

Adam and Christ,<sup>9</sup> each being seen as the beginning of a new order of creation. The resurrection of Jesus, referred to above, is presented in the New Testament as the very beginning of that new creation, for “He is the image of the invisible God, the *firstborn* over all creation. For by him all things were created. . . who is the beginning, the *firstborn* from the dead” (Col. 1:15-18, NKJV). And Jesus says of himself: “These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, *the beginning of the creation of God*” (Rev. 3:14).

Furthermore, those who are in Christ, who have been baptized into his death and resurrection, are themselves caught up into this new order of things: “Therefore, if anyone is in Christ, he is a *new creation*; old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new” (2 Cor. 5:17, NKJV). All who will be raised from the dead and, having been justified by faith, receive the incomparable gift of eternal life, will truly be incorporated into God’s new creation in Jesus

Christ. They will be parts of the “new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness”, which the Creator will establish for His own pleasure: “For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind. But be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create: for, behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy. And I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in My people” (2 Pet. 3:13; Isa. 65:17-19).

At that time those who have puzzled and wondered at the mysteries and marvels of this present creation may hope to share the supreme privilege of knowing and understanding all that the Creator in His own wisdom has performed. And that will be a science study course beyond compare!

---

9. See, for example, Rom. 5:15-19; 1 Cor. 15:22,45; 2 Cor. 4:4, *cf.* Gen. 1:26; Eph. 5:30-32, *cf.* Gen. 2:23,24; Phil. 2:5-9, *cf.* Gen. 3:4-6.

## The Two Books and the history of science

Stephen Snobelen

**G**OD HAS revealed Himself in both His Word and His Works. The first of these two revelations is the most familiar to us. Scripture is ‘God-breathed’ (the literal meaning of “given by inspiration of God”) and provides for the believer “doctrine”, “reproof”, “correction” and “instruction in righteousness” (2 Tim. 3:16). But God has also made Himself known through His creation of the natural world. Although this second revelation does not offer detailed instruction about God, nature nevertheless does teach us, through its evident design, that there is a Creator. Moreover, when we compare the Book of Scripture with the ‘Book’ of Nature, it becomes clear that the Designer is none other than the God of the Bible. There is a fundamental unity between the Two Books.

### The Two Books linked

But there is more. Not only does nature confirm that the Bible is right to speak of a Creator God, but our understanding of nature also reinforces other, more specific Scriptural truths. Thus the unity of design in creation implies a *single* Crea-

tor, which in turn upholds the monotheism of the Bible against the polytheism of paganism. Similarly, the Bible’s teaching on the mortality of human and animal life is perfectly consistent with what the natural world reveals about the inevitable processes of organic decay and dissolution that tragically afflict all life in this dispensation. Even the regular rhythms of night and day and the seasons, along with the appearance of the rainbow—all too often taken for granted—present a continuous testimony to God’s immutability and unchanging faithfulness, which in turn guarantee His other promises (Gen. 1:14; 8:22; 9:12-17; Jer. 31:35-37; 33:20-26).

Several more characteristics of God are displayed in creation as well, including His love and care for us, made manifest in His provision of food from both earth and field (Gen. 1:29,30). The magnificence and grandeur of creation reveal the enormous extent of God’s glory (Isa. 40:12-28)—so much so that the many features of creation are said, in a metaphorical manner, to praise and glorify the Lord (Ps. 148). The stunningly rich beauty of creation, and the requisite

human senses and understanding with which to experience it, also tell us something of the mercy of God, Who desires us to lift up our heads from the mundane to appreciate its beauty, and to praise the Lord for all His Works (Ps. 8).

The Bible itself teaches both the inspiration of the written Word and the revelation of the natural world. In the New Testament, the Apostle Paul affirms that even the Gentiles without the Scriptures should recognise the existence of a Creator through the evidence of creation: "For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse" (Rom. 1:20).

But the fullest articulation in the Bible of the doctrine of the Two Revelations comes in Psalm 19, which opens with a description of the Book of Nature speaking and teaching in a manner like that of the Book of Scripture: "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth His handywork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge. There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world" (vv. 1-4). Then, beginning in verse 7, we read of the Book of Scripture: "The law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple". Both nature and Scripture, in their distinct ways, teach us about God. Nature, then, is a kind of text, a book that complements the Scripture and that can be read to learn, not the specifics of doctrine, but more general, qualitative truths such as God's infinite wisdom and boundless glory.

