

## The Age Of The Earth

Tom L. Bright

Tom is a native of Oklahoma. He and his wife of 37 years, Jane, have two children, Tom Bright, Jr. of Olathe and Michelle Lyons of Muskogee, Oklahoma. Tom is a graduate of the Elk City School of Preaching in Elk City, Oklahoma. He has done local work in Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, Missouri and Tennessee. He has conducted meetings in 9 states and has participated in lectureships in 8 states. He has been an instructor in the Elk City School of Preaching and the Owasso School of Preaching. He is a past director of the West Plains School of Biblical Studies. He has done radio work in Oklahoma, Texas and Missouri. He debated Richard Jackson of the United Pentecostal Church in 1994 on the subject of miracles and also Bob Ross of the Baptist Church in 1995 on the subject of Mechanical Instruments of Music in Worship. He and his wife now live in Dyersburg, Tennessee where he preaches for the church there and also is director of the Online Academy of Biblical Studies.

Some will think of this subject as being unattractive and uninviting, even unimportant. However, it is of utmost importance. Creationists (those who believe in the Bible account of creation, Genesis 1) affirm the earth we inhabit is only a few thousand years of age. Evolutionists on the other hand, advocate the earth is billions of years old and through evolutionary processes (accident and happenstance), the origin of all life is easily explained.

The subject under consideration is extremely important. Both the creationists and the evolutionists agree, if the universe/earth is young, then evolution cannot be true. Wysong said,

Both evolutionists and creationists believe evolution is an impossibility if the universe is only a few thousand years old. There probably is no statement that could be made on the topic of origins which would meet with so much agreement from both sides. Setting aside the question of whether vast time is competent to propel evolution, we must query if vast time is indeed available. (113)

Based on this statement, we can see the importance of a study of the Age of the Earth. If the evidence points to an “young earth,” the conclusion necessarily follows that evolution is false. If the evidence points to a “young earth,” the concept of Theistic evolution and Progressive evolution likewise falls.

Therefore, the crucial nature of whether the earth is “young” or “old.” If it can be clearly shown the earth is billions of years old, creationism falls. Likewise, evolution is overturned if it can be shown the earth is not billions of years old, but only a few thousand years of age.

### **TIME IS THE ESSENTIAL INGREDIENT OF EVOLUTION**

The number of times evolutionists could be quoted wherein they admit “time” (billions of years) is the absolute essential ingredient of evolution is numerous. It is not a matter of finding one, but choosing which one to quote. Consider the following by Harvard Professor George Wald:

The important point is that since the origin of life belongs in the category of “at-least-once” phenomenon. However improbable we regard this event, . . . given enough time, it will almost certainly happen at least once. . . . Time is in fact the

hero of the plot. . . .Given so much time, the “impossible” becomes possible, the possible probable, and the probable virtually certain. One only has to wait: time itself performs miracles. ( 55)

Thus, the basic argument is: Given enough time, the “impossible” becomes “virtually certain.” So, when problems arise in the evolutionary model, they wave the magic wand of “time,” take a fanciful trip into *Alice in Wonderland*, and pompously pronounce their pat answer.

However, it is a fact of science that any system left entirely to itself, with no outside “guidance,” will always go towards disorganization. There is never a process of assembling, but of the exact opposite, of dissolution.

Science recognizes a law called the Second Law of Thermodynamics. This law states the very thing mentioned in the previous paragraph. In other words, any ordered system left to itself (with no outside intervention) disintegrates and always moves toward disorder. So, even if the evolutionists were allowed their “miracle worker” (billions of years of time), how can they account for the complexity in our universe? Things unattended do not become more complex, they become *less* complex.

### **THE SCIENTIFIC PROOF OF AN OLD EARTH**

An important question that must be asked and honestly answered is: Is the claim for a great age for the earth and humanity (as affirmed by the majority of scientists) based upon scientific evidence? The answer to this question is a simple “No.” In fact, the available scientific evidence that has to do with this area says the opposite.

