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ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the rise of Young Earth Creationism from its infancy to the present day, its theological implications, and what is next for the movement. First, this paper explores the framework for the argument by delving into the history of the movement by exploring the interpretation of the book of Genesis, and the rise of the Creation movement as the result of Darwinism taking hold as a scientific theory. Then, it explores the movement and strategies of contemporary Young Earth Creationists up to and including the Creation Museum and includes first person interviews with key players in the movement today. Finally, this paper includes a discussion about the future of the movement and who is winning the creation versus evolution battle in American culture.

This thesis finds Young Earth Creationism is winning the war of creation versus evolution. They have the energy, the numbers, and the financial backing to continue on and bring about what they say could be a second reformation with Christians taking the Bible literally and “nailing Genesis 1-11 to the doors of churches, colleges, and
By examining this topic, this thesis will bring academic research and exposure to the key ideas of a religious movement that has been largely dismissed by many Americans. It will show the influence Young Earth Creationists are having on the American Christian landscape.

---

1 Ken Ham, interview by author, Petersburg, KY, October 20, 2011.
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CHAPTER I

A BRIEF EXPLANATION OF THE PROBLEM, THE METHODOLOGY, AND THESIS

There are many approaches around to the world to the Creation story found in Genesis. In this paper, the focus will be on an American Christian subset, Young Earth Creationists, who believe in a literal six days of Creation. The crown jewel for Young Earth Creationists’ interpretation and dissemination of their ideas is the Creation Museum in Petersburg, Kentucky. If you look closely at the Garden of Eden display at the museum, there is a penguin staring at Adam and off to the side, there is a kangaroo and a dinosaur. The museum is run by Answers in Genesis, the standard bearers for Young Earth Creationism (YEC). Young Earth Creationists (YECs) believe God created the world literally as the Bible describes it, in six 24-hour days. They also believe the earth is approximately 6,000 years old, following the genealogies in the Bible. In their model of creation, death did not enter the world until the Fall, when Adam and Eve ate the forbidden fruit from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Prior to the Fall, Adam and Eve lived in harmony in the Garden with every kind of living creature including dinosaurs, penguins, and kangaroos.

In YEC theology, Adam and Eve were real, historical people, as described in the book of Genesis. Their choice brought sin into the world and with sin, eternal death as a penalty. They paved the way for the coming of Jesus, whose death paid the price for the sin of all humankind. A worldwide flood, as described in the Noah story, accounts for the scientific evidence of fossils, and the young age of the earth. For YECs, if the stories
of Genesis 1-11 falter in any way, scientifically or historically, then Christianity crumbles along with it because there would be no need for redemption and the sacrifice of Jesus.

Creationism as a science and Young Earth Creationism as a theology are relatively new fields of study. Prior to the theory of evolution put forth by Charles Darwin, religion and science in the United States lived in relative harmony. As evolution took hold in the scientific community, an anti-evolution movement arose. The two sides came together in an epic battle in Dayton, Tennessee at the Scopes trial in 1925 – where, in a grand display, evolution and creationism were put on trial. Evolution came out the victor in that battle, but after a period of retreating and changing strategies, creationists came out even stronger. Today, polls show nearly half of Americans believe the origins of the earth were as described in the book of Genesis.¹

YECs’ interpretations have led to theological and scientific battles. The war is raging on two fronts: one against alternate Christian interpretations of the Creation story and the other against science. Other Christian interpretations of the Creation story are brushed aside by YECs as “compromises” made by “so-called Christians.” Scientists are seen not as non-theistic, but anti-theist in their approach. Anecdotal evidence of the greater than one and a half million visitors to the Creation Museum seems to indicate the YECs are winning on some fronts, though the popularity of their beliefs is a relatively new phenomenon. Oddly enough, earlier Creationists in the time of Darwin, and prior,

were overwhelmingly Old Earth Creationists, who believed the Creation story narrative allowed for an interpretation that the earth could be millions of years old.

In this thesis, broader scholarship on Genesis as a whole will be examined, specifically focusing on the historical interpretation of the book and briefly examine the origins of Creationism. While YEC has some global reach, it is, for the most part, a uniquely American belief. I will trace the origins of Creationism in America from the publication of the *Origin of Species* to the present day.