#### Interpreting God's Word and His Works

The right way to interpret God's Word is to derive teachings *out of* an unbiased reading of it, rather than by reading preconceived ideas *into* it; the first approach is *exegesis*, the second *eisegesis*. The first approach is also a foundation principle of modern science. This method, empiricism, involves a direct observation of nature to draw truths from it. Unfortunately, during the Middle Ages both Scriptural exegesis and the philosophy of nature were encumbered by the mistaken notion that one must place human authorities above the real Word and World. Thus, the interpretations of the early Church 'Fathers' were used to fix the meaning of the Biblical text,

and the understanding of nature was determined through the consultation of ancient books by Greek philosophers such as Aristotle. Of course, the ancient Fathers of the Church and science were all too often well wide of the mark of truth.

But this was not the only hindrance. During the medieval period, Scriptural interpretation was mired down in a morass of allegory. For theologians of this age, the most important message was not the obvious, literal meaning, but the supposed symbolic one. It goes without saying that this method of interpretation could yield almost any result the theologians desired. The same state of affairs predominated with the interpretation of nature. Many viewed God's creation primarily as a presentation of a series of symbols or 'emblems' teaching moral truths. Thus the ant was studied (and even then mainly in books rather than by direct observation) mainly as a metaphor of industry.

Yes, it is true that the Bible contains symbols, and lessons can be learned from nature (the Bible itself offers the example of the ant in Proverbs 6:6-11). But these are minority examples, and, in the case of the Bible, medieval theologians were quite happy to derive up to *three* levels of allegorical meaning from even the much more numerous literal texts, while the obvious meaning was derogated. Allegory was out of control. Similarly, 'contemplative' philosophy of nature was prized above and almost to the exclusion of practical knowledge. It is not hard to see why both the Bible and science were shrouded in obscurity in the aptly named Dark Ages.

With the coming of the Reformation, however, a literal-historical method of exegesis was introduced. This, combined with the principle of *sola scriptura* (only Scripture), led Martin Luther to break with Rome and, crucially, helped stimulate many more radical reformers to advance further to discover that doctrines like the Trinity, immortality of the soul and the eternity of hell torments were not to be found in the pages of Scripture.

Shortly after this overturning of tradition-laden Christianity, a second transformation began: the Scientific Revolution. This involved the rejection of the ancient human authority of Greek philosophers such as Aristotle in favour of the direct and rigorous observation of nature—a programme aided, from the beginning of the seventeenth century, by the telescope and the microscope. Recent historical research has shown

that it is no coincidence that the rejection of the symbolic view of Scripture was closely followed by the repudiation of the emblematic view of Nature.<sup>1</sup> For good or ill, the methods of interpretation are linked, because the Two Books were designed, and designed to be read, by the same God.

Arguably the greatest scientist of all time, Isaac Newton, understood this connection well. In manuscript writings on the interpretation of Revelation dating from the 1670s, Newton wrote that it was important:

“To choose those constructions which without straining reduce things to the greatest simplicity . . . It is the perfection of God’s works that they are all done with the greatest simplicity. He is the God of order and not confusion. And therefore as they that would understand the frame of the world must endeavour to reduce their knowledge to all possible simplicity, so it must be in seeking to understand these visions”.<sup>2</sup>

Newton was convinced that the God of order ensures that both Scripture and Nature can be read in a simple way by those who use the right (and similar) methodologies to do so.

What is more, Newton (who rejected the Trinity) also contended that, just as the truth of the Bible had been distorted through the addition of unBiblical ideas by Trinitarians, so science (then called natural philosophy) had been corrupted by the unwarranted introduction of non-empirically based hypotheses. Newton also believed that the unity in creation pointed to the unity of God, and there is in the history of science an association between belief in the unity of creation and pure (that is Biblical) Unitarian theology, along with the radical denial of authorities in both nature and Scripture. It is thus interesting to note that, along with Newton, his successor to the Lucasian Professorship at Cambridge, William Whiston, and the eighteenth-century chemist Joseph Priestley, were also antitrinitarians.

