

# Death Before the Fall

Some thoughts by Earl Jackson

Mike, I have been reviewing the site which you referred me to, Reasons.org, also known as "Reasons to Believe". I have to say right up front, that I am not a scientist. God has not called me to be a scientist. I do not want to be a scientist. In fact I do not believe in the validity of science at all. I think it is a bogus system of knowledge based on the false notion that there are so-called "Laws of Nature", and based on the false assumption that these "Laws" have operated for millions and billions of years just the way that they appear to operate today. I know that this might make me seem narrow minded and medieval in my thinking, perhaps anti-intellectual, but my thinking is not based upon the teachings of men, but on the teachings of God.

Hugh Ross and the other scientist on the site propagate, as if it were a true, the idea that somehow science supports the Bible. In fact this question is dealt with in question number four of the sites FAQ's.

## **"4. Does RTB exalt science over the Bible or the Bible over science?"**

**God's Word cannot and does not contradict God's work in nature.**

RTB believes that God has revealed Himself to humanity in at least two ways—the words of the Bible and the record of nature. Reasons To Believe's mission is to work rigorously to integrate both of God's revelations into one harmonious picture revealing the identity and character of the Creator. When properly understood, God's Word (Scripture) and God's world (nature)—as two revelations (one verbal, one physical) from the same God—will never contradict each other."

A cursory reading of this implies that science and the Bible are equal and therefore completely harmonious. "When properly understood, God's Word (Scripture) and God's world (nature) - as two revelations (one verbal, one physical) from the same God - will never contradict each other". This statement is an unproved assumption. Who says' God's Word and God's world will never contradict each other? The Bible certainly does not say that. In fact the Bible does not say anything close to the opening statement which is in bold letters, "God's Word cannot and does not contradict God's work in nature". If this were a true concept, then God's Word would clearly establish it and validate it's authenticity. It does no such thing. (I will talk about the notion that nature is a Divine revelation from God in a minute). This statement (that Scripture and Science are equal and harmonious revelations) is the presupposition for this entire website. In reality, God's Word and God's world often contradict each other! In fact, it is just such a contradiction that sparked this discussion in the first place. God's word says that He gave grass to eat for lions and other carnivores with carnivorous teeth (Gen. 1:30). This plain statement of God's Word cannot be denied or explained away, but it radically contradicts God's world

which says: "Carnivores eat meat, and have carnivorous incisors to rip and tear at flesh, therefore Gen. 1: 30 is not true, and must be explained some other way. Since science teaches that God created carnivores to eat meat, it must therefore follow that animals ate and killed each other before the fall of man. So the notion of death before the fall is established based on science, not on Scripture, but this supposedly harmonizes with the Bible". This kind of false reasoning mangles the Bible, and effectively nullifies the Word of God. Such humanistic rationalism, completely destroys true rational thinking and logic which is founded on truth and not falsehood.

There are perhaps hundreds or thousands, maybe millions of contradictions between the Bible (God's Word) and science (Man's god). So the basic philosophy of the Reasons to Believe site is flawed because of it's own premise. It exists solely to prove that science validates the Bible, is in harmony with it, and somehow proves Gods existence. I contend that this is utterly false. Science cannot prove and validate God, because science is fundamentally flawed. Scientist cannot agree amongst themselves, so how in the world can they prove the existence of God? If one scientist who is applying the same "laws of nature" as another scientist comes to a completely different and contradictory conclusion, then how can these imagined "laws" prove the existence of God? They can't even prove the so-called facts that they are claiming to be based upon. One scientist sees the geologic column as evidence that the earth is million or billions of years old. Another scientist sees the same geologic column and say's "look here's proof for a young earth and Noah's flood". One scientist says that radio carbon dating proves that fossils are millions of years old. Another scientist says that form of dating is flawed and tests a living mollusk and finds out that it is 20,000 years old. What's going on? If there is not the slightest harmony within the scientific community, then how on earth can there be any possibility of Reasons To Believe's stated mission: **" to work rigorously to integrate both of God's revelations into one harmonious picture revealing the identity and character of the Creator"**. In other words, science is elevated to the position of Divine revelation, and has the same validity as God's written Word. Who came up with this notion? Is this what God says or is it something else?

Actually, the Devil invented science, when he used scientific observation (a feasibility study of the harmlessness of an alternative diet) to tempt Eve into sinning against the revealed Word of God (yea hath God said?). Satan's false science led to false knowledge (Ye shall be as gods KNOWING good and evil). His scientific method was based on the lie that everything has remained the same ever since creation, therefore "you will not really die. It has never happened. We can prove it scientifically. The laws of thermodynamics and digestion prove that you wont die. It is knowledge, that God is keeping from you. Use your head. God gave you reason. Think this out. The tree looks like it should be good for food. Test it. Prove it. Run your own scientific analysis.

Conduct a double blind study. Prove it for yourself, and then have your husband prove it also." All false reasoning and science comes from Luciferianism and humanistic rationalism which seeks to reason apart from the real Divine Revelation from God.

