

GENESIS AND GEOLOGY

We will go through the first two chapters of Genesis. In the Biblical record here we have what we may demonstrate in other areas as a revelation of essential knowledge that ~~which~~ man should have by which he should be able to judge the material world around him.

The scientific approach, whether it be called the historical method or whether it be called the scientific method, is an approach which concludes that nothing pertaining to ORIGIN is properly within the scope of science. Though science books may discuss the questions of origin, they do so only because they are forced to, probably because they really want to—but when asked for a proof they would immediately say that the question of origins is not a proper or a possible matter for the scientific method. We should understand this kind of thinking, understand why scientists recognize that such a thing as origins could not, under any circumstance, be within their scope because it isn't being repeated! We should understand that the scientific method is strictly a matter of the kind of world in which we now live where there is a repetition of the same things in the scope of our experience. There can only be, in other words, speculation on any other area. Yet most writers intentionally and deliberately, whether it be historians or scientists who use this method, discuss the question of origins and lead students to believe that there is some reasonable basis for their conclusions.

In the first chapter of Genesis we have certain fundamental information. What is given and what is not given is something we should discern. Here is a record of what man needs to know about the start of things so that he will know the direction in which he is headed and in which the universe is headed, if you please.

"In the Beginning"

We are told that "In the beginning"—now we'll just analyze a few of these points. There is no definition of time given here that we can grasp. There is no intent anywhere in the Bible to define, in terms of concepts of time that we are familiar with, the significance of this phrase. There are two possible reasons: Either we should expect that "in the beginning" would obviously be available to science and therefore would not need to be revealed here; or, if it is not readily available to science, the information would be meaningless anyway.

The question of whether or not it has been made available by science should be your responsibility to pursue even further than we do in this class, and ask yourselves, What is it that science accepts? When we are told a date something like four and a third billion years, or some other figure, for the "big blast" that sent the universe spinning into orbits, I would merely ask you, "Is this figure the standard represented by all the "time clocks" which scientists have experimented with, or is it merely the oldest figure that they have experimented with?" (A "time clock" is something like radio-activity, the amount of salt in the sea—anything that science wants to lay its hands on by which it determines how long in the past such-and-such an event has taken place before this day based on the amount of change that is taking place now and the amount of accumulation or loss in the past.)

Now if all time clocks have been wound up to the same level, then we could certainly and logically conclude—since there is not Biblical revelation and since all time clocks in the universe point to the same definite time in the past—that we would have the necessary answer. But this is not the case at all!

The Time Clock of Radio-activity

There are all kinds of clocks—all of which read different times! Scientists choose the oldest because they want to. Astronomers choose the oldest, that's all. They dismiss any younger ones. It is quite clear that whatever has happened, one could say that none of the clocks were set to register in the beginning ANY particular time as far as we are concerned, as far as any means by which man can measure.

Let's take one basic assumption as an example, the assumption that lead, which is the ultimate result of the decay of uranium, will give us the amount of time that that uranium has been decaying—which, presumably, would give us the beginning of the age of the rock material out of which the earth is made. This assumption is based on the fact that since lead from uranium is distinct from other kinds of lead that are also available in nature, the assumption is that that lead which is from uranium could only—that is, that lead which we know to be derivable from uranium in any quantity in the universe—must have been derived, and none of it could have been created.

In other words, let's say you have three different forms of lead—x, y and z. We know, let's say, that y comes from uranium. The question is, if x and z are natural, if y comes from uranium, does all this lead come from uranium? This is something no scientist can tell because, after all, it isn't a question that he can demonstrate. It's a matter of origins. And if indeed some lead—y—was created along with x and z, and it is also a result of decay which cannot be answered by any means known to science—in other words, it can't be demonstrated in any way. I'm not saying that we can prove it. It doesn't matter, it's not susceptible to proof because neither you nor I nor the scientist were there at creation! And the idea that we have to prove some of these things because they want to believe something, that doesn't demonstrate it one way or the other. We need to know what we can prove, what we cannot prove, and what as far as we are concerned is nothing but theory in the first place—and never can be demonstrated with assurance! That's all it is based on—the ultimate decay of uranium is based on this concept, that the lead that comes from it represents lead that wholly must have been the result of radio-activity.