At the same time, Newton believed that the Scriptures are not written in the manner of a scientific textbook to be mined for scientific detail. With respect to astronomical phenomena described in the Word, he argued that the Scriptures do not speak “in the language of Astronomers (as [some] think) but in that of the common people to whom they were written”.<sup>3</sup> This observation is similar to the saying made famous by the Italian astronomer Galileo in 1615, when he

said that the Bible “tells us how to go to heaven, not how the heaven goes”. Putting aside the evident false doctrine implicit in this statement, there is a measure of truth in this clever aphorism. The primary purpose of God’s Word is to teach us spiritual truths concerning salvation, not detailed insights into quantum mechanics or the structure of DNA. At the same time, the Word certainly offers general truths about the natural world and does not contradict what genuine science tells us about the more detailed matters.

### The design argument

With the increase of knowledge brought about by the Scientific Revolution of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries came an increase in the appreciation for design in creation. The seventeenth-century chemist Robert Boyle was so taken by the evidence of design that he stated that the only atheists were those who had not studied nature. Works advocating the argument from design became popular in the wake of the Scientific Revolution, particularly in Protestant Britain.

One of earliest of such works is the naturalist John Ray’s *The Wisdom of God Manifested in the Works of Creation* (1691). In 1713, Newton added the General Scholium (a heavily theological appendix) to the second edition of his *Principia Mathematica*, in which he declared that “this most elegant system of the sun, planets, and comets could not have arisen without the design and dominion of an intelligent and powerful being”.<sup>4</sup> Shortly after this, his successor William Whiston (also known as the translator of Josephus) published his *Astronomical Principles of Religion, Natural and Reveal’d* (1717), a full-length study of design in creation explicated by Newtonian physics. The Anglican clergyman William Paley, who, it seems, veered from Trinitarian orthodoxy, and whose rooms at Christ College, Cambridge were

- 
1. P. Harrison, *The Bible, Protestantism and the Rise of Natural Science* (Cambridge, 1998).
  2. Newton, Yahuda MS 1, cited in F. Manuel, *The Religion of Isaac Newton* (Oxford, 1974), p. 120 (text modernised).
  3. Newton, Cambridge University Library MS Add. 4005, Sec. 7, cited in I. B. Cohen, “Isaac Newton’s Principia, the Scriptures and the Divine Providence”, in *Philosophy, Science and Method* (New York, 1969), p. 544.
  4. Newton, *The Principia: Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*, translated I. B. Cohen and A. Whitman (Berkeley, 1999), p. 940.

later occupied by Charles Darwin, published in 1802 his phenomenally popular text *Natural Theology*, a work that remained part of the curriculum at Cambridge well into the twentieth century.

All these writers had a powerful faith in the Scriptures. Others in the eighteenth century, however, began to reject the Bible and to reduce their religion to the design argument, or natural religion, alone. The belief in a Creator God without an acceptance of written revelation or Providence is called Deism, which on its own is sterile and incomplete. Newton, Whiston and Priestley all recognised this, and that the design argument only takes a believer so far. For this reason, they were all ardent advocates of the argument from fulfilled prophecy—an argument that pointed specifically to the Divine origin of the Bible. Nevertheless, it is interesting that, in this age of apparent secularism, a sort of ‘neo-deism’ has emerged in the works of some science writers such as Paul Davies (*God and the New Physics; The Cosmic Blueprint*), who point to unexplained complexity, harmony and design in nature. Such works can be used with profit, but the design argument is insufficient without the Scriptures. As shown above, Psalm 19 speaks of *two* revelations.

#### Nineteenth-century reconciliations of science and religion

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, the science of geology was beginning to accumulate data that pointed to the earth being much older than the traditional reading of Genesis would allow. This data (and especially interpretations of it) presented a challenge for expositors of the Mosaic account. One response was that of the ‘scriptural geologists’, who contended that science had to be read straightforwardly in light of the Scriptural text, and thus geological phenomena were explained by such agencies as the Biblical Flood. The ‘scriptural geologists’ were the forebears of twentieth-century advocates of Flood geology as epitomised in the now classic work by Henry M. Morris and John C. Whitcomb, *The Genesis Flood* (1961). Critics of this view contend that it discounts much good science and produces a form of pseudoscience that remains unconvincing to nonbelievers.