The Word of God and the world of science often collide, and are diametrically opposed to each other. Science is based on assumption. All of the discussions that I read by Hugh Ross and the other acclaimed Christian scientists on the site, (and I spent 7 hours on the site, all the time that I was willing to devote to it), assume that scientific observation (empiricism) establishes fact. Is that a valid assumption to make? Who says that scientific observation can determine fact from fiction? Is it possible to observe everything that can be known? If it is impossible to observe everything that can be known, both past present and future, then observation serves no function at all when it comes to establishing truth. Because we cannot observe everything that happened a thousand years ago. We cannot observe everything that happened at creation. We cannot observe what will happen in two days from now, or one hour from now. How can we assume then that observation is a basis for believing in something, or understanding something? Who says that scientific observation can establish what is true? God certainly does not say this. In fact, God says that He is the fact by which all facts are defined. God is truth. "*O LORD God of truth*" (Ps. 31: 5). "*But the LORD is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlasting king*" (Jer. 10: 10). "*I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me*" (Jn. 14: 6). "*...a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he*" (Deut. 32: 4). "*the God of truth*" (Isa. 65: 16).

Truth is completely tied up with God's revelation (apocalypsis) in Jesus Christ. Just as it can be said in a general sense that God is truth, it can be said in a specific sense that Jesus Christ, (who is the supreme revelation of God), is the truth also. "*And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth*" (Jn. 1: 14). "*For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ*" (Jn. 14: 17). "*I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me*" (Jn. 14: 6). "*I speak the truth in Christ, and lie not*" (1Tim. 2: 7). "*...the truth is in Jesus*" (Eph. 4: 21).

Truth is also tied up with God's written revelation. Just as God is truth and Christ is truth, so God's word is truth. "*Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth*" (Jn. 17: 17). "*Thy word is true from the beginning: and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth for ever*" (Ps. 119: 160). Look up and also study (Ps. 119: 86, 138; Pr. 30: 5; and 2Tim. 3: 16). God's Word is truth, because God cannot lie. "*God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent: hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?*" (Num. 23: 19). "*In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began*" (Tit. 1: 2). God Himself determines what is true and what is not true, and He says that "His

Word is Truth!" He does not say anywhere that "Science is an equal and harmonious truth with the Bible". Such a concept is simply a dangerous lie. There is no truth in it at all. Science is not the source of truth, nor is nature the source of truth. God is the source of truth, and He has spelled out everything He wants us to know about the truth in His verbal communication...the Bible.

I have clearly shown so far that 1). God is truth. 2). Jesus Christ is truth. And 3). God's Word is truth. It is because of these three things, that God tells us what we are to think. We are to think the truth. "*Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things*" (Phil. 4: 8). We are to love the truth. "...therefore love the truth and peace" (Zech. 8: 19). We are to rejoice in the truth. "Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth" (1 Cor. 13: 6). We are to speak the truth. "...speak ye every man the truth to his neighbour" (Zech. 8: 16). "Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour" (Eph. 4: 25). "He that speaketh truth sheweth forth righteousness: but a false witness deceit" (Prov. 12: 17) "I speak the truth in Christ, and lie not" (1Tim. 2: 7). And we are to worship God in truth. "God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth" (Jn. 4: 24). In fact our sanctification as believers is totally linked to the truth. "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth" (Jn. 17: 17). "...that they also might be sanctified through the truth" (Jn. 17: 19).

Truth is to be the sphere in which Christians operate. We are told not to follow "Error" and "Falsehood" (James 1: 16; 1Jn. 1: 5-6; 4: 1; 2Pet. 2: 1; 1Tim. 4: 1; Matt. 7: 15). We are to be people of truth and children of light (1Thess. 5: 5). "In Him we live and move and have our being" (Acts 17: 28). The truth is all encompassing for believers. It is the sphere in which we function. That is why, I take this so seriously. The truth is the most important thing. We are to speak truth if we are Christians. It does not matter if someone has a higher IQ. It does not matter if they have 15 Doctorates and 12 PHD's hanging on their wall. If they do not speak truth, then they are liars. It is simple. But some people never get it. Their eyes are darkened and their minds are hardened against God. May God keep us from such blasphemy and heresy.

I have clearly shown that the Word of God is Truth. It is therefore the authoritative source for information about God and what He wants us to know, understand, perceive, think, do and believe. It cannot be shown that science has the same authority and validity and is therefore equal with the Bible as the source for what we are to know, understand, perceive, think, do and believe. Not one verse of scripture validates the false notion that "**God's Word cannot and does not contradict God's work in nature**". It is impossible to prove logically and rationally that God's world is equal to God's Word as the source for truth. The Word does not say this. The Word does not teach this. And rational thinking cannot verify or prove this lie in any way shape or form, because rational

thinking is based on the truth. Thinking which is not based on truth is not only irrational. It is stupid. It is idiotic. It is retarded. It is degrading for someone who was created in the image of God. And it is blasphemous. Truth is perfect rationalism and absolute logic (logos). Anything not truth is a lie. Anything not rational and logical is also a lie.