Included is an exhaustive literature review of the works of YEC authors, specifically the writing of Ken Ham, the head of Answers in Genesis, as well as some of the foundational works he cites, namely *The Genesis Flood*. This reading and analysis will provide insight into YEC arguments and the theology behind them. It will serve to examine how those arguments are presented. It also underscores the fact that YECs target audience is the lay public versus the scientific establishment with each argument.

A trip to the Creation Museum is also analyzed, exploring how the museum has become as successful as it has and how YECs are using it as a platform to continue their mission. Another key component in this thesis will be an extended personal interview with Ken Ham, the head of Answers in Genesis. This interview, in addition to a visit to the Creation Museum, will provide an extensive exploration into the theology of the movement and where they hope to move next.

Within Christendom, lines are drawn across many boundaries. The risk of schism is real and damaging. YECs risk further fractures, not just because of what they believe
about Creation, but also because of how they treat differences of opinion on the matter. Throughout their literature and conferences, Reformation language fans the fire of schism. By adding another battle line that stretches across multiple denominations and traditions, YECs risk further schism in the Christian communion with their belief in absolute adherence to their theories. The new battle line is drawn across Genesis.

In addition to potential schism, there are other consequences to the promotion and dissemination of their views, as the absolute authority on Biblical interpretation and a failure to adapt to advances in science. In their theology, the entirety of the Bible rests on a scientific understanding of Genesis and an equally strong refutation of evolution and other natural sciences. If a young Christian is brought up believing in a YEC interpretation, he or she will be ill equipped to deal with the broader scientific world around them. It could easily shake his or her overall faith and lead them to abandon their faith in the Bible for the same reasons YECs insist people cling to their theological understandings.

Finally, I will explore the theological implications of YEC in American Christianity in the context of a pluralistic society. Specifically, this thesis will explore the aim, goals, and trajectory of the YEC movement in the United States and how it might impact the American Christianity. The movement is massive, financially stable, and winning converts to its ideology.
CHAPTER II
SCHOLARSHIP REVIEW

The History of Genesis from Authorship to Interpretation

How the first eleven chapters of Genesis are interpreted is critical to understanding Young Earth Creationism (YEC) and Young Earth Creationists (YECs). Of particular importance to their theology are how they understand Creation, the Fall, and the Flood.

**Creation:** The book of Genesis begins with the Creation account. In chapter one, verse one, the writer begins with what is now one of the most famous phrases in any language. “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.”\(^1\) After this introductory sentence, the book goes into how, on consecutive days, God speaks into creation the earth and all that is in it, and the sun and the moon. After each creative act, God sees that it was good. On the sixth day, God creates humankind. “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them.”\(^2\) At the end of the sixth day of creation, God sees that all he has made was “very good” and on the seventh day he rests.

The second chapter of Genesis opens with God resting on the seventh day and then returns to the creation narrative. Chapter 2:4 reads, “This is the account of the

\(^1\) Genesis 1:1 (New Revised Standard Version).

\(^2\) Gen 1:27 (NRSV).
heavens and the earth when they were created.” Here it goes into more details of the surface of the earth, the creation of mankind, and placing them in the Garden of Eden.

**The Fall:** The third chapter relates the fall of Adam and Eve. Here they fall from perfection into sin when they eat of the forbidden fruit in the Garden of Eden. Eve is tempted by the serpent to eat the fruit from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. She and Adam partake of the fruit and their eyes are opened. They realize they are naked and have sinned. This is the introduction in the Bible to the idea of sin, death, and suffering. They are confronted by God and banished from the garden. Sin penetrates into everything and the world becomes increasingly evil.

**The Flood:** Genesis 6-8 tells the story of Noah, a righteous man living in the midst of a world overrun with evil. God decides to send a great flood to purge the earth of evil. He instructs Noah and his sons to build a great ark to survive the flood. God also instructs Noah to take with them on the great ark two of every kind of animal that walks on the earth and flies. God sends a great flood and Noah and the ark are spared after 40 days and 40 nights of rain. They land on the top of a mountain and God sends a rainbow as a sign he will never destroy the earth again.