Now it doesn't matter, therefore, how old the universe is as far as we are concerned because the age of that world over which angels ruled is incidental to anything that we are concerned with. Time as far as Divinity or angels are concerned has no bearing on the present pattern that we are dealing with.

The Errors of Fundamentalist Writers

Now we will not discuss the theological matters—we will not go into the meaning of Elohim. We're just going to look at certain things we want to know about so that we know where we are in the pursuit of truth.

Now, concerning "in the beginning": Fenton will have a footnote that the Hebrew word for "beginning" is, in fact, dual; it's not a pure singular form.

There is no indication necessarily that everything that God made in the universe was all completed at once. We don't know any concept of time here, but as an illustration we do know this: When God laid the foundations of the earth, it says that the angels shouted for joy (Job 38:4-7). Now, obviously, that was only the beginning. We don't know the rest of the story. How much longer, in any sense of time—are we dealing in minutes, hours, what??? We don't know. But there are clear evidences in the Books of Job and Psalms: the Creation as such, the "in the beginning," is not in itself an instantaneous act throughout the universe—just as Creation Week was not in a day, but it was in a week. Obviously, ~~there are certain things~~

there are certain things that must fit together. Nature demands it. You can't have certain types of life without other supporting types of life separated one from the other to any great extent. That an act of Creation is required is obvious. So at least we have an indication of movement of time even in terms of this.

We should all understand the meaning of the 2nd verse of the Bible which is made plain in the article, "Did God Create a Devil?" This is the most important one that we should understand in terms of geology; it is not properly in the scope of written history, but it is certainly one of the most important articles in terms of setting a geological pattern that underlies archaeology.

We should, at this point, comment about some of the books we use in this field. For instance, if we use The Genesis Flood, if we use any of the works of Adventists or Lutherans or other authors, you will discover that these men who would be learned in their field of theology, almost exclusively specialize in the question of geology and in nothing else. That is, they make a study of human skeletons (which is maybe properly an archaeological matter)—they make a study of human remains in terms of evolution and of the earth as a geological study in terms of Creation Week, and also the Flood. Therefore, none of these writers to my knowledge—not a single one—has honestly faced up to the question of Genesis 1, verse 2. They automatically assume that the whole record that is not due to some catastrophe by water is creation, and the catastrophe by water is attributed to the Flood exclusively. None of these men has ever—you can read any work, I don't care what it is—you can read any book that has ever been published by the Adventists, you can read The Genesis Flood, you will not...those men have not faced up to it. They have frankly not been honest with it.

If they had been honest with the evidence, they would have taken the Bible and explained it! But the human being, even though he is not conscious of it, is basically dishonest! This is true of the human being—we're going to see that when we come to Adam and Eve. When God talked to Adam he blamed Eve; when God talked to Eve she blamed the Devil; the Devil had no excuse—God didn't even question where that came from! He knew him already!

These men try to use science and, in fact, have more harm than good in the long run because anybody who knows the history of human beings even half-way knows that it is impossible to explain geology as these religion-minded scientists do and attribute that to the Flood, and then account everything above that to the world this side of the Flood, and still accept the Bible! This is why SDA's today have rejected the Biblical record in terms of when the Flood was and have pushed it way back—because, as they say now, it isn't a question...We know, as they say, that there are 7000 years—I should say there were to be 6000 years, and ultimately 7000, so their argument is this: Not that there were 6000 and then the 1000, but they're arguing now that when the Bible indicates the 6000 years, it means not less than that but not more than 7000, so they want to push the Flood a thousand years back hoping they can fit all of man in that, which is impossible anyway, and then put the Flood back there. That kind of demonstration doesn't work. The Flood was in the 2300's—they would make it less than the 3300's or something like that, I guess, in order to have all of history if possible, and then attribute the Flood to the world before that. How they're ever going to justify the other several thousand years of human history I don't know. If they accept the idea that history is otherwise reconstructed correctly all the way back to 3000, then they can't possibly believe the Bible.

So these men, in fact, are neither honest with the Bible which they profess or the Biblical record. We might just as well face up to it. Not a one of them is willing to face both the Bible and science, both archaeology and geology. They are not!