*“The world by wisdom knew not God”*. (A careful study of 1Cor. 1: 19-22 should be undertaken at this point, I am not doing it right now, but you should do it on your own). Humanistic reasoning and wisdom does not lead to knowledge of God. This is a grave error. *“The world by wisdom knew not God”*. This worldly wisdom is false logic and false rationalism, based upon false assumptions, and is incapable of giving people any knowledge of God or truth, because truth does not exist outside of God, His revelation and His decrees. Romans 1, which people attempt to use to prove the validity of natural revelation, says nothing to the effect that science is equal to and harmonious with Scripture. Romans 1 is dealing with the effects of reprobation and how God darkens the minds of the reprobate, and not how He enlightens the minds of men. To construe such a concept from Romans 1 is to totally misread the passage and mangle that portion of scripture also.

Romans 1: 19 makes it crystal clear that what can be known of God is already known by the reprobates, because **“God has made it clear to them”**. We call this the innate knowledge of God. It is the minimum amount of knowledge which every human is born with. It is *“the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world” (Jn. 1: 9)*. It is the basic knowledge which establishes that the human being is made in the image of God. It is what keeps man from being merely a great ape. It is the remnant of the original image of God in Adam. God’s image in Adam was his knowledge of God. The image was in His mind by virtue of his creation. That image no longer shines in the full and unpolluted light of creation, but there is a vestige of it: *“the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world” (Jn. 1: 9)*. *“God hath made this clear” (Rom. 1: 19)*. So Romans 1: 19 is pointing out to us that even reprobates have been given an innate knowledge of God. Now it is true what the Westminster Confession asserts that “Although the light of nature, and the works of creation and providence, do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God, as to leave men inexcusable; yet are they not sufficient to give that knowledge of God, and of his will, which is necessary unto salvation“. So even the knowledge which God innately puts in the minds of men, is insufficient for salvation. *“The light shineth in the darkness and the darkness comprehended it not” (Jn. 1: 5)*.

If you understand this, then you will have no trouble understanding that verse 20 is not saying that creation or so-called science is a revelation of God equal to the Bible. What it is saying, is that the invisible things of God (specifically the wrath

and righteousness revealed in verses 17 and 18 and the eternal power and Godhead of verse 19), these invisible things are clearly seen in the intellect of what He has created i.e. man. It is not saying that God is understood by observing creation. It is saying that there is an intellectual understanding in the created things (which in this very specific case are reprobate human beings). This intellectual understanding is placed there directly by God. So this passage is explaining the concept that God is righteous in sending the reprobate to hell in His wrath, because men know about these invisible attributes of God, because God has revealed them directly to their brains at their creation. Nature and creation confirms this, but does not establish it. This light is from God Himself. It keeps them from being mere monkeys and it establishes them as homo sapiens. It is the innate knowledge of God. It is "*the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world*" (Jn. 1: 9).

God is clear that men deny this knowledge. Men reject this light. Men pervert it. Men hate it ( Jn. 3: 19-20, Jn. 1: 10-11; 1Cor. 1: 18). But it is given by God none the less, so that "*They are without excuse Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened*" (verses 20-21). (For a good translation of these verses we recommend the Murdock translation by James Murdock 1851, and the English Majority Text version 2001).

I have not really discussed anything that I found on the site yet, because I wanted to remove these false presuppositions before I addressed a few of the notions which are espoused on the site. If the river is polluted, then the water drawn from it is polluted also. Do men gather grapes from figs, or figs from thistles? Of course not. I have demonstrated that the well from which these so-called scientific Christians are drinking is not in fact the well of truth. God tells us what the truth is, and He tells us where the truth is to be found. It is in the Bible. It is not in human reasoning apart from the Bible. It is not in scientific speculation apart from the Bible. It is not in empiricism or human epistemology apart from the Bible. It is not in observation of creation apart from the Bible. It is not in the imaginary "laws of nature" apart from the Bible. I am not saying that the Bible is a book of science. It is not. The Bible is a book of Divine Revelation, a book of truth. Science is a falsehood. The Bible is apocalypsis, REVELATION...Gods full written disclosure to man. We need not go beyond it's pages to validate what is true or what is false. It bashes all falsehood to smithereens. So I can honestly say that I did not learn one valuable truth during my entire 7 hours on this site which is supposed to be all about the truth. I learned that science is a scam that is perpetrated by people with degrees that they got by pleasing other people so they could be called Doctor this or Doctor that. That does not impress me, and it certainly doesn't impress God. The Pharisees were loaded with the same sort of things. I am not anti-intellectual because I am anti-scientific. I am all for intellectualism. God made us to be

“wiser than the children of this world”. Solomon was a super intellectual.

