternity there. Are we going to have clocks in heaven? Wow, there goes another million years! It won’t matter to us, just like it doesn’t matter to God.

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

Non-Biblical Evidence (Page 25)

2. Living Things. Not a problem for the progressive creationist, but it is a problem for the old-earth theistic evolutionist.
3. Fossils (page 26). Provides a rebuttal against evolution, but has absolutely no bearing on the progressive creationist.
4. The Age of Things (Page 27). The first paragraph has inaccuracies. The authors make the claim that there is much evidence that the universe is young...but this is far from the truth. The truth is that the only scientists who accept this is the young-earth believers...no reputable scientist has accepted a young age for the universe. For instance, they mention the argument that the decay of the earth's magnetic field is evidence of a young earth. What the young-earth theorist is pointing to is the weakening of the magnetic field. However, this weakening has occurred many times over earth's history. As the earth undergoes a magnetic reversal, the field lessens, then reaches zero, then reverses polarity. This movement toward zero is not a "weakening" but is a natural part of the reversal process. This is but one example of how they try to "pull the wool" over the reader's eyes.

Conclusion

I agree with the young-earth theorist that God exists. However, I do not possess the preconceived assumptions that the young-earth believer has. I rest on the scientific evidence for the age of the earth, whereas the young-earth believer first assumes the earth is young, and then he tries to prove his conclusion with science, which ignores the "scientific method." Therefore, so-called young-earth "creation science" is not science at all, but is part of a system of belief, best summed up as a "theory."

I can rest on the science, and still believe in the inerrant Word of God. Instead of ignoring the scientific community, we should embrace it.