

Preserved Text-v1. Preliminary considerations

I greet you in the name of the Sovereign Creator of heaven and earth, the Lord Jesus Christ. Before discussing the evidence, I wish to take up some preliminary considerations.

In any discussion involving the interpretation of evidence, three things need to be clearly distinguished: evidence, interpretation and presupposition. True evidence, objective reality, should be the same for everyone. However, the interpretation that different people give to that evidence can vary considerably. The different interpretations derive from differing sets of presuppositions. Since it is impossible to work without presuppositions, no one should be criticized for having them. That said, however, since presupposition controls, or at least heavily influences, interpretation, any honest participant in a discussion of evidence should understand his own presuppositions and state them openly and plainly. A failure to state one's presuppositions is dishonest and reprehensible. For someone who does not state his presuppositions to criticize someone else who does, is simply perverse; it is a despicable proceeding. Any and all discussions involving the interpretation of evidence should begin with a declaration of presuppositions. At this point a question presents itself: can presuppositions be evaluated, and if so, how? I offer the following opening attempt.

The fundamental question that governs human existence on our planet is the question of authority: who has it, if he has it, and under what conditions. The competition between worldviews (ideologies, religions, philosophies-of-life), in the marketplace of the world, goes back to that question. I am aware that few people concern themselves with ultimate cause, being content to live out their lives as their culture dictates—perhaps 'content' is not the best word here; they do not have time and opportunity to dream up alternatives. But what happens when an agent of change shows up? The agent of change is promoting an alternative worldview; he is challenging the culture. Even if the question of authority is not overtly stated, it lurks in the background. I submit for due consideration that the most basic factor is the existence (or not) of a Sovereign Creator. If such a Creator exists, then He will have absolute authority over what He created. Where more than one candidate is presented, the correct choice should depend upon the evidences. In today's world, it is common to deny the existence of any Creator, the existence of the universe that surrounds us being attributed to evolutionary processes.

All genuine science is based on the principle of cause and effect—we observe an effect and try to isolate the cause; and it is logically impossible for a cause to produce an effect larger or more complex than itself. Any human being who

is both honest and intelligent, when confronted with the observable universe with its incredible organization and complexity, is obliged to conclude that there must be a CAUSE, a Cause with intelligence and power beyond our understanding—to refuse to do so is to be perverse. Since we have personality, He must also.

The only alternative to a Cause would be chance working with nothing. But it is stupidly, ridiculously impossible that chance, working with nothing, could produce anything. $10 \times 0 = 0$, $1,000 \times 0 = 0$, $1,000,000 \times 0 = 0$, and so on; no matter how many times you multiply zero, the result is always zero. If you multiply zero by something every day during five billion (or trillion) years, the result will always be zero. That chance plus nothing produced the universe is stupidly, ridiculously impossible. Even if one starts with the superstition of a 'big bang' of inorganic (without life) material, where did life come from. [I bypass the question of where all that inorganic material came from.]

The science of physics tells us that the inorganic [no life] known universe can be described with up to 350 information 'bits'; but it takes 1,500 information 'bits' to describe the smallest protein—it is so small that it cannot live by itself, but it is part of a living system. So how could evolution produce life? Where could chance find 1,150 'bits' of new information, if in the whole universe there were only 350? Not only that, the 'e-coli' bacteria takes about seven million 'bits', and one human cell takes around twenty billion 'bits'! The theory of evolution, to explain the origin of life, is stupidly, ridiculously impossible!!

The science of genetics, with its genome projects, has discovered that a random change of only three nucleotides is fatal to the organism. Consider the chimpanzee, presumably man's 'nearest relative': the genetic difference is said to be about 1.6%. That may not sound like much, but it is around 48 million nucleotide differences, and a random change of only three nucleotides is fatal to the animal—it follows that it is simply impossible for a chimp to evolve until it becomes a man (some 15 million chimps would perish in the attempt, never getting beyond the first three nucleotides!). Each different type of animal had to be created separately, just as Genesis affirms. Any evolutionary hypothesis, to explain the different types of animals (not to mention birds, insects, fish, plants, etc.) is scientifically impossible, stupidly, ridiculously impossible.