We need to realize this because we too often ourselves get into this habit. If we can't put all of this together in principle and make it make sense, then maybe we need reconsider where we are, in other words. It is not enough to merely question early man . remains in terms of evolution as they do. We need to question it in terms also of the over-all Biblical record. Then we need to put together the record of creation as we have it here in the first chapter of Genesis.

No Life Without Light

So there was an earth whose surface was obliterated—"darkness was upon the face of the deep" (v. 2). The expression "the deep" refers to the oceans. The implication here is that there was a complete lack of sunlight.

And now we would briefly raise the question, When there is no sunlight that penetrates what happens to life on earth? Are certain types of life possible when no light penetrates? If these forms of life disappear, then what happens to oxygen which these forms of life produce? If we have no oxygen, what happens to the rest of the creatures who might be able to exist in darkness but need oxygen?

At least we have an indication here of the possibility that something has gone wrong and should even leave a record in terms of the sudden decline of life.

Now we grant that we cannot read geology exactly as men have written it and try to fit it into the Biblical record because, in the first place, there are concepts which the geologist works from that distorts his writing, and it would therefore be difficult always to know how to draw the line. But we're going to at least ask ourselves, Have men found that at certain basic levels, irrespective of the question of stratigraphy and missing faults or faults that have been put in, could we just look at the sequence of events around the earth and discover that somewhere along the line there is a sudden loss of oxygen as represented by a sudden death rate of certain types of oxygen-producing plant life and animal life—basically plant life, in this case? And is any evidence of this represented in the geological record? This is what we would like to know. And does it indicate that all forms of life as a whole suddenly declined?

It is possible just from geology alone that we couldn't know the complete answer because one would not know whether the life that follows was necessarily created or did it survive? Some things you can't necessarily tell. If all things could be told, then we wouldn't have to have a complete revelation. This is what we must understand. We're given the revelation in Genesis One, and verse one, to know that there was indeed a beginning of a physical creation.

Now if the earth's surface is pictured as a wreck, shall we say—"void," in a sense, means no life—and darkness. It is possible that, in examining the record, you might conclude that some few things survived; yet, on the other hand, you could say that it looks like most everything is dead. Now the Biblical record only tells us here that, for practical purposes, we could write off the question of life. That's what it means here if there is no light! Where there is no light there is no life (spiritually or physically!). That it is remotely possible that some vegetable life could have survived, I would say that we shouldn't close our minds to those things and draw a conclusion for which we have no basis. We don't know the kind of heat that might have been involved and whether this would have killed all the life of seeds. What we are not told we cannot answer. What we are concerned with is the general picture.

I will read to you late—not today—the important statement by a teacher at UCLA which he plainly points out that there is a certain point in the Cretaceous where clearly it looks as if something happened. There must have been a decline of whatever it is that

causes plants to produce oxygen. A total loss of oxygen is indicated. The answer is already given right here in the Bible—"darkness was upon the face of the deep." Where there is darkness there is no photosynthesis by plants, and there is no production by many types of plants (in the sea especially) of any form of oxygen which would keep other life existing. We'll come back to this point. Anyway, we are only asking what we might be able to know from the record.

Was All Land Under Water?

If "the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep" we might ask ourselves another question—I have not asked this one before but we will now. We are told that "darkness was upon the face of the deep"—that is, depths, oceans. Now the reason it is important that darkness was hovering all over the oceans is obvious: If indeed, ultimately, the source of oxygen comes from the waters, this is God's way of saying that life was through for practical purposes.

But does this necessarily imply—I ask you the question—that all land or continental material was itself under water all this time? (We don't know how long it was from the destruction to re-creation—we're not told here. There is no way for a scientist to say either. The question is no longer repeating itself, therefore not subject to scientific tools.)

It does not say, in Dr. Hoeh's estimation—from anything that is given here in the Bible—necessarily that the land masses were universally all tucked away under the water. I think we rather have assumed that—I know I have. And yet I do know that in reading geology I am faced with the question quite of ten of whether this really is so; of whether all life was destroyed and all there is was barren rock, in some cases, or sandy plateaus merely protruding above. We should retain this question in our minds. It only describes the form of the earth's surface as having no character of anything created—it is, in a sense, just formless—and it tells us where darkness is. I think we have assumed, therefore, that that means that since darkness enveloped the earth that all the earth must have been covered with water. But I doubt that this is necessarily the meaning of the statement in verse 2—that this understanding is absolutely required.