To understand where YECs fall on the spectrum of Biblical interpretation, some background is needed. This thesis does not presume to summate three thousand years of Biblical understanding but will touch on several important aspects for understanding YEC. In particular, authorship of Genesis and its interpretation through the ages will be explored. While Young Earth Creationism is a relatively new phenomenon and many of
its adherents are laity, it is important to grasp how the understanding and interpretation of
Genesis has changed over the centuries. Of note in particular, the past three hundred
years have brought dramatic changes to how Genesis is viewed. Most YEC adherents
rely on a simple, literal, reading of the Bible and Genesis. The publisher and translation
of the particular Bible can make an enormous difference in how Genesis is portrayed.
Several commentaries and versions of the Bible will be explored to better understand this
phenomenon.

**Authorship**

For centuries, Christians and Jews believed that Moses was the sole author of the
first five books of the Old Testament: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and
Deuteronomy, collectively called the Pentateuch or Torah. The tradition was that Moses
was inspired by God to write these books. Early rabbis pointed to Moses’ extended stay
on Mount Sinai when he went to receive the Ten Commandments as the place in time and
history when he received the Torah, or the law. The Torah includes both the law, which
according to the text comes from God, and histories, in the latter parts of which Moses is
a central character. “The written Torah would include, according to all rabbinic sources
(which are followed by the early church), even the book of Genesis, which represents
God’s narration to Moses of the early history of the world and of Abraham and his
family.”

---

3 Marc Brettler, “Introduction to the Pentateuch: Terminology, Contents, and Traditional views of
of the Torah, through Moses was the authoritative view of both Jews and Christians through the Renaissance. 4

Nowhere in the five books of Moses does the text claim, implicitly or explicitly, to be written by Moses. Lack of an attributed author was common in Near East literature at the time. The Pentateuch text itself offers clues that Moses could not have written all of the accounts found in the first five books. The most glaring suggestion Moses was not the only author of the complete Pentateuch is the account of his death found in the book of Deuteronomy. Rabbis and other scholars at the time generally held one of two views on this: either that Moses’ successor Joshua completed the book of Deuteronomy or that God dictated to Moses the story of his own death and then Moses “wrote it with his tears.” 5 Both theories return to the broader idea that Moses was not in fact the author, but merely a vehicle used by God for transcription.

As the Renaissance gave way to the Enlightenment, many scholars looked at the Torah in a different light. Thomas Hobbes and others began to question the veracity of Moses as the singular author. Source criticism began to grow. In 1753, Jean Astruc, a doctor in Paris to King Louis XV, was one of the first to suggest in writing that the different names given to God in the text of Genesis suggested different sources for the material. He also suggested an editor, as opposed to a singular author, was responsible for the text. While Astruc published his medical works under his own name, he

5 Ibid., 4.
anonymously published *Conjectures*, his theological work. Author Ana Acosta suggested that publishing the work anonymously likely had more to do with his standing in the Parisian medical community than his concern over his biblical theory. Astruc’s suggestion that there were two sources Moses was using in writing Genesis, perhaps unwittingly, began the process of removing the divine revelatory nature of the text.

Astruc’s source criticism theory has been expanded on greatly. German scholars, in particular, further explored the theory. Julius Wellhausen, a German biblical scholar, standing on the shoulders of Astruc and others, published *The History of Israel* in 1878, formulated the Documentary Hypothesis theory. Wellhausen expanded the sources from two to four and suggested the narrative as it is presented was unreliable because it contradicted itself throughout the Torah. He noted the works likely came from a time in Jewish history during the exile period, much later in history than others had thought:

> It is an opinion very extensively held that the great mass of the books of the Old Testament not only relate to the pre–exilic period, but date from it. According to this view, they are remnants of the literature of ancient Israel which the Jews rescued as a heritage from the past, and on which they continued to subsist in the decay of independent intellectual life.\(^7\)

Most contemporary scholars refer to the four sources as J, E, P, and D and a later editor who compiled them as R. They can even extract the four sources from the Pentateuch

---


and turn them into four separate books. Most scholars postulate there were earlier
editions or sources JEPD drew from which could explain their similarities.8

**J:** This source was called the Jahwehist (or Yahweh) because the author refers to God by
that name. The J source refers to God as a proper noun. In most English texts, this is
translated as LORD. The J source is thought to be the origin for the second creation
account found in Genesis 2:4. J is one of the earlier, and perhaps the earliest, sources
dating to 800s BCE.