There is nothing wrong with being intelligent. In fact we are commanded to have the same kind of mind as Christ *“Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus” (Phil. 2: 5)*. The mind of Christ is the mind of God, and God knows everything. God is intellectual, and we should be too. Too many Christians are content with feeling cozy and fuzzy without any of that doctrinal stuff. Their anti-intellectualism disgraces God. I am certainly against that. We have access to infinite wisdom because we have the mind of Christ. Christians who claim to have the mind of Christ, and who follow a pack of wolves into a ravine of falsehood and lies, do not really have the mind of Christ. He said that we would know the truth and the truth would set us free. Set us free from what? Error. ***“Concerning spiritual things brethren...I do not want you to be ignorant” (1Cor. 12: 1)***. Error is ignorance. Falsehood is stupidity. Lies are retarded thinking. Christ tells us to test the spirits and try them to see if they are of God (Lk. 11: 38-52; Matt. 7: 15). He also tells us that the people of God believe the truth and they also obey it without questioning it (2Thess. 2: 12-13; Rom. 2: 8; and Gal. 3: 1). He said it, and that’s enough. We do what He says, because of who He is. We do not question God. Skepticism is heresy. Skepticism is blasphemy. That’s why even Thomas had to believe. He could not have remained as a skeptic and a disciple of the truth at the same time. Blessed are those who believe who have not seen.

Now I would like to talk about a few things I found when exploring the site. I have no idea or intention of discussing everything. It could fill a large book, but I think writing it would be basically a waste of time since I have already spelled out the flaws with the whole concept. Everything disagreeable to the truth is exposed by the truth, and what has already been said applies to all of it. When you lay the axe to the root of the tree, the whole tree falls down. So, based on what I have already done in chopping down the base of the tree, anything else I find will be like simply breaking off the branches which will die anyway.

First we will consider the statement by John C Munday Jr in his well written article called “Creature Mortality: From Creation or the Fall?” Munday says: ***“As a “God-breathed” revelation, the Bible is completely without error (historically, scientifically, morally, and spiritually). God's written word is our supreme and final authority in all matters that it addresses. Many Christian leaders have affirmed that an old-earth creation interpretation does not compromise Scripture, including Norman Geisler, the late Gleason Archer, Chuck Colson, Jack Hayford, and the late Dr. Walter Martin”***. At first glance this statement sounds quite orthodox, and it was obviously written with the intention of not being disagreeable to those evangelicals who are indeed orthodox in their beliefs. What’s wrong here? The answer is everything here is wrong. So I will break it down in pieces so you can see it. ***“As a “God-breathed” revelation, the Bible is completely without error***

(historically, scientifically, morally and spiritually).” That sounds so good. But it is so wrong! What’s wrong with it? For starters the Bible is not “a” God-breathed revelation. This statement implies that it is one of many. If this was a Christian viewpoint being expressed it would say what we’ve already said. The Bible is not “a” God-breathed revelation....it is “THE” God-breathed revelation. There are no others! God only breathed out one book of truth. Can you name any other God-breathed revelations? Nature is not one. Science is not one. There is only one, and it is called the Holy Bible.

Ok, let’s move right along to the next phrase. “**the Bible is completely without error (historically, scientifically, morally, and spiritually)**”. This statement is a half truth. The first part is correct: “**the Bible is completely without error**”. If Dr. Munday would have stopped there he would have actually stated something factual. But he did not stop there, instead he decided to add a bunch of qualifiers (words designed to expand upon what he means). The Bible is completely without error in these areas...historically...scientifically...morally...and spiritually. If he had said that the Bible is completely without error period...no qualifiers, then he would be in line with the truth. Because the Bible truly is completely without error. But according to Munday it is only completely without error as history, science, morals and spirituality. So it is not without error after all. I have already pointed out that science is false. So how can the Bible be without error concerning a lie? Any honest scholar will plainly and truthfully tell you that the Bible is not a book of science at all. It is a book of Theology (perhaps Theology is included in Munday’s qualifier “spiritually” but we have no way of knowing for sure because spiritually can mean anything from witchcraft, demonism, and astrology to the notion of God Himself. We don’t know what Munday means by “spiritually”). How about “poetry”? Is the Bible not completely without error in it’s hundreds of poems? Are we supposed to throw out the book of Psalms? Perhaps we should throw them out of the Bible because they are not history, morals, science or spirituality. If Munday would have simply stated the truth WITHOUT QUALIFIERS, we would have been all set. How about songs? Are the songs of the Bible not completely without error? What about the allegories and parables? Are they not completely without error? Instead of a red letter Bible with the words of Jesus in red maybe somebody should write a purple letter Bible where all the allegories, parables and prophecies are in purple to warn is that they are not completely without error like the history, science, moral, and spiritual parts of the Bible. The inspiration of the God-breathed book extends to every word...every jot and every tittle. So putting qualifiers on the concept of it’s inerrancy serves no good purpose. In fact, to me it appears that he included these qualifiers, only to sneak in the word “scientifically” under the radar of the orthodox ones whom he is trying to impress and not offend. He should be more concerned about offending God who designed and wrote the only perfect and inerrant Book that has ever been written.



