

## Heat of the Jungle

### Introduction to the Book of Genesis II



~ In our previous report from our Spiritual Safari expedition through the entire Word of God, we divided the Book of Genesis into two sections, the first being up to chapter eleven; and we labeled that section: Creation. There are many ways of labeling the first section, and one other way would be: Sin. In the second section - chapter twelve through fifty, which we could expand all the way to the end of the Bible – we titled that section: Personalities. Well, section two, likewise, could be alternatively labeled many things, such as: The Redeemer. Irrespective of how we baptize those two sections, the creation of the universe and everything in it is succinctly and accurately accredited to God; and is summed up in the ten simple words that comprise one verse....

#### ***1 In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth ~***

~ This is one factual tenet of absolute truth that mankind could never possibly change. Believing that God already WAS in the beginning is the only way into Holy Writ. I admit that it is a bit briefer than I would have preferred, personally. The Scriptural creation account is completely summed up in just two hundred eighty-two words. Someone has said that it would have been better if just a few more hundred words had been used. Of course, you might think from my extremely long-windedness that a few more hundred thousand words would have been okay with me; but that's where you would be absolutely wrong because, strangely, a few more billion words would not satisfy the unbeliever. I mean, they already refuse to accept the truth of what was said in the first place. Adding more would never change their hearts and would have been a total waste of time, space, matter and energy - and breath – and, friends, God just does not do that. Our safari is getting thick in the jungle real quick.

We could denominate chapters one and two to be merely an abridged edition of the creation of earth. However, because abridged editions of anything always leave me with more questions than I began with - my questions now become: what exactly did God have in mind? What was the purpose of even giving us this rather uninformative section of Scripture? Was the purpose to teach us to develop a thing called geology whereby we dig down into every square inch of earth that we step on? There is so much argument and disagreement concerning the answers to these questions that we could literally make our life's work answering them; but I don't think God wants us to do that. In fact, I KNOW He doesn't! So, you dear readers are going to examine my answers to those questions in pursuit of an educated, competent and inveterate Bible study. While my answers will be proper, correct, complete and succinct, they will also be very brief, unequivocally dogmatic, approaching incorrigible – and, either way, not open for discussion as far as I am concerned.

The State Board of Education in California voted at one time to include what they called “biblical theory” regarding creation in their public school science books. Dr Ralph Gerard, Professor of Biology and Dean of Graduate Division at the University of California at Davis, was reported in the newspaper as saying, “....it makes just about as much sense to teach creation as it does teaching about the stork.” The exact quote was, “....should a scientific course on reproduction also mention the stork theory?” Well, I double-checked – just to be sure - and the fact of the matter is that the stork theory is not mentioned in the Bible at all – not anywhere. The account of creation is the beginning of God's Word to us, as well it should be. I probably would have started there myself – all things considered. Well, Mr. Gerard's comment was really unwarranted, but was made nonetheless. The Bible deals quite literally with the matter of pro-creation. A simple study of the Bible would have never concluded with any stork theory statements at all. So, ultimately, Dr Gerard's type of thinking is literally beside the point; as is most liberal pensive activity.

What Dr Gerard's type of statement does reveal in any person is their antagonism towards believers and towards the Bible itself. I am sure Mr. Gerard was very educated in his particular field of biology - but he knew little or nothing about God and His Word – because God had already said

something that Mr. Gerard knew to be irrefutable: "...thou knowest not how the bones *do grow* in the womb of her that is with child: thou knowest not the works of God who maketh all" – Ecclesiastes chapter eleven verse five. See, anyone that makes the types of statements that Mr. Gerard made immediately declares that they are the simple-minded enemies of God.

As we go forward in our lives today we must take one small step at a time and be very careful in guarding and maintaining our understanding. We must recognize that this problem of origins and its relations anent any particular Bible subject, such as creation, provokes more violence, controversy, general disagreement and wildly weird theories than anything else in this world. Man's hypothesis is always included as an "alternative" in education. As a result, a virtual Babel of noises has drowned out the clear voice of God today – especially in the church! There are two extreme groups that have blurred the lines of Scriptural understanding by insisting on their ignorance: one group is the arrogant scientific communities that assume biological and philosophical evolution to be gospel truth. Their ridiculous axiom is the "assured findings of science." The second group is the super-duper-pious-theologians who advocate to themselves that, through super-duper-pious-like knowledge, they have figured out how God "did it."