**E:** The E source derives its name from use of the word Elohim in the text. In this
context, Elohim is a common noun translated as “God.” The Elohim source uses only
Elohim to refer to God prior to God revealing himself to Moses at the burning bush in
Exodus, and then switches to the proper noun, Yahweh. There is no creation story in the
E source.

**P:** The P source takes its name from the word Priestly, as this source is most concerned
with the role of priests in Israel. Scholars think this text comes nearly 100 years after J
and E and is corrective in nature, unhappy with the earlier texts. The creation story in
Genesis chapter 1:1, as well as the story of Noah and the flood, seems to come from the P
author. The book of Leviticus, which details priestly life, likely came from this source
also.

**D:** This source takes its name from the book of Deuteronomy (which as a whole is
attributed to the D author). Likely, the D source knew all the other sources. Scholars
have come to that conclusion because of the opening summation of the history of Israel at
the beginning of Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy is presented as a speech of Moses to the
people of Israel and ends with the account of Moses’ death.

**R:** In addition to JEPD, scholars have also put forth a theory of R for the Redactor. The
R is thought to be an editor or editors, some scholars have suggested it was Ezra, who
compiled all the source material into what we currently view as the Pentateuch.9 This
editor was not concerned with a single point of view but allowed JEPD to mingle
together to form a more complex and nuanced narrative.10

---


9 Ibid., 10.

10 Brettler, “Introduction to the Pentateuch,” 5.
The dating of the JEPD sources and biblical scholarship prominence of the Documentary Hypothesis theory have been questioned. Additional methods of interpretation have risen in prominence, including literary criticism, feminist criticism, and others. But the Documentary Hypothesis theory and Source Criticism continue to be important for many Biblical scholars and have been adopted in one form or another by many denominations and sects, both Christian and Jewish. While the specifics of the theory may not make it into doctrinal statements of denomination, the influence can clearly be seen. It is important to note, many conservative Christian groups (particularly evangelicals) and Orthodox Jews reject the theory. With their origins in conservative Christian Protestant denominations and evangelical groups, YECs reject the Documentary Hypothesis theory and Source Criticism for what they see as a deliberate undermining of biblical inerrancy.

Companion notes and essays in different translations of the Bible often reveal the publisher’s theological perspective and anticipated audience for their product. In the New International Version Archaeological Study Bible, published by evangelical publisher Zondervan in conjunction with conservative evangelical seminary Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, the Documentary Hypothesis is explained in depth but quickly discounted in a note saying that, “In refuting these arguments it is helpful to recognize that repetition was an essential part of ancient Near Eastern narrative.”11 It

concludes, “Many scholars today have abandoned the Documentary Hypothesis, agreeing that it is based on a faulty understanding of ancient Near Eastern literature and that it contributes nothing helpful to our understanding of the Pentateuch.”

By comparison, the New Oxford Annotated Bible New Revised Standard Version takes great pains to explain the Documentary Hypothesis theory and presents it as a debated theory but the scholastic standard. It affirms the books are derived from multiple sources but suggests they can also be read as a uniform whole. Marc Brettler, a Professor of Biblical Studies and chair of the Department of Near Eastern and Judaic Studies at Brandeis University, explains in his introduction to the Pentateuch, “The annotations of the following books will draw attention to this issue, showing how meaning may be uncovered by looking both at the early building blocks of the text, and the text in its final, redacted form.” The essay does not discount the theory, but at the same time opens a dialogue with the reader welcoming a questioning of the theory.

**Interpretation**

The history of the interpretation of Genesis, and specifically the first eleven chapters, has changed over time. Christians and Jews have long held the importance of the book as telling the story of who was behind the creation of the world.