The so-called 'geologic column' is a fiction. In Australia there are fossilized tree trunks, upright, passing through various layers of sedimentary rock, that according to the 'geologic column' represent many millions of years-- stupidly, ridiculously impossible! In the U.S. there is a high plateau (mesa) with a layer of older rock on top of a layer of newer rock (according to the 'column'), but

the area involved is so extensive that no known force would be able to overcome the friction caused by an attempt to have one layer slide over the other layer (the argument that is used)—this also is impossible for the ‘geologic column’.

Some 60 miles southwest of Dallas, Texas, there is a town called Glen Rose, that is close to the Paluxy River. The Dinosaur Valley State Park is located there, because the river bed has tracks of two types of dinosaur: three-toed and four-toed. Upriver from the park a paleontologist named Dr. Carl Baugh bought a significant amount of land on both sides of the river, so he could do his own excavations. On his property he has a museum that I myself have visited. In the **same layer** of sedimentary rock he encountered the following: two trilobite fossils, that evolutionists say existed 550 million years ago; a fossilized moss called 'lapidodendron', that evolutionists say existed 250 million years ago; a complete fossil of a dinosaur called 'acrocantiasaurus' (40 feet long), that evolutionists say existed 100 million years ago; seven tracks of a huge 'cat', that evolutionists say existed 6 million years ago; 57 human footprints (some being inside a dinosaur track); the fourth finger of a woman's left hand, fossilized; and even a pre-deluvian iron hammer (its iron does not rust, being 96.6% iron and 2.7% chlorine)—**all of that in the very same layer of sedimentary rock!**

It follows that a geologic column does not exist; it is a perverse invention perpetrated by dishonest and perverse persons. All those fossils were produced by Noah's Flood, about 4,365 years ago; otherwise, how can you explain that all those things are in the very same layer of rock? (We may note in passing that it is common for defenders of the 'geologic column' to argue in a circle: the age of a rock layer is determined by the fossils it contains, while the age of a fossil is determined by the rock layer where it is found!)

Furthermore, the earth is young. In the royal observatory in England they have been measuring the force of the magnetic field that surrounds the earth each year since 1839. They have found that the magnetic force is diminishing at a constant rate, or geometric progression: plotting the yearly values on a graph, they form a cline. This means that it is possible to project the line in both directions. If we project the line to a point 10,000 years ago, the magnetic force would be so strong that it would crush all life on the planet. It follows that any theory that requires millions, or billions of years is stupidly, ridiculously impossible.

The Mississippi river dumps 80,000 tons of sediment into the gulf of Mexico every hour! All you have to do is measure the delta to see that the earth is young. The diameter of the sun is diminishing at the rate of about 40 inches

every hour. Projecting backwards for 100,000 years the sun would be twice its present size—it would fry everything on the earth’s surface; there would be no life. Evolutionists say that granite took 300 million years to crystalize, but within granite there are polonium ‘haloes’ with half-lives of minutes, or even seconds. Granite had to be created instantaneously. Symbiotic plants and insects had to be created at the same time, and require 24-hour days. And so on.

In short, the evolutionary hypothesis of origins is scientifically impossible; stupidly, ridiculously impossible. A number of decades ago the scholar Sir Frederick Hoyle was contracted to evaluate the scientific probability that life could have appeared on the planet by chance (he had unlimited funding and free access to libraries). He arrived at the following conclusion: it would be easier for a whirlwind to pass through a junk yard and a perfect Boeing 747 come flying out of the other side than for life to have appeared on our planet by chance. Well, well, well, that life could have originated by an evolutionary process is obviously, stupidly, ridiculously impossible. [By the way, any questions about the morality of the Creator have nothing to do with science.]