Even evolutionists admit there is no evidence. For instance, evolutionist Dr. Stephen Moorbath, associated with the University of Oxford has this to say, “No terrestrial rocks closely approaching an age of 4.6 billion years have yet been discovered. The evidence for the age of the earth is circumstantial, being based upon ... indirect reasoning” (92)

Consider further the words of Dr. John Eddy, an evolutionary astronomer. He said,

“There is no evidence based solely on solar observations that the Sun is 4.5 to 5 billion years old.” He continued: “I suspect that the Sun is 4.5 billion years old. However, given some new and unexpected results to the contrary, and some time for frantic recalculation and theoretical readjustment, I suspect that we could live with Bishop Usher’s value for the age of the Earth and Sun [4004 B.C.]. I don’t think we have much in the way of observational evidence in astronomy to conflict with that.” (18)

### **EVOLUTIONARY DATING METHODS ARE EXTREMELY FAULTY**

We often hear about the “proof” of an *old earth* (billions of years). We are told the dating methods of science have proved this beyond any reasonable doubt. For instance, when applying this

“infallible” method to mollusks that were living at the time of the test, the mollusks were shown to be 2,300 years old! (Funkhouser). How reliable can the system be? Consider another case where hair from a mummified musk ox was dated at 7,200 years, while muscle tissue from the same carcass was dated at 24,000 years! (Jackson 13). Such instances of absolute inconsistency with the proposed method of dating are numerous.

### **THE PROVEN DETERIORATION OF THE EARTH’S MAGNETIC FIELD**

Science has discovered the earth has a magnetic field. This magnetic field is caused by a massive electric current (billions of amperes) which circulates in the core of the earth. Because of the many “outside” sources which can create distortions in this field, the earth’s magnetic field is very complex.

We have no desire to go into a long, involved technical discussion of this magnetic field. Let it suffice to say that it has been proved this magnetic field is continuously decaying. Furthermore, this rate of decay is measurable. Based on this fact, when we look back in time, there is a limitation of the earth because of how much magnetic energy the earth could have had originally. This very fact suggest the age of the earth as being a few thousand years of age, just as the Bible presents it.

### **THE GEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE**

Evolution contends that life has gradually evolved over the past 2 billion years or so, slowly going from the simple life forms toward the more complex life forms. Among evolutionists, one of the generally accepted standards of *proving* this concept is through the so-called “geologic time table.” This model proposes to show the development of living organisms as they (supposedly) ascended from simple life forms to the more complex in the ancient past.

Supposedly there are four major eras seen in the geologic time table. They are: Pre-Cambrian (sometimes subdivided into Archeozoic and Proterozoic); Paleozoic (the most ancient life), Mesozoic (intermediate life); Cenozoic (more recent life forms).

This “column” is arranged according to the types of fossils (called index fossils) found in them. In other words, a certain life form is said to lived at a certain time, or at least come into existence, during a specific time period. When this life form is found in fossil form, then we know (supposedly) the age of the rock.

However, this fanciful “geologic time table” is based on “circular reasoning.” Let me explain. When a fossil is found, we are told the fossil is so many years old. When asked the method in determining the age of that fossil, we hear the answer “By the age of the strata of rock in which it was found.” The second question necessarily follows, “How do you know the age of that rock?” The normal answer is, “By the age of the fossil found in that strata of rock.”

Thus, the age of the fossil is shown by the strata of rock in which it was found. Furthermore, the age of the rock is known by the age of the fossil found therein. This is called “circular reasoning.”

In other words, if “A” is that old, then “B” is that old; and “B” is proven to be that old because of the age of “A.”

Nonetheless, geology gives us an incomplete record. Supposedly the record of life in the various strata of rock date back almost 3 billion years. If this record were found intact in any one place, it would be approximately 130 miles in depth. However, the sedimentary rocks in any one place is no more than twelve to fifteen miles deep! In fact, the earth’s crust is about twenty-five to thirty miles in depth!

The instances in which the “geologic column” has a supposed lower (thus older) strata above a supposed younger strata is too numerous to mention in this short article. Furthermore, there are places where one, two, or more strata are not even found!

An example of this is the Grand Canyon. Evolutionists claim it represents some one billion years of life history. Yet the top five periods (all of the Cenozoic and Mesozoic eras), representing (supposedly) more than 200 million years, are not found. The lower Paleozoic era, which supposedly represents about 150 million years is also absent!