**“God's written word is our supreme and final authority in all matters that it addresses”.** The problem with this statement is that it seeks to limit the Bible's authority only to the “matters that it addresses”. In other words, If the Bible doesn't address it, then it has no final supreme authority. This is another very sneaky trick to fly something under the radar of orthodoxy. It has all the verbiage of orthodoxy...SUPREME, FINAL, AUTHORITY...Of course the orthodox Bible believers will like this! Bull Crap! This statement is a slander against God, and a slander against the real supreme final authority of the Bible. The historical Christian position is that the Bible is the Supreme Final Authority in all matters. Whether it addresses them or not does not matter. The doctrines, information, principles, precepts, teachings and revelation of truth contained within the Bible are to be applied to every situation and to every matter. Even if a matter is not spelled out, there is sufficient truth in the Bible by way of application and extension to make the Bible The Supreme Absolute and Final Authority on anything that is knowable or do-able. It's principles and precepts do address every conceivable matter. The historic Christian position on this is quite well understood by evangelicals who are fond to say that the Bible is “the all-sufficient rule for FAITH and PRACTICE”. But I am particularly fond of the way that the Westminster Confession says it in Chapt 1 paragraph 6. **“VI. The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for His own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men.”** That is the Christian position, not the position that says: the Bible has no authority on matters which it is silent upon. Of course the Bible is silent on the Big Bang Theory, God did not determine to reveal His creative methodology that way. Is the Bible the authority in how we understand the Big Bang Theory?...Absolutely. If we understand the theory to say that matter is eternal and in a very condensed form it then exploded, and poof the universe came into existence in a big bang that excludes God. That is 100% false...a lie of science believed by many. If, on the other hand, we understand the Big Bang theory to be a possible explanation of the mechanism which God may have used to bring all the matter of the universe in to being ex Nihilo, then it may have some plausibility as far as human viewpoint is concerned. The Bible allows at least the plausibility that this could be one possible theory explaining how God might have effectuated creation out of nothing. But this too must come under the authority of scripture, so that at best, this concept can be understood only as an interesting theory, and certainly not as a fact. So, in actuality this too is 100% false as far as God's revelation is concerned, because quite simply it does not match up with what He says. So even though the Bible does not address the topic, what it does clearly reveal tells us what we can and cannot believe. So Nix the Big Bang. It's OK as a theory. But it is nothing more than that, because God says He created in some other way. He spoke and it happened. That is what God, who was present at creation, has revealed, and nothing more. Creation was caused by the word of

God, and not by a big bang. If I understand this, then I'll never need to go beyond what the Bible says. **"All things necessary may be deduced from Scripture...and nothing is to be added...especially "the traditions of men"**.

Finally let's consider the author's last statement: **"Many Christian leaders have affirmed that an old-earth creation interpretation does not compromise Scripture, including Norman Geisler, the late Gleason Archer, Chuck Colson, Jack Hayford, and the late Dr. Walter Martin"**. This is pure sophistry. It has no validity whatsoever. Who cares if ten thousand people affirm something false? That does not make it true. I have clearly shown that this whole system compromises Scripture over and over again. A fountain of death cannot send forth life. Men love darkness rather than light, so summoning a parade of them does not make the errors and the darkness any less dark. And it does not nullify the clear compromise of the Scripture that has taken place. Don't say that you have not compromised the Scripture, until you can prove it.

Let's move on to something different from the site. This is a summary statement dealing with the same subject...Did animal death exist prior to the fall of man?

#### **"V. SUMMARY**

**The issue of original animal immortality has been re-examined from a primarily Scriptural base. The context is human death and its cause in the fall of man and the Edenic curse on the ground. The following premises were developed: Creation was transitory from the beginning; Adam's original immortality was not by nature but by access to the tree of life, which was never offered to animals; death immediately caused by sin spread to men only; the lion-lamb peace of Isaiah 11 and 65 is not strictly "postdictive" of Eden nor predictive of a future absence of creature death; man is the secondary cause of creation's bondage to decay; and this bondage is to be in part released by Christians, as children of God, living life in the Spirit. The conclusion is that Scripture does not demand the absence of animal death before the fall. The consequence of concluding otherwise leads to flood geology."**

My purpose here is not is not to exhaustively evaluate everything on the site, but to show you how to apply the Biblical truth so that you too can evaluate and destroy false doctrine wherever you find it. We will start here where the author says: **"The following premises were developed"**. What exactly are the premises that were supposedly reached by a re-examination of the issue **"from a primarily Scriptural base"**? We will number them as we go.

1). **"Creation was transitory from the beginning"**. You have to read the article to understand what the author is saying, but I will paraphrase what he is saying. According to him, Creation was not made to be permanent or everlasting, nor were the creatures made to be immortal, they were not to live forever in paradise, and in fact, since they were transitory by nature, they must have died prior to the fall. The reasoning for this is very weak, and it is certainly not based on anything found in the Scriptures. In fact the Scriptures seem to directly contradict this view. Science itself, seems to teach that matter can never be

destroyed. Of course I reject science, but how can this scientist seem to directly contradict one of his own basic scientific laws? The answer is simple of course. If God created matter out of nothing, then God can destroy matter and blast it back into nothingness. Now, as far as death before the fall, which is supposed by this so called **"transitory"** nature of creation, is it a valid conclusion from Scripture? Or is it a conclusion reached simply by humanistic reasoning and false logic? Let me present, why it is not a Scripture based premise, as the author claims.