So a Cause must exist, and that Cause must be incredibly intelligent and powerful. That Cause must also have personality, since He created beings with personality. The customary term used for that Cause is ‘God’, but I will use Sovereign Creator. In the marketplace of the world, there is no lack of differing ideas about ‘God’. Genesis 1:27 informs us that “God created man in His own image”, and ever since, man has been trying to return the favor! I wonder if people understand that any god that they create will be smaller than they are.

Since a Sovereign Creator exists, He holds absolute authority over what He has created. But in what ways can authority be exercised? It can be exercised by fiat, by sovereign intervention, but doing that to beings created in God’s own image would turn them into robots, which would be contradictory to the purpose in creating such beings. As the Sovereign said to the Samaritan woman, while He walked this earth: “the true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and truth; for the Father is seeking such to worship Him. God is Spirit, and those who worship Him must worship in spirit and truth” (John 4:23-24). If the Father is seeking spontaneous, or at least voluntary, worship, then it cannot be coerced, or forced. But how can man know what the Sovereign Creator wants? There must be communication. But what form could such communication take? To communicate concepts, He would have to use human language. Since human language is governed by rules—phonological, grammatical, semantic—the Creator would have to limit Himself to the repertoire of possibilities offered by the language of choice.

If the Creator was only concerned to transmit information to a given individual, or group, at a given point in time, for a specific purpose, it could be done orally, either speaking directly, or through a representative. But if the Creator's purpose was to furnish orientation that would be valid for subsequent generations as well, then the appropriate form would be in writing. Consider 1 Chronicles 16:15, "the word which He commanded for a thousand generations". Well now, there have scarcely been 300 generations since Adam, so the Creator's written revelation will be in effect until the end of the world. However, to be in effect until the end, it must be kept available until the end, but I am getting ahead of myself.

If the Sovereign Creator exists, and if He has addressed a written Revelation to our race, then nothing is more important for us than to know what He said (with a view to obeying it, if we are smart). This because such a revelation will have objective authority over us (although the Creator gives us the option of rejecting that authority [but due regard should be given to the consequences]). [In passing, the enemy has always understood this better than most of us, and began his attacks early on—"Yea, hath God said, . . .?" (Genesis 3:1).] Now then, objective authority depends on verifiable meaning; if a reader/hearer can give any meaning he chooses to a message, any authority it ends up having for him will be relative and subjective (the 'neo-orthodox' approach).

As a linguist (PhD) I affirm that the fundamental principle of communication is this: both the speaker/writer and the hearer/reader must respect the norms of language, in particular those of the specific code being used. If the encoder violates the rules, he will be deceiving the decoder (deliberately, if he knows what he is doing). If the decoder violates the rules, he will misrepresent the encoder (deliberately, if he knows what he is doing). In either event, communication is damaged; the extent of the damage will depend on the circumstances.

Several times the Lord Jesus referred to the Holy Spirit as "the Spirit of the Truth", and Titus 1:2 affirms that God cannot lie—it is one thing He cannot do, being contrary to His essence; "He cannot deny Himself" (2 Timothy 2:13). It should be obvious to one and all that the Sovereign will not take kindly to being called a liar. To interpret the Sacred Text in a way that is not faithful to the rules of Hebrew and Greek, respectively, is to ascribe to the Author the intention of deceiving us, is to call Him a liar—not smart. But to interpret the Text, we must have it, and I will take up the subject of preservation below.

But first, how can we know whether or not He did in fact address a written revelation to us; and if He did, how can we identify it? Taking the point of view

that the Sovereign Creator decided to furnish orientation to our race, He would know that He would have to make it recognizable for what it was, and the evidences would need to remain available to succeeding generations. But how can we know what means He would use to make His revelation recognizable? We can know by looking at what He has done, and working back, as it were. At this point, I must jump ahead to what I have concluded, based on the evidence, and then work back to see if my conclusion holds. I here state the presuppositions that I bring to my task: the Sovereign Creator exists, He has addressed a written Revelation to our race, and He has preserved it intact to this day to the extent that we can know what it is, based on objective criteria.