God moved on the waters to bring them off the land. The only question is, To what extent might there have been?—I ask the question. We are told down below that God separated the waters above from those below (vv. 6-7), that is clear. One could conclude that at the close of the Cretaceous, as geologists define it, that water universally covered vast areas—but did it necessarily cover all? That is the question to keep in mind.

Now we are told (v. 9) that "God said, 'Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear.'" The implication from is, normally—as I have always taken it—that there was no dry earth before. But I would now really wonder whether this is absolutely the case. After all, land might appear, and it might disappear if there is any tidal movement at all, and there certainly would be—you had the moon, as I presume certainly about this time; and one would expect this kind of influence—the sun exerts an influence as well.

Again there are just a few little things like this—the question of whether all life disappeared, whether all land was altogether under water completely; or whether there indeed might have been areas otherwise, barren of life where everything had been washed away, that on occasion might have appeared and disappeared. Certainly I don't get a feeling of something that was universally, to any great extent, above water. But in reading the geological record, and examining what is reported there, I don't perceive that the other would be an impossibility—or even from the Biblical record.

The Atmosphere

God moves, He acts: There is light. We have the presence of a new week beginning.

And now we are told—we are looking for certain things that would be of consequence. There is the formation—no matter what the gaseous envelope might have been around the earth, it was not the kind of envelope that would produce life as we know it—so God had to form the atmosphere. The term "firmament" here is the wretched Latin word, but we'll use it anyway—in other words, this really says, "Let there be an atmosphere" (v. 6) in which waters float to the top because water vapor is lighter basically than most of the elements that make up our atmosphere. And in this atmosphere all kinds of life were later to live.

Land Masses Appear

Then we have suddenly, in verse 9, the rising of our land masses. We should now expect that at a certain, in various places of the earth, there should be a rising of land masses and no longer a condition of having the land rather extensively under water.

Now "God called the dry land" (v. 10) that suddenly rises up "Earth"—eretz in Hebrew (number 776 in Strong's Hebrew dictionary)—"and the gathering together of the waters He called Seas." So we have more than one, the plural for bodies of water—the land mass itself is called earth but the plural is used for the bodies of water. We should expect at some time, then, to find a geological record in which the present concept of the structure of the continents is fixed, after which there is little variation.

Vegetation

On this same Third Day of Creation Week we have the origin of herbs (v. 11).

The remarkable thing in the geological record is the fact that herbs bearing seeds, and fruit trees yielding fruit as we characteristically see it, and grass—this kind of thing mentioned in verse 12—and the difference between the herb and grass. And we should know that human beings can digest herbs but not grass. Not even cows can digest grass. Now you might wonder about that: It's what's in the stomach of the cow that digests the grass; they have to have several stomachs in order to process it. Grass is not something that humans have the capacity to digest. So God distinguishes between herbs and grass.

Now in the evolutionary and geological scheme, you have the remarkable picture that for all of the early world up to the Cretaceous, we find gigantic ferns, gigantic trees, but there simply are no angiosperms. Angiosperms refers to any plant which has seeds within itself—"any plant...having the seeds in a closed ovary" (Webster). This is important because you will discover that ferns were here, tropical trees—strange kinds of trees—but there is not a single record all the way from the Pre-Cambrian to at least into the Cretaceous where we have any evidence of herbs or grass.

Now, logically, we would conclude that surely the lowly grass would hardly have been left till the last sequence in evolution! In the case of vegetables, one would rather have concluded that, somewhere along the line, maybe there were non-angiosperms and angiosperms and that, instead of having one evolve wholly before the other, you would have expected just as you have today, that they both were evolving from the simple to the complex. But it isn't that way. It's as if there was another kind of world; and then a new world arose in which there is a need for grass and herbs and trees bearing fruit. In other words, the angels didn't need apples and pears and pineapples and lettuce and tomatoes—there is evidence of any such thing! This clearly implies that there is a demarcation in the geological record of a world that was destroyed and another world that was made for man with
10 new and different flora and fauna.

You suddenly have here an indication, and we should ask ourselves, If this is created here, did it exist before? And if not, then do we have a kind of guide between this creation week and what existed before that was destroyed?

There is nothing that we can say in terms of the geological record for the Fourth Day of Creation Week, verses 14 through 19.