---

12 Ibid.

In the early Jewish tradition, there was great deference paid to the stories of Creation and the Fall found in the early portions of the text. In their book on varied interpretations on the Garden of Eden, Kvam, Schearing, and Ziegler point out, “Rabbinic treatments of Genesis 1-3 also reflect a willingness to hold conflicting interpretations in tension without needing to arrive at a ‘correct’ reading.”14 This Near Eastern notion of reading and understanding the text is completely foreign to Western scholarship, which is most concerned with a ‘correct’ reading. YECs often strive for a plain, literal understanding, of the text as a historical narrative, a notion that is in conflict with early rabbinic treatments.

Philip of Alexandria wrote one of the earliest surviving Jewish commentaries on the book of Genesis (20s-40s CE); while he understood it to be divine scripture, he thought the Creation and the Fall stories were allegorical in nature.15

Another famed Jewish historian, Josephus, wrote a broad history of the Jews from the creation story through the war against the Romans. Josephus wrote that Moses was the author of the text of Genesis and quotes him liberally in his early history, which, like Genesis, begins at Creation. After he moves through the formation of the earth, he makes this note about the creation of mankind: “Moreover, Moses, after the seventh day was over, begins to talk philosophically; and concerning the formation of man, says thus: that


15 Ibid., 42.
God took dust from the ground, and formed man, and inserted in him a spirit and a soul.”  

Josephus appears to take the story as factual history but his use of the word “philosophically” is curious. He is talking about the creation of the soul, which could account for its use or he may subtly questioning the historicity of the creation story as fact and leaning more towards the story as an allegory. Basser writes in exploring Josephus’ presentation of the Garden of Eden, “By attributing the story to Moses, Josephus may feel that he could read the text more creatively than if the Biblical story were the very word of God.” In essence, saying Moses was the author versus God, at the very least, gives him poetic license to interpret the presentation allegorically.

Young Earth Creationists in particular point to Josephus’ later use of genealogies in his text as an external qualifying source for dating the earth as being less than seven thousand years old, because he expands upon the genealogies found in Genesis 10 after the Flood. What is important about Josephus is he treated the creation story and Adam and Eve as a history, and a clear, true story. YECs would argue Josephus does not view the story of Adam and Eve as an as an allegory. In the Jewish works of the Talmud and


Midrashes, rabbinical explorations of the Biblical text, the stories are treated in a variety of ways – at times as an allegory and at times as history.

The Creation story also played an important role for early Christians. The New Testament points to pieces of the Genesis account of Creation and specifically the Fall. The Gospel writers in the New Testament sought to explain the history of Jesus and that he had come as the promised Jewish Messiah. Paul’s letters seek to connect Jesus to Genesis as the remedy for the Fall.

In particular, Paul’s letter to the Romans goes to great lengths to explain that Jesus is the new Adam. In Romans 5:12 he writes: “Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death came through sin, and so death spread to all because all have sinned.”\textsuperscript{19} The one man he is referencing is Adam, and he formulated the Christian idea that original sin is innate in humankind after Adam and the punishment is death, or eternal separation from God. He adds in verse 15: “But the free gift is not like the trespass. For if the many died through the one man’s trespass, much more surely have the grace of God and the free gift in the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, abounded for many.”\textsuperscript{20}

The writer of 1 Timothy, which may or may not have been Paul, uses the creation of Adam and Eve as a hierarchical code for church leadership, saying women should not be permitted to teach or have authority over men in the church. “For Adam was formed

\textsuperscript{19} Romans 5:12 (NRSV).

\textsuperscript{20} Rom 5:15 (NRSV).
first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a
transgressor."  Paul’s letter to the Colossians also looks to Jesus and points back to
Genesis. He also presents a common theme in the New Testament, the presence of Jesus
at Creation:

[Jesus] is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation; for in him
all things in heaven and on earth were created, things visible and invisible, where
thrones or dominions or rulers or powers – all things have been created through
him and for him.  

The language style here in Colossians is strikingly similar to the early creeds of the
Christian church.