Both of those groups write and speak cleverly and seemingly learnedly about some small-minded self-contrived theory, which they think either reconciles or disproves science as it relates to the Bible. They look down in condescension and utter disdain upon the great men of God that have expounded His spiritual truth and wisdom in certitude concerning the physical creation of the universe to them. They'll have no part of that. Well, consider the position Job was put in. When the Lord finally appeared to him, He asked Job, "...where were you when I laid the foundations of the earth? Declare it unto Me if thou hast understanding!" - Job chapter thirty-eight verse four. God has basically said to man that we may want to talk about the origin of the universe – but, the reality is, we don't even understand where WE came from! Mankind is more than a little bit mixed up as a people, friends, as the spiritually discerning man or woman can very easily descry.

It would only be appropriate in a prudent study of this magnitude to consider some of the wild theories that are around and abound. We have a division right here in our reading; whereby we can only go one of two ways. We will either head in the direction of assumption and speculation - or we will go in the direction of creation. Don't bother sending me any confounded "assured findings of science," either, because for each one you can produce I can produce three that contradict each other. Some of the most reputable scientists and "deep-thinkers" in history disagree completely about evolutionary matters. We are not talking about two plus two equals four – and even that has been bastardized, but I digress – and, in the real world, two plus two really equals four. Always has. Always will. Then there is the account given here in Genesis as creation.

The entrance door to the Word of God found in Genesis chapter one verse one has to be accepted by faith. If you excuse yourself as unable to proceed in faith – then your Spiritual Safari ends here. Let me go ahead and say goodbye now. For those that choose to continue, fasten your seat belts. I admit that we're going to have a very bumpy start. This is just the way that God made it. I think it is very interesting. See, chapter eleven of Hebrews says faith is the substance of things hoped for; the evidence of things not seen. Faith is what gave the elders a good report; and the Word of God framed the world. Things which are seen were not made of things which do appear. The big problem for mankind remains – how did we get from NOTHING to SOMETHING?

The only way you will ever have that alchemical question answered satisfactorily, comprehensively, conclusively and aptly in your mind is by setting sail on the high seas of Scripture and meditating on the Word of God that only the Spirit of God can reveal to your heart. Your ONLY other option is speculation, my beloved; and speculation is utterly unscientific, by the way. Modern scholarly writings assert nothing but one of myriad "scientific answers." I can't find the Biblical perspective even when they say they are going to present it. What is the scientific answer? – Well, again, that totally depends on what "science" we're talking about. In 1806 professor Lyle said that the French Institute enumerated eighty-something geological theories which are hostile to the Scriptures - but not one theory

written there is held to be accurate today - and I don't mean our today - I mean 1806 today.

I was taught scientific theories that are not even considered credible anymore. I had one of the wackiest science teachers in school that I can remember. There was also a time that Thalmic Science was taught. Thalmic Science today is as dead as the Pterodactyl. Of course, Thalmic Science completely contradicted the Bible; or, perhaps I should say the Bible completely contradicted Thalmic Science. Then there was Newtonian science. It was held firmly for so many years and, likewise, was contradicted by the Bible. Newtonian Science has been absolutely ruled out. Moreover, some people started off with the Nebular Hypothesis. I seriously doubt that anyone even remembers that? – it's the theory that matter is indestructible. Well, that theory imploded with the ironically named "Trinity" atomic bomb at 5:29 a.m. on July 17, 1945.

So, to claim that you can hold a scientific viewpoint up against the account God has given us in Genesis, by de facto, means that you must also indicate what kind of science you are talking about. Science today is usually the subject of a stand up comic's routine tomorrow! It is well known that science books change, on average, every ten years - with most being replaced every five years. I'm sure that even my declaration of how often science books change is now outdated. I would not be surprised if we are changing science books twice in each academic semester! On the other hand, the purpose in Biblical writing can be summed up in just thirty-five words from the apostle Paul, who said, "...all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works" – second Timothy chapter three verse sixteen and seventeen.

The purpose for God even speaking to us at all is instruction in righteousness, friends. God is not concerned with geology, archaeology or biology - and the Bible was not written to deal with those things. The Bible was written to expose God's relationship with mankind - and likewise. It was written to record God's requirements of mankind in His universe in order to be saved from death. You can write all of that down anywhere in

the first eleven chapters of your Bible. Suppose for a moment that God had given us a scientific statement of creation. How many people in Moses day – or even in our day - would have understood it? I can promise you that NONE of us understand God's science. The Bible is not directed at schooled professors and learned intellectuals - except that they would be included in the category of every man and woman in every age – to whom it *is* directed. See, the Bible appeals only to the most intelligent of intelligent men and women!