Fish, Fowl and Cattle

Now drop down to verse 20. And here we suddenly discover the presence of fowl and creatures in the sea—whales, God created them: (Dr. Hoeh quoted all of verse 21).

Now I've deduced from this, frankly, that if God created great whales "and every living creature that moves" I would draw the conclusion that there wasn't anything that survived in terms of this kind of living creature from the world before. I don't see how—if you know the nature of water and what that world must have been like.

If you have a spewing out over the entire Pacific Basin of a vast amount of volcanic basalt—as the authors of The Deep and the Past, Ericson and Wollin said, "We have to presume something like a hundred million years for something like this to spread out or else the whole ocean would have been heated up and all life in it would have been 'a gargantuan bouillabaisse of boiled fish!'" Now, indeed, if the catastrophe did come in a hurry, that's exactly what you had—fish stew and oyster soup! That's why God had to create "every living creature that moves." I think the implication there is quite clear.

I will merely comment, though it is not expounded clearly here, that if there are certain types of food for man—and, of course, types which are not—it is interesting that all the early fish are not true scaled fish. They may have armored plates but they are not a true scaled fish. That again is interesting in terms of what we find from the Pre-Cambrian into the Cretaceous.

Feathered birds suddenly appear in the same way. Whales, you see, are looked upon as one of the last steps in the development of mammals—because, according to the theory, the creatures came on the land, developed lungs, and then decided to take out for the sea again and thus developed certain other characteristics so that they can survive there.

Well, I think it is quite clear when you read this that there are certain things that are created here, and you want to ask yourself, Did it exist before? And you discover the remarkable thing that most did not! Cattle and creeping thing all make their appearance late. A geologist from Cal. Tech. said, "Now when you come to this area in the Cretaceous, suddenly you are faced with this: Whereas before you might have organized trees with branches, suddenly, when the geologist looks at it, he sees that everything just bushes out—as he pointed out, and drew it that way on the board. He didn't know how to explain this phenomenon—it's just as if from nowhere, so to speak, all the ramifications of the mammalian world suddenly appear, or the world of angiosperms. And he used this expression, "It seems as if everything BUSHES UP so rapidly"—from the evolutionary point of view that it is very difficult to tell how it was all possible. The answer is, it all started at once—it was re-created (or, that is, life in these forms were created for the first time).

Man

Then we have the presence of man. Now if we find man all the way from the Pre-Cambrian to the Cretaceous, then I think we should seriously ask how we would fit this into the story. There used to be a few people who presumably thought they were supporting the

Bible, and you will find some quotations even in The Genesis Flood by Whitcomb and Morris—it would almost be foolish if it weren't tragic that apparently intelligent men are trying to find footsteps of human beings in Carboniferous coal (pp. 172-3 of Genesis Flood). They admit that what look like footprints usually are upside down and they're very, very tiny. I think this preposterous. You should all have read that portion of the book in Second Year Bible where they try to explain how far back in the Geological Record you might find human remains.

Now I don't say that every definition scientists put on these remains is correct. I think geologists have mistakenly labelled some things. For instance, when they say that Permian material in Brazil shows characteristics of the Ice Age, I seriously question whether there was an Ice Age in Brazil; and I would question whether it really is Permian because it basically is right on the top. Sometimes the definitions are invalid and should be questioned.

However, one would draw this conclusion: When you have an entire characteristic of life around the earth—of plant life, of animal life, of sea life—and find neither grass nor herbs nor seed-bearing trees nor fish with scales nor fowl nor cattle or human beings, then you suddenly discover that indeed, on top, just where it is, without worrying about whether there is a fault or no fault—in other words, just as you find it in nature itself with no indication of reversal of layers—you could reasonably conclude that certainly there was a kind of world that ceased to exist by the time man was placed on the earth.

Rate of Multiplication of Life

Now we have another question: Once all kinds of life like this are multiplied, we know that it is possible within months for some types of life in the sea to completely replenish the sea in a matter of months or, at most, a very few years—because they multiply into the millions! But man's generation—even if Adam and Eve should have had children right away—it might be between 25 and 30 years before any others would be born, and probably a little later, in another generation. The chances for human beings to be multiplying to any extent—or of certain kinds of animals, if they all started in the Garden of Eden, to multiply by any extent—would be quite slim at first.