In the first creeds of the church, early church fathers pointed often to the creation
story as a key component of the Christian faith. “The one true God, Creator of heaven
and earth” was a popular phrase in creeds. Prior to the formation of the Nicene Creed,
Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Origen all explicitly mentioned God as the creator in their
early creeds and writings. Origen wrote, “First, that God is one, who created and set in
order all things, and who, when nothing existed, caused the universe to be. He is God
from the first creation and foundation of the world…”

21 1 Timothy 2:13-14 (NRSV).
22 Colossians 1:15-16 (NRSV).
23 Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie R. Hotchkiss, eds., *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the
24 Pelikan, and Hotchkiss, eds., *Creeds and Confessions*, 63.
At the First Council of Nicaea, convened by Emperor Constantine in 325 CE, the
global church sought to solidify its theological underpinning and recognize the divinity of
Christ. There were 318 bishops and the emperor in attendance. The church was still
reeling from persecution. Pelikan and Hotchkiss note, “Persecutions of Christians in the
empire had only recently ended, and many of the participants at Nicaea bore the wounds
and disfigurements of torture.”25 The final outcome of the meeting was the Nicene
Creed, which still stands as a universal confession for Christians of all denominations. It
pointed specifically to God as creator: “Maker of all things both seen and unseen.” And
again, “through whom all things came to be…”26 These first creeds clearly affirmed the
“who” and “why” of creation but dealt much less with the “how” and the “when.”

By contrast, a key component for YEC interpretation of Genesis is the authorship
of Genesis by God, as dictated to Moses. For them, the story not only tells the “who” and
“why” but also the “how and “when,” in a narrative that details Creation, the Fall, and the
Flood as both historical and a scientific accounts. Publishers of Bibles and commentaries
often address these phenomena, and often contrast or highlight what they believe about
YEC.

The introduction to Genesis in the New Oxford Annotated Study Bible New
Revised Standard Version, which markets itself as an ecumenical study Bible, addresses
truth claims about the book of Genesis. David M. Carr, Professor of Old Testament

25 Pelikan, and Hotchkiss, eds., Creeds and Confessions, 156.
26 Ibid., 14.
Studies at Union Theological Seminary, a multi-denominational seminary, points out that the concern of the historical and scientific claims of Genesis is a new issue, one in particular found in the West. “This definition is relatively new: the historicity of Genesis was not a significant concern prior to the rise of modern science and the historical method; in fact, in premodern times, the stories of Genesis were often read metaphorically or allegorically.”²⁷

The New Jerome Biblical Commentary, edited by Raymond E. Brown, which arises out of the Second Vatican Council and is written by Catholic scholars, points in its commentary on the Creation story that Moses was likely not the author of Genesis, despite the fact it was believed he was for nearly two millennia by Christians and Jews. As for the differing Creation stories in Genesis 1 and 2, the commentary notes a tolerance for different versions of the story. “The biblical writers have produced a version of a common Mesopotamian story of the origins of the populated world, exploring major questions about God and humanity through narrative.”²⁸ It also notes that this could be a challenge for modern readers and criticizes YEC:

Some readers even end up concentrating their energies in defending a ‘literal interpretation’ of esp. chaps. 1-3 against modern evolutionary theory, something


the ancient authors of Gen, with their tolerance of versions, would never have done.29

In the Anchor Bible commentary on the book of Genesis, author E.A. Speiser also addresses the issues of history and science. He separates Genesis into two parts, with chapters 1-11 telling the “Primeval History” and the remaining chapters dealing with the “Story of the Patriarchs.” On the issue of creation and the primeval history, he writes in the introduction, Genesis should be weighed as a work of theology, not as a history or scientific account:

...biblical thought reflected the best that was available in contemporary scientific thinking, yet raised such data to its own theological standards...And the basic question about any statement in a given source is not whether the statement is true or false, but what it means.30

He goes on to bring in the Documentary Source theory in brief, then returns to the issue of science. “The point here is not whether this account of creation conforms to the scientific data of today, but what it means to, and how it was arrived at by, the writer concerned.”31 Again this scholar is pointing to the “why” of the story versus the “how.”