The ‘concordists’ set out a different strategy. This school strove to reconcile the findings of geology with the Bible. One of the foundation principles of this movement was the above-out-

lined analogy of the Two Books. Concordists were happy to accept the great age of the earth revealed by contemporary geology. Critics of this school argue that, although the intention is to find harmony, the approach can lead to the subordination of Scripture to science.

A prominent group of concordists, centred around the Scottish evangelical Thomas Chalmers, proposed the development of a ‘Christian philosophy’ that promoted both Biblical truth and the results of science in a manner that permitted no division between the two. It was Chalmers who, noting in 1803 that “[t]he writings of Moses do not fix the antiquity of the globe”,<sup>5</sup> promoted and popularised the ‘gap theory’—the proposal that there was a gap between an initial creation and the one described at large in Genesis 1 and 2. This optimistic view of the sciences was neatly summed up when, in an 1833 speech to the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Chalmers proclaimed that: “Christianity had everything to hope and nothing to fear from the advancement of philosophy”.<sup>6</sup>

One of Chalmers’ allies in this movement to promote a ‘Christian Philosophy’ was Henry Duncan, minister at Ruthwell, Dumfriesshire, who, in the late 1830s, produced a four-volume work entitled *Sacred Philosophy of the Seasons*—a compendium of essays and meditations on the wonders of creation and the latest discoveries in science. His son, George John C. Duncan, also a minister, contributed an article to this work entitled: “True science, the handmaid of religion”. The opening paragraph epitomises this positive view of science:

“There are few mistakes less reasonable than that which leads believers to entertain a jealousy of the investigations of science, as if there were a risk that the bulwarks of our holy faith might be undermined by the progress of philosophical discovery. Science, properly so called, is nothing else than the knowledge of truths. Scripture, rightly interpreted, is emphatically the word of truth; and though the subjects treated of by each may have no immediate relation to one another,

5. Cited in Hugh Miller, *The Testimony of the Rocks; or, Geology in its Bearings on the Two Theologies, Natural and Revealed* (Edinburgh, 1857), p. 115.

6. Cited in Adam Sedgwick, *A Discourse on the Studies of the University* (Cambridge, 1833), p. 107.

still it is impossible that there should be any contradiction between them. Truth cannot be opposed to truth".<sup>7</sup>

Of course, such an all-encompassing statement was much easier to make in a pre-Darwinian world.

It is evident that our early brethren John Thomas and Robert Roberts adhered to this nineteenth-century harmonising approach, willing to accept the findings of geology as to the age of the earth but interpreting these findings in a way that was consistent with the Scriptural record. When contending for a pre-Adamic creation in *Elpis Israel*, John Thomas wrote:

"Fragments . . . of the wreck of this pre-Adamic world have been brought to light by geological research, to the records of which we refer the reader, for a detailed account of its discoveries, with this remark, that its organic remains, coal fields, and strata, belong to the ages before the formation of man, rather than to the era of the creation, or the Noachic flood. This view of the matter will remove a host of difficulties, which have hitherto disturbed the harmony between the conclusions of geologists and the Mosaic account of the physical constitution of our globe".<sup>8</sup>

Thus Brother Thomas was not an adherent of 'Flood geology'. Nor, as is made evident in his book *The Visible Hand of God*, was Brother Roberts, who believed the Flood was demographically universal but geographically local. Whether or not today we accept pre-Adamic humans, the gap theory or a local flood, we can agree with Brother Thomas's wise desire to seek harmony between God's revelation through His Word and His manifestation in His Works.

### The 'Conflict Thesis'

An assumption often heard in the media today is that science and religion are inherently at odds with each other. Although now completely discredited by specialist scholars, this notion still flourishes among those without a sophisticated knowledge of either religion or the history of science. Referred to as the 'Conflict Thesis', this common myth has an early prehistory among secular French intellectuals of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment, who began to argue that religion had become obsolete in a world where science (supposedly) had all the answers. But the 'Conflict Thesis' did not come of age until the late nineteenth century, when it emerged in the wake of the wars over Darwinism. The main

theme of the thesis is that religion has been little more than a vehicle for ignorance, while science has only promoted enlightenment.<sup>9</sup> A modern and notorious advocate of this position is the popular science writer Richard Dawkins.