So it is possible—we have to bear this in mind—it is possible that life could have teemed in the waters (this is the kind of remains that geologists find the most) long before human beings would have multiplied far enough to expand to any great extent over the earth. It is possible that many inland seas could have teemed with life, and by the time the sin of Cain is mentioned—because, after all, he was old enough (and also his brother) for them to get into quite an argument and one wanted to kill the other; they seem to have been mature, each one was taking care of some agricultural responsibilities in the family—it is possible that many inland seas could have so teemed with life. And if there was a change on the earth—because we are told that Cain was cursed from the earth so that it no longer would bring forth as it would. Something clearly has happened to effect the climate—there is something that happened there to effect the climate, there is no doubt. And such inland seas that might have dried up could have left all kinds of remains before any human beings ever got there.

Variations could have occurred in which the life of Creation Week, other than some types of mammals and man, might have filled the earth and would give the implication of who knows how long a time in the geological picture. We must bear that in mind.

Migration

Then we have other factors. We are told that normally the earliest mammals are those which seem to live just on the earth and just beneath the earth—gophers, moles, that type of creature. And you have the implication of first one, then another—and there is clearly, in any local area, the presence of new kinds of life that weren't there before. To assume, now, that this is strictly a matter of evolution—this is the way the story is presented.

Now the presence of new kinds of life in a given geographic area could have another explanation—just a simple one: Migration! After all, if man comes there late, the probability is that he migrated there too. So there is no reason why migration should not be the explanation again. We should expect to see the same thing after the Flood as well.

If all animals—listen carefully—did go around the earth from the ark after the Flood (we haven't gotten to that part of the story yet), then it is possible that many animals before the Flood were also centered originally in a certain specific area. Since God brought them to Adam to name, it is probable that God did not have certain types of animals scattered everywhere in Creation Week but, again, at least certain types may have been centered where Adam was—because, after all, what good is a sheep in Australia if Adam is in Palestine? Obviously some kinds of life that were made specifically for man could just as well have been where man was, but this doesn't mean that all types of life had to be.

One would conclude, therefore, that there is a strong possibility of migration of animals to various areas before any human beings arrived there.

If you have a world that suddenly comes up out of the waters that is comparatively susceptible to erosion, is it possible in other words to have limited forms of life to start with, and then to discover newer and newer—so-called "newer"—forms of life that are merely migratory forms long before man gets there? Well, of course it would be.

Tertiary and Quaternary

And this is why we have the whole sequence—I won't say this is true in every instance but, basically, through the Tertiary you have a sequence—through the Tertiary you have a sequence—of various forms of life appearing and then, finally, man—Tertiary into the Quaternary. Man is not Tertiary by definition of geologists. Anytime you find remains where human beings are by definition this must be Quaternary because, according to the evolutionary concept, man did not appear until the Quaternary.

Therefore, by definition, since the strata are labelled by the fossils, and the fossils are organized on the basis of the evolutionary tree, man must appear late; therefore, wherever human beings are found, we call it Quaternary; wherever human beings are not found, we can call it whatever it should be on the basis of the fossils.

I don't think this is wholly valid. I think in some cases what would have been called "Tertiary" elsewhere really is Tertiary, but it is called "Quaternary" because they want it to be that. See, it's all based on the nature of the fossils. And if in some areas— if in North America you build up a fossil sequence in which man is the last, long after the other animals have arrived, and then you go to the Middle East—well, the implication there is that man is parallel with those animals almost from the beginning in the Biblical sense, then that whole thing would be labelled late in the Quaternary there whereas elsewhere it would be parallel with the Tertiary somewhere else.

Geology and the Biblical Record

This gives you an idea how you can study geology from Genesis One and get a picture of questions in your mind before you proceed with the subject. That's what the Biblical record is for—anybody who read that could have asked questions. And then when he goes to the geological record, he would have discovered the answers.

The men who did go to the geological record, never looked to the Bible to see if there were answers because, in the first place, they had been deluded by the theologians. In the second place, they just didn't want to justify the Biblical record after a certain period of time. I think to start with some did—in the 1700's and the early 1800's—but after that they certainly didn't. It was an innate hostility that led to draw many of the conclusions they did.