George McCready Price cited an Annual Report for 1886 for the Canadian Government. This report described the region near Banff in Alberta, Canada, which is just east of the Rockies. He wrote:

East of the main divide the lower Carboniferous is overlaid in places by beds of lower Cretaceous age, and here again, although the two formations differ so widely in respect to age, one overlies the other without any perceptible break, and the separation of the one from the other is rendered more difficult by the fact that the upper beds of the Carboniferous are lithologically almost precisely like those of the Cretaceous (above them). Were it not for fossil evidence, one would naturally suppose that a single formation was being dealt with. (11, 12)

### **THE BIBLICAL EVIDENCE FOR A YOUNG EARTH**

If one believes in the inspiration (God-breathed) of the Scriptures, he realizes the Bible *does indeed* speak to the issue of the age of the earth. Let us notice briefly the following points.

First, in Genesis, chapter one, Moses describes the creation of the earth and man as happening in the same week. The “days” of Genesis 1 have reference to twenty-four hour days, not great eons of time. This is shown by the fact that, in giving the ten commandments, this same writer clearly viewed the days of creation as the same length of time as the days he mentioned relative to giving the sabbath commandment. Notice his words, “For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it” (Exodus 20:11). In blessing the “sabbath day,” did God bless “great eons of time”? Surely not.

Second, the sovereignty and majesty of God has been evident to man “from the beginning, indeed from the “foundations of the earth” (Isaiah 40:21-25). According to the theory of evolution, this cannot be true because man is a virtual “latecomer” to the earth, evolving billions of years after the earth had its beginning. If man is relatively new to the earth, how could God’s greatness be evident from the “beginning”? The Bible contradicts evolution. Which will you believe?

Third, consider the words of Christ. “But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female” (Mark 10:6). Here inspiration affirms male and female was “from the beginning of the creation.” Does “from the beginning of the creation” mean eons of time? This is in direct conflict with evolution.

Fourth, in Luke 3, inspiration traces the genealogy of Jesus to Adam (the “first man,” 1 Corinthians 15:45). From Christ to Abraham, there are fifty-five generations. Archaeology demonstrates these fifty-five generations cover about 2,000 years. Furthermore, from Abraham back to Adam, there are an additional twenty generations, which are known for their longevity (several hundred years of age).

By looking closely at other instances of the recording of other genealogical records (Ezra 7:3-4; 1 Chronicles 6:6-10) which allows the possibility of some omissions, we can safely assume the lives of those between Abraham and Adam were not radically different than others who lived during the same time. Thus, the Bible implies a relatively young age for the earth and for man.

### **THE CONCLUSION OF THE WHOLE MATTER – A YOUNG EARTH**

Dear people, the Bible has been assailed by doubters, skeptics, agnostics and unbelievers through the centuries. Yet, it stands today much, much more solid than the Rock of Gibraltar. It has stood the test of time. It **IS** the very word of God. It can be trusted.

The origin of all life forms which exist today upon the earth or has ever existed is traced to the creative power of the Sovereign Ruler of the universe, the Great I Am – the God of the Bible. Let us look to the Bible for a hope that “maketh not ashamed” (Romans 5:5).

### **Works Cited**

Eddy, John (September 1978). *Geotimes*, as quoted by Wayne Jackson, Christian Courier Website, taken from [http://66.33.75.203/archives/earth\\_age.htm](http://66.33.75.203/archives/earth_age.htm)

Funkenhouser, John G. And John J. Naughton (7/15/1968). *Journal of Geophysical Research*. as quoted by Wayne Jackson, Christian Courier Website, taken from [http://66.33.75.203/archives/earth\\_age.htm](http://66.33.75.203/archives/earth_age.htm)

Jackson, Wayne Jackson (1989). *Evolution, Creation, and the Age of the Earth*. Stockton, CA: Courier Publications

Moorbath, Stephen (March 1977). *Scientific American*, as quoted by Wayne Jackson, Christian Courier Website, taken from [http://66.33.75.203/archives/earth\\_age.htm](http://66.33.75.203/archives/earth_age.htm)

Price, George McCready (1911). *God's Two Books*. Washington, D. C.: Review & Herald. as quoted by Wayne Jackson, *The Mythology of Modern Geology*. Stockton, CA: Apologetics Press, 1980.

Wald, George (1980). "The Origin of Life," in *The Physics and Chemistry of Life*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955. as quoted in, Henry M. Morris, *Scientific Creationism*. San Diego, CA: Creation Life Publishers

Wysong, R. L (1976). *The Creation-Evolution Controversy*. East Lansing, MI: Inquiry Press. quoted in: Bert Thompson, *Creation Compromises*. Montgomery, AL: Apologetics Press, 1995.