It is important that the myths surrounding the 'Conflict Thesis' be dispelled. First, although this stereotypical view has long been the default position of the majority in the media, it has been rejected by the majority of historians of science for many years. They have shown that, rather than being in perpetual conflict, religious beliefs often acted as an *incentive* to study nature. Second, historians and philosophers of science point out that science perpetually goes through revolutions in which the standard science of one age becomes the pseudoscience of the next. The implication here is that some—even much—of today's science will one day be rendered as obsolete as Aristotle's physics or Galen's medicine.

Third, the classic case study used by advocates of the 'Conflict Thesis', the trial of Galileo by the Catholic Church in the early seventeenth century, has long been misrepresented. It was not, as commonly portrayed, a battle between a noble scientist in pursuit of simple truth and the fossilised adherents of the supposedly outdated Bible. Instead, Galileo came into conflict with the Church because the latter had unwisely committed itself to Aristotelian philosophy, which they believed supported their unBiblical teaching of transubstantiation. Because their commitment to Aristotle was holistic and included his advocacy of a geocentric (earth-centred) universe, Galileo's Catholic judges deemed that any claim to a heliocentric (sun-centred) model would bring down all of Catholic theology. Moreover, the Council of Trent (1545-63) had ruled that, in cases where there was harmony between the Church Fathers over the interpretation of particular passages in the Bible, this consensus must be ac-

- 
7. G. J. C. Duncan in H. Duncan, *Sacred Philosophy of the Seasons; Illustrating the Perfections of God in the Phenomena of the Year: Spring*, 2nd edition (Edinburgh, 1837), p. 356.
  8. John Thomas, *Elpis Israel* (Birmingham, 1990; originally published 1850), Chapter 2: "The Creation of the Earth and Man".
  9. The two classic works of this tradition are John William Draper's *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science* (1875) and Andrew Dickson White's *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom* (1895).

cepted as orthodoxy. Since the Fathers viewed the relevant passages as teaching geocentrism, this was the official view of the Roman Catholic Church. In this case, both scientific and religious tradition obstructed truth.

Another important development in the history of science has been the growing awareness that science has had its fair share of failures. In a post-Hiroshima world in which nuclear and other potential environmental disasters wrought by science are a constant background threat, it is now possible to see science in a negative as well as a positive light. In fact, the notorious Nazi doctors of the Second World War demonstrated that science could be used for evil. More recently, concerns about the troubling potential of genetic engineering, along with worries about genetically modified food and infections from 'mad cow' disease, have alerted the public mind to the view that science can be a threat as well as a benefit. The position of science in society today is far from impregnable.

#### God's Word and God's Works

How should a believer at the beginning of the twenty-first century view the relationship between the Bible and science? To begin with, the analogy of the Two Books shows us that there is nothing wrong with seeking truth from the study of nature. On the whole, the results of sound science can be viewed in a positive light. There are two important exceptions to this proposal, however. First, while microevolution (variation within species) is perfectly compatible with the teachings of the Bible, Darwinian macroevolution (along with more modern ancillary disciplines such as evolutionary psychology) represents a real contradiction.

Second, the same is true of philosophical or metaphysical *interpretations* of scientific data that presuppose strict naturalism. Belief in a fully autonomous nature is little more than paganism. It is also important to add a caution to these two exceptions. We must remember that, although we can confidently accept many of the discoveries of science, it is not infallible. For this and other reasons we need to be wary of exaggerating the achievements of science, or, what is worse, treating science after the manner of some as if it were an infallible religion that has all the answers. It is not and it does not.

The next lesson is that the Bible must not be read with the same expectations as a science text. For, while we must avoid the extremes of alle-

gorical interpretation and instead fix our exegesis of Scripture within its historical context, we must not venture to the other extreme of unreasonable, wooden literalism that would, for example, force us to accept a geocentric universe. Passages that describe the sun moving across the sky (as in the long day of Joshua 10) are written from the perspective of a terrestrial observer, and no more teach a geocentric universe than a modern, informed astronomer would by casually referring to the 'setting' of the sun. Just as it is mistaken to expect detail on science in the Book of Scripture, it is also wrong to expect detail on doctrine in the Book of Nature. At the same time, there is no contraction between revelations that both come from God.