The whole question of when the fall occurred, is one that is ignored on not only this site, but on many creation/science websites, and in many of their writings and articles. Almost uniformly, the science oriented Christian people assume that Adam and Eve, along with the animals, lived for a long time in the garden before the fall. Many even believe that Adam and Eve could have lived for millions of years before the flood, and that their age when they died, was computed from the date of the fall, and not the date of their creation, because they did not age till they started to die. This reasoning while plausible, cannot be said to be Scriptural, because it is not based on anything that is true. It is based on conjecture and speculation only. An actual reading of the Genesis account indicates that in six days God created the universe. He rested on the seventh day, and sanctified it, and then Adam and Eve sinned on the eighth day. This seems to be the immediate sense of the passage, since God is talking about successive days, and not millions of years. If this is the case, as it appears to be, when you read the text without interjecting anything else into it, then there is no need to presuppose death before the fall, since everything happened so quickly. It almost appears as though Adam and Eve sinned as soon as they were created. So death entered immediately into creation, and was not delayed by hundreds, thousands, or millions of years. Everything started dying within hours of creation. So the question of animal death before the fall is a useless question, unnecessary for any kind of knowledge at all.

2). **"Adam's original immortality was not by nature but by access to the tree of life, which was never offered to animals"**. The issue being discussed here is along the lines of the first premise. The author is trying to justify the notion that man lived for a lengthy period of time in the garden, but that he wasn't in fact immortal, but neither were the animals. Adam could live a long time, because he had access to the tree of life, but the animals didn't, so they died. These so called premises, are nothing more than human speculations. They are not substantiated by anything in the Genesis record. Who say's that **"Adam's original immortality was not by nature but by access to the tree of life"**? The Bible does not say this. The tree of life is mentioned, but nowhere does it say that Adam and Eve ate of it. Nowhere does it say that the tree of life provided them immortality. Nor does the passage say that the animals were excluded from it. The book of Revelation seems to indicate that the tree of life has something to do with

healing *“The leaves thereof are for the healing of the nations”*. The Bible does not say that Adams original immortality was not given to him by virtue his created nature. Which is what the author is insinuating when he says that **“Adams immortality was not by nature”**. Where is the “Scripture base” for any of these concepts? Everything in this point is a matter of speculation, and not Scripture. Therefore this premise is false also.

3). **“Death immediately caused by sin spread to men only”**. This statement not only contradicts Scripture, it contradicts simple observation also. It is not **“men only”** who die. But animals also die. So to say that death immediately spread to men only, is a lie. Animals also die, but is it **“caused by sin”**? The uniform teaching of the Bible seems to be that death came about as a result of sin. Romans 5: 14, part of the key passage dealing with this subject, says that *“death reigned even over them who did not sin after the similitude of Adam’s sin”*. This could certainly include the animals, because they did not sin after the similitude of Adam’s sin, and because they are not expressly excluded in this passage which deals with the whole issue of death. Furthermore, it is clear that God included animals in the curse of Adam, because He mentions that the Serpent was *“cursed above all cattle and above every beast of the field”*(Gen. 3: 14). This clearly teaches that the beasts were cursed, but not as much as the serpent, who was given a different kind of curse in addition to the curse which the animals received. All Bible scholars are agreed that the curse included death, because death is not eliminated until the curse is finally taken away (2Tim. 1: 10; 1Cor. 15: 26; Rev. 21: 4). So, the death of animals should be included in the curse which they received, just as it was included in the curse which Adam received. God’s judgment upon Adam included returning to the dust from whence he was taken. It is only logical and rational to believe that that was also part of God’s judgment upon the animals as well. It is always normal for God to judge the animals when he judges man. This seems to be a consistent theme throughout the Bible. Animals are judged when men are judged. Such judgment is actually a method whereby God intensifies mans judgment. But in any case animals are judged together with man, when man is judged. Genesis 6: 7 is an example of this *“And the LORD said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them”*. God could have spared the animals and given a judgment specific to man, but He didn’t do that, instead He judged the animals together with man, and in the same manner as man. Why? Because that is the way He apparently wanted it. The animals are incapable of sinning, but God judges them because of man’s sin. It is no different from the way He judged things in Eden. This makes perfect sense. To say that death spread to man only, because it was caused by sin, makes absolutely no sense, and does not follow the clear pattern of Scripture. This premise was clearly not evaluated from a **“primarily Scripture base”**, because if a Scriptural analysis had been done, a Scriptural conclusion would have been reached. There is no evidence of either. This doctrine is both

false and foreign to Scripture.