In an attempt to refute all of these truths, man has concocted several counter-solutions in rebuttal to Biblical perspectives relative to the origin of the universe. One is that everything we see is all an illusion, which is preposterous. Yet some people still hold to that. Others say the earth all arose spontaneously out of nothing. Well, if you take an empty shoebox and put it in your closet for a billion years you will still have any empty shoebox, friends. Seriously, let's at least apply some common sense in this connection. The third theory is that there is no origin and the earth has existed eternally. Well, if that's the theory you want to subscribe to then just know that you will take it on faith – faith in the wrong thing – faith in speculation!

So, as you can see, there are many different ways man has tried to explain the origin of the earth, life and universe. It's almost as if God's explanation is just too simple for man – so, man purports that it must have happened in some strange fashion that has only ever occurred one time throughout written records of history – or that it may have happened again but just didn't get recorded. That's sheer subjective nonsense. I have before me several other theories that man has advanced down through the history of the world - and I am now going to bore you to tears with several of them in this report just to make sure we cover all the bases.

Dr Harlow Shapely was the director of the Harvard Observatory at one time. He stated the following: "*...we are still embedded in a dismal ignorance of the world in which we live; we have advanced very little relevant to the total conceivable extent of knowledge available; beyond the level of wisdom required of animals of long racial experience. We are, to be sure, no longer afraid of strange squeaks in the night, nor are we*

*neurotically superstitious about the dead; but on many occasions man is still valiantly rational. Nevertheless, we know how much the unknown transcends what we do know."*

Dr Eiseley held the office of Provo at the University of Pennsylvania, saying, "...we do not know any more about matter and how it was or is produced than we do about spiritual things. Therefore, I think it is unwise to state in our present state of knowledge that the one precludes the other. The universe seems to exist as a series of emergent levels, none of which is like the level before it. That man and all of life have changed is undeniable. But what lies beneath these exterior manifestations we do not know. I wish I could [answer your question] but clothing my ignorance in big words would benefit neither you nor myself."

Next, we have two headlines and summations that I have gathered from the popular press - to help speed us along; I think you may be getting the idea by now: (1) The Mystery of the Origin of the World / *Man is on the verge of discovering [that]....*1961. Well, there hasn't been anything written, apparently, since 1961 on that subject; so – if you have an update - please feel free to let me know (2) Reasonable Alternatives to Baugham's Big Bang / *The chances of the Big Bang theory being correct are roughly equivalent to the Abridged Dictionary being the result of a print shop explosion"....circa 1927.*

Moving on, astronomy has three theories that are fascinating to mankind: (1) steady state theory (2) big bang theory and (3) oscillating theory. Great Britain propagated most of these theories that we have considered in this report, too, by the way. In the astronomical connection, it may serve us well to acknowledge that not much news was ever made of the rocks that we brought back from the moon. Scientists just don't get worked up about those rocks because they disprove a scientific theory that was being cultivated in that day. Then, there came a man named Dr Leaky that found a skull in Africa and named it the Nutcracker man. This doctor dates Nutty back six hundred thousand years. Well, we've had theories like that before and since with both people and animals. Most reputable scientific men simply don't fall for any of that nonsense anymore.

There are other theories of the origin of earth and man. In Indianapolis, Dr Lawrence S. Dillon, associate professor of biology at Texas A&M, said, “...man is not an animal; but a plant which evolved from brown sea-weed.” This doctor relegates man to a highly modified type of plant life - derived a billion years ago, nonetheless, from a common ancestry. Perhaps I have been looking in the wrong places for my grandpa and grandma? Some have been looking up trees; but some people have been, evidently, looking in the ocean’s kelp and such – so it should be no wonder that chaos has ensued in the scientific community. Some of this becomes embarrassingly ridiculous for them.

Readers Digest printed this: “After centuries of bitter argument about how life began on earth, an awe-inspiring answer is emerging out of the highly advanced laboratories and through shrewd, patient work of detective scientists all over the world” - READERS DIGEST – 1959. Unfortunately for the editor’s at Readers Digest, we still have no answer on that - sixty plus years later. The dogma that science follows is that the archaeological finds of prehistoric cultural objects must be so arranged that the cruder industries must always be dated earlier than those of what we consider a more advanced culture, regardless of where they are found. Today, they are a little disconcerted when they find the “advanced” civilization underneath the barbaric, heinous – and well-known – culture.

So, we’re going to end this leg of our Spiritual Safari expedition through the entire Word of God here; because on – and on - and so on we could go. So many theories exist today about how the earth began – but I don’t see us connected any more with apes than with canaries or kangaroos or cats. One thing is sure, the scientific pursuit of the “assured findings” thereof will continue. For believers, however, the simplest answer is usually the correct answer; and, in this case, it is not only the answer – it is the ONLY satisfactory answer – that God created the Heavens and the earth - and that was our beginning ~