Another insight is that, while in general Scripture and nature each play different roles, these functions overlap somewhat. For this reason, the Bible and science can complement each other when both are correctly understood. This is not the approach taken by many secular scientists, such as the popular science writer Stephen Jay Gould, who would interpret the above-cited aphorism used by Galileo to claim that science and religion should exist as two separate non-interacting spheres, with science not interfering with religion and religion not commenting on science. Gould has an agenda in contending for this position, namely, that science should be "preserved" from interpretations of its data that are amenable to Scripture. This is the policy of secularism, and science is a poorer discipline without the insights of religion. Galileo himself would not have agreed with Gould's radical separation, as he allowed for interaction and even for the Bible to have a say in the interpretation of nature. Knowledge of the world and man's place in it should be holistic; there must be no wall between science and religion.

Finally, the believer should approach the study of nature with a sense of reverence and awe for the power of the Creator. Science for a man or woman of faith should bring glory to God and act as a form of worship. This was certainly the attitude of some early modern scientists such as Robert Boyle, who saw himself as a "priest of nature". It was also the view of Newton, who, in his General Scholium to the *Principia*, included not only an articulation of the design argument, a discussion of God's attributes and an affirmation of His essential Unity (against the Trinity), but also the expostulation that the discussion of God "from phenomena [in nature] is certainly a

part of natural philosophy [science]”.<sup>10</sup> Yet, while we may marvel that the single most important book in the history of science should conclude with an affirmation of belief in the Creator as the One True God of Israel, we must mourn the spiritual declension of science since this earlier age. For while early modern philosophy of nature had as its chief aim a greater understanding of God’s character, much of modern science has turned its back on the ways of God (although we must remember that Bible-believing scientists are neither as few nor as unimportant as popular myth would have us believe). Thus, Newton’s current successor, Stephen Hawking, is not even a believer, let alone an advocate of the argument from design.

Something has been lost: a sense of wonder, an awareness of the miraculous, a reverence for

the glory of God in creation. It is not so with those who have faith in God’s Word. Those in this blessed position can declare with the psalmist, “O LORD, how manifold are Thy works! in wisdom hast Thou made them all: the earth is full of Thy riches” (Ps. 104:24).

#### Suggested further reading

John H. Brooke, *Science and Religion: Some Historical Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1991).

John H. Brooke and Geoffrey Cantor, *Reconstructing Nature: The Engagement of Science and Religion* (Edinburgh, 1998).

---

10. Newton, *Principia*, p. 943.

## Genesis—the foundation stone of our faith

Donald Pearce

**T**HE SUCCESS of a product often depends on the ability of people to use it properly. The more complex an item, the more important it is that it comes with a clear instruction book. It will not necessarily explain how the particular item actually works, but it will tell us how to make the most of it.

What could be more complex than a human being! As believers, we are not surprised that the Lord God has given into the hands of man, who occupies the pinnacle of His creation, the Instruction Manual for life. It does not tell us how our body works, but it does give us the information necessary in order that we might know how to live, how to worship, how to work out relationships, how to hope for the coming redemption and the better life.

#### Begin at the beginning

With an instruction manual, the most sensible place to begin is at the beginning. How much more must this be true with God’s revelation of His plan and purpose with this earth! The foundation stone of this Handbook for Life is the book of Genesis. The rest of Scripture is erected on this foundation. And, just as with the natural,

if we undermine the foundation of a building it will collapse, so with the Word of God.

“Thy word is true from the beginning”, says Psalm 119:160, that is, true right from Genesis 1:1. Remove the literality of the Creation account, remove the literality of the Fall, of the Flood, and quickly the authority of this book disappears. If we do not believe what the Creator has recorded—and, after all, He and the angels were the only ones to have witnessed the Creation—then where can we turn for truth? Nowhere! If we do not believe these words then we have no foundation for our faith, as Table 1 shows.

#### Man’s disbelief

Man speculates as to the origins of the earth, and life upon it. He refuses to accept God’s account because that establishes that man is not the highest pinnacle of an evolving planet, but a created being responsible to his Creator. He seeks his own explanations, which constantly change because they are based upon a myth. With incredible faith he chooses to believe in the gods of time and chance. As one creationist put it: “Isn’t it incredible what an unbeliever must believe in order to be an unbeliever!”.