4). **"The lion-lamb peace of Isaiah 11 and 65 is not strictly "postdictive" of Eden nor predictive of a future absence of creature death"**. This may appear to be just stuck in here without much of a reason, but it is actually a critical part of the author's argument for the existence of animal death before the fall. It is actually the substance of an argument he uses to try to disprove some people, who have apparently argued that "The lion will lay down with the lamb", and that this shows that the lion will no longer eat the lamb, because he will be changed back into the vegetarian he was at creation. The argument which he is trying to oppose has at least a few good things for it's merit . It puts the carnivore question into a context where the Lion is obviously doing something which his carnivore teeth say he shouldn't be doing. We should not have a problem with this, because God often uses His creations in manners which appear to totally contradict their appearance. He has them do what He wants, and not what we think they should do. He can make stones into "*Children of Abraham*" (*Matt. 3: 9*), and He can make a donkey to talk, and a fish to eat Jonah, and He can make water into wine. God can regulate the function of anything He has made despite the way that it appears. So the vegetarian Lion, is a good context in which to discuss death before the fall. But the author denies all this by assuming that Isaiah 11 and 65 is neither "**postdictive, nor predictive**". Who say's that Isaiah 11 and 65 are neither postdictive of Eden, nor predictive of some future time when the lion may function as the vegetarian he was created to be? God certainly does not say this. (God has clearly said what the lion's original diet was supposed to be Gen. 1: 30). So the Isaiah 11 and 65 passages are at least postdictive of Eden, because there is no doubt that in Eden the teeth of the lion were chewing grass and herbs in obedience to God, and were not tearing apart the flesh of little lambs in disobedience to God. Animals cannot disobey God. They always do His will. This makes us wonder why God didn't create man like the animals? As far as God is concerned He created the lion to be a perfect herbivore. God says this, and that settles it. It doesn't matter if God later decides to turn Him into a carnivore. He was predestined to have the right kind of teeth, because He was predestined to serve many functions in the economy of God.

5) **"Man is the secondary cause of creation's bondage to decay; and this bondage is to be in part released by Christians, as children of God, living life in the Spirit"**. Ok. This should be pretty straight forward. Man is the cause of his own effect. The effect is that "*the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together*"(*Rom. 8: 22a*). Is it true that man is the secondary cause? And is it true that this bondage is partially released by the Spirit filled Children of God? I'm not sure what the second half of this statement really means, since I can find no references similar to it anywhere in Scripture. We release the bondage of creation, but only partially, as children of God living life in the Spirit? I don't understand this, because it is language

foreign to anything found in Scripture. It is unintelligible. I think he is trying to say, that man was partially responsible for the curse upon the earth, but don't worry, he's also partially responsible for its removal. Is that what he means by man's is the secondary cause? He's not the primary cause, but the secondary one. OK, This makes no sense. I'll stick with the Bible which teaches that **the cause of everything is God. And there is no solution to sin, death and the curse...NOT EVEN A PARTIAL ONE...in man himself, no matter how Spirit filled he is.** *"He worketh all things after the counsel of His own will"* (Eph. 1: 11 also Isa 40: 13-14; Acts 2: 23; Acts 4: 28) *"our God is in the heavens: he hath done whatsoever he hath pleased."* (Ps. 115: 3). *"Whatsoever the LORD pleased, that did he in heaven, and in earth, in the seas, and all deep places"*. (Look up and compare Jn. 1: 13 with Eph. 2: 8-9 ; Jn. 6: 44, 65; Rom. 8: 7-8; 2Pet. 2: 14; and Jer. 13: 23). God causes everything, and man causes nothing. Thank God. So while I do not know what the author means by this mysterious statement. I do know what the Bible says in its pages of clear truth. I suggest a thorough study of Romans 8: 18-25. But please stick to the Bible and shun profane and unwise babblings and the doubtful disputations of heretics.

6) **"The conclusion is that Scripture does not demand the absence of animal death before the fall. The consequence of concluding otherwise leads to flood geology."** All reasoning, true and false, starts with a premise, and ends with a conclusion. If the premise is true, the conclusion will be true also, provided true logic and true rational thinking has occurred in the various deductions from the premise. If the premise is false, then the conclusion will always be false, no matter what kind of logic, rationalisations or deductions are made. I have amply proved that the premise is wrong and science is false. They have built an apologetic upon this false premise. What is the conclusion? It is false, because everything leading up to it is false. SCRIPTURE DOES DEMAND THE ABSENCE OF ANIMAL DEATH BEFORE THE FALL, as I have clearly shown. Not one verse of scripture can be produced to substantiate the conclusion that Scripture does not demand truth in the handling of the truth. Where are the verses to substantiate this conclusion? Where are the verses to substantiate the premise? The conclusion was reached without Scripture, because the entire theory is based upon science and not Scripture. There are no verses showing animal death before the fall. There are no verses showing any kind of death before the entrance of sin.

The second part of this statement is really bizarre... **"The consequence of concluding otherwise leads to flood geology."** In other words we are to accept animal death before the fall, or we will be led to the dreaded "FLOOD GEOLOGY". God forbid that we should believe that the FLOOD has anything to do with GEOLOGY! What kind of blasphemy would that be?...believing in "FLOOD GEOLOGY"? That is some dangerous stuff, brought about by rejecting animal death before the fall! "FLOOD GEOLOGY" might damn a soul to hell or something, after all It is based on a narrow minded, spiritually bigoted, literalistic belief in the global flood of

Noah, which is plainly taught in the Bible. If you don't believe in the scientific proof of the fossils that show that animals and dinosaurs died before the fall over millions of years in the day-ages of Genesis one...Then the only alternative is to believe the dreaded "FLOOD GEOLOGY", which is plainly taught in the Bible. But we don't read the Bible that way! What way? Plainly...in it's plain and ordinary meaning. We have to say that days aren't days they are millennia. Animals didn't eat grass, they ate one another! The flood wasn't global cataclysm, it was a regional flood in the area of Eden only. Man didn't bring death upon the whole of creation, but only upon man himself. Adam was not created immortal, he had to become immortal by eating from the tree of life. My, my, my, it's not over till the fat lady sings. And this fat lady will never get a chance to sing because there will never be an end to contradicting the Bible once we start.

Just as "all truth is one truth" so "all falsehood is one lie". It is the master lie of Satan to destroy man and keep him in darkness forever. Do not misunderstand what I am saying. Satan is a doomed dupe. God prescribed what He could and could not do, just as He prescribes everything. But this lie is very ancient, very deceptive and very destructive. He is the father of all lies and all liars, and he is a murderer from the beginning. Because of the lie, men love darkness rather than light. Because of the, lie men change the image of God Himself into the likeness of four footed beasts and idols. Because of the lie, people with good intentions, maybe even the best of intentions, are blinded and sent to hell. Because of the lie, churches fail to reach the lost with the gospel, because it's preaching is turned into foolishness in them that know not God. Because of the lie, there are 5,000 or more so called Christian denominations, because Christians fight and devour one another like dogs. Because of the lie, martyrs blood cries out from the ground. Because of the lie, hell is populated by humans who should never had went there, because hell was created for the Devil and his angels. Because of the lie, multitudes bow down and kiss the ring of the pope. Because of the lie, multitudes pray to Mary and practice necromancy by praying to other departed saints. There is no end to the lie, because it steers clear of the Bible. If it's not in the Bible, it's the lie. People will believe it rather than believe God. It makes no sense. It is totally irrational. It is stupid. It is retarded. It is idiotic. It turns men into what the Bible calls "fools". It wipes away almost every vestige of God's image in man. It kills. By the millions, men have marched to it's drumbeat. They have died believing it to the end. They trust it like a cherished possession, but it is the hold of every unclean and foul spirit. It is the rotting melting pot of ungodliness. It is the dark cave of alienation and loneliness, inhabited by the bats of darkness and hellions of the deep. It is the cage of every unclean beast and every vile affection and thought. It is moral rot. It is dirty. It is polluted. It is filthy. It is pornographic. It is sick. It is adulterous. And it is death. Why on earth, would anyone in their right mind, want to take the lie into their bosom, and cherish it like the beloved of their soul? We worry about the death of animals before the fall, and could give a rats ass, about the death of

human souls under the perdition of the Devil's lie. What's wrong with us? Are we nuts? Lucifer's deception means more to us than God's truth? Are we out of our minds? Big name, popular Christian scholars endorse this...blind leaders of the blind. Are we going to follow their Pied Piper call to hell? just because they are popular and have made a name for themselves? God, help us. God, deliver us. God, keep us. God, assist us. God, illuminate us. God, protect us. God, awaken us. God, empower us. God, direct us. **"Let God be true, and every man a liar"**.

Mike, I love you in Christ, and have always respected your intelligence. I know that you are going to think what you want to think about this and everything else. I am not trying to change what you think. That is up to God. As a matter of fact, you are thinking what God wants you to think anyways. When he wants the saints to see the light...He shows it to them. When He wants the reprobate to think evil thoughts and harden their heart, He sends them strong delusion and they believe the lie. I cannot change what you think. But God directs all your thoughts. It is up to us to become conformed to the image of His Son by being obedient children. The issue is really one of simple obedience. If we believe Him, we obey Him. If we obey Him, we embrace all that is true. We obey, because of His infinite Grace toward us. I can only hope and trust that you will pick out the valuable concepts which I have shared with you, and that you will embrace them and implement them in obedience to His grace. But I do want you to understand one thing...I mean you no harm, and only wish God's best for you. And no matter whether you see I to eye with me, or not, I still consider you a dear and valuable friend. We have known each other for over 30 years, and you know how I tend to be dogmatic and preachy. That's because my calling is also my fault. My weakness is also my strength. I am passionate about the things of God, and this is my weakness. I spout off at the mouth, because I take literally the command to **"speak every man truth with his neighbor"**. I can do nothing else. It's the way God has made me. I trust that you will think about these things. I have put a lot of thought into the things I have written to you. I'm sure you don't get 16 page dissertations every day. Take it as a compliment and not as an offense. I would not have wasted so much time putting it together, if I did not believe that it would benefit both you and me. I did it because I value what you think, and I contemplate what you say very seriously. So take it for what its worth. And God richly bless you. Earl