By contrast, the New International Version (NIV) Archeological Study Bible points to Moses as the editor of Genesis, citing tradition. It also allows for Moses to have used other sources in compiling the book, but affirms this was at God’s direction. It makes mention of the source criticism theory as arising from scholars who are skeptical

29 Ibid.


31 Speiser, The Anchor Bible: Genesis, 9.
of Moses as the author/editor, but returns to Moses suggesting he compiled the text during the period of exile from Egypt. As the NIV is aggressively marketed to and often preferred by conservative and evangelical Christians, NIV publisher Zondervan straddles the YEC line. This text is targeted to the lay market, unlike the other editions previously mentioned, which would be targeted to an academic market. Not all conservative and evangelical Christians uniformly accept YEC, but many who do accept it come from these traditions. In a chart denoting times of events in Genesis, the earliest date is 2200 BC. The first marked event is Abraham’s life at 2166 BC. Above it are Creation, the Fall, the Flood, and the Tower of Babel. None of these are marked specifically on the timeline, but all appear after the 2200 BC mark. This is a subtle affirmation of YEC while trying not to offend conservative Christians and evangelicals who do not believe in YEC.

In the notes and the margins for the Creation account, the editors further straddle the line. In the first note on Genesis 1:1-31, the editors point out, “The length of the creative days of Genesis 1 is not specified in the Bible.” They go on further to explain how in Hebrew there are many different versions of the English word “day.” This is a key point for YEC, that “day” literally means a 24-hour period. The editors effectively seem to confront YEC at the end of the note: “The Bible provides no specific statement as to how long ago matter was created, when the first day of creation began or when the

sixth day ended.” 33 But, in the very next note the editors take aim at one of the key
theories in opposition of YEC, the Gap Theory. “Some scholars hold that there is a long
gap between verses 1 and 2, during which God’s perfect creation came into a period of
chaos through a great catastrophe. Hebrew syntax, however, leaves no room for such a
view.” 34 What that note does is eliminate one of the key arguments YECs vehemently
disagree on. In the gap theory, the age of the earth can be much older. A young age of
the earth is paramount for YECs.

One of the versions of the Bible most favored by evangelicals since its publication
in the 1900s is the Scofield Reference Bible. Cyrus Ingerson Scofield was a Civil War
veteran who enlisted in the Confederate Army at 17. After a messy divorce, he became a
Christian and then a minister. He taught a correspondence course through the Moody
Bible Institute, which enrolled ten thousand students and laid the groundwork for his
reference Bible. The first version of the Scofield Bible was published in 1909 as a study
Bible aimed at the general public. It was a best seller and went on to sell one million
copies. It was widely praised because it combined detailed notes and cross references to
other parts of scripture. 35

For the updated 1917 edition of the reference Bible, Scofield added a dating
system created by seventeenth century Irish Archbishop James Ussher. Scofield used it

33 Ibid.

34 Ibid.

35 R. Todd Mangum and Mark Sweetnam, *The Scofield Bible: Its History and Impact on the
to put the Minor and Major Prophets in historical perspective. But, it was Ussher’s date for creation that caused the biggest stir. Ussher calculated creation to have occurred in 4004 BC by tracing the genealogies of the Old Testament. Mangum and Sweetnam noted that Scofield was “agnostic” on the age of the earth. Despite leaving the age of the earth an open question, in his notes he specifically points to Ussher and says, “Ussher’s dates, however, imply a young earth, roughly six-thousand-years old.”36 Nearly one hundred years later, the 1917 edition remains popular and is marketed as “the Old Scofield Reference Bible.”

In the notes on Genesis found in the 1967 Scofield edition, published after his death in 1921, editors sought to further explain his position on the age of the earth and creation. “In this Reference Bible no dates before 2,000 B.C. are given, because of the lack of evidence on which to fix such dates.”37 And then they further in the note on Genesis 1:1, “Scripture gives no data for determining how long ago the universe was created.”38

Regardless of where Scofield stood on the age of the earth, he was a fierce defender of the truthfulness of Genesis. In his introduction to the Pentateuch, perhaps in response to his theological counterparts in Germany and their development of the

36 Mangum and Sweetnam, The Scofield Bible, 97.
Documentary Hypothesis, he lists the author of Genesis as Moses and the date of writing as 1450-1410 B.C.:

Some theologians, [rejecting] the actuality of the events recorded in the early chapters of Genesis, yet at the same time recognizing their religious value, call ‘myths’ such accounts as those of Eden and the fall, meaning by ‘myth’ not merely legend, but rather, a ‘supra-historical’ story that conveys spiritual teaching of permanent significance. However, the historicity of the Genesis record is so related to the authority of Christ that it cannot be assigned to a mythical category without impugning the perfection of His knowledge.\(^{39}\)

In this introduction, he clearly states a piece of what is today both evangelical and YEC doctrine that, “In a profound sense, therefore, the roots of all subsequent revelation are planted deep in Genesis, and whoever would truly comprehend that revelation must begin here.”\(^ {40}\)

**The History of Creationism**

The movement of Young Earth Creationism as it exists in present form grows out of the broader creationism movement in the United States. There are several key guideposts important to understanding the history of the movement. Little research has been done into the movement as a whole, but that which has been done is of considerable depth and scholarship. Ronald Numbers stands out both as an historian covering the movement and as an editor of a multivolume set of early writings of Creationists in the United States. Raymond Eve and Francis Harrold have also produced extraordinary scholarship into the movement from sociological and anthropological perspectives.

\(^{39}\) Ibid., xvi.

\(^{40}\) Ibid., 1.
There is also much to be gleaned from the early writings of the movement and from the scientific establishment. In the United States, there were two galvanizing points to the movement: the release of The Origin of Species and the Scopes Monkey Trial. After those two points, creationists disappeared from the public square until the 1960s. At the height of the Cold War, science once again dominated the public arena. Having retreated to their own institutions, creationists reemerged with new strategies that continue to guide the movement today.

The Origin of Species

As science began to grow in prominence in the late 1800s, people in the United States began looking for other explanations beyond religion for the origins of the world. Prior to the Civil War in the United States, religion and science lived in relative harmony with one another, and the scientific community paid little attention to the Creation story. But, in a very short period of time, one man changed all of that: Charles Darwin.

In 1859, Charles Darwin published The Origin of Species by means of natural selection or The Preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life. In it, he posited the theory of evolution through natural selection, “from so simple a beginning endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been, and are being, evolved.”41 Darwin was a naturalist and in his concluding chapter suggested that his theory could bring a paradigm shift to the scientific community: “When the views entertained in this volume

on the origin of species, or when analogous views are generally admitted, we can dimly foresee that there will be a considerable revolution in natural history."\(^{42}\)

Prior to the publication of *Origin of Species*, America’s institutions of higher learning were often still religiously affiliated and filled with clergy as professors. Harvard, Yale, and Princeton were all originally founded as seminaries. In many U.S. universities and colleges, approximately one third of the professors were clergy and about a third of the students went on to the ranks of professional ministry.\(^{43}\)

Darwin’s work came into this blend of church, science, and scholarship. In about a decade, the theory of evolution became the scientific standard across America’s top institutions of higher learning. Harvard professor Louis Agassiz, who was America’s most famous and influential scientist, was against the theory of evolution, in large part because of his Christian beliefs. His fame and influence provided the perfect cover in the early debates on the matter for scientists who supported the idea of Creationism over evolution.\(^{44}\) But even he conceded at the end of his life that the battle in the scientific community was coming to an end. “Just before his death in 1873, even Louis Agassiz (1807-1873), the archcritic of developmental theories, conceded that the idea of organic development had won ‘universal acceptance.’”\(^{45}\)

\(^{42}\) Darwin, *Origin of Species*, 417.


\(^{45}\) Ibid.
In 1879, the weekly magazine the *Independent* challenged its rival weekly to find “three working naturalists of repute”\(^{46}\) who were not evolutionists. Only two could be found, and one was in Canada. JS Lippincott, writing in *The American Naturalist* in 1880 on “The Critics of Evolution,” wrote that the vast majority of U.S. universities taught evolution at the time. Lippincott pointed to Harvard’s science faculty and cited Johns Hopkins as the best in the country in the field, then added, “At Yale, Michigan University, Brown, Cornell, Dartmouth, Bowdoin, Princeton, the biological professors are all in the same category.”\(^{47}\) It is interesting to note he lists the names of professors at Harvard and points out that each man is also said to be a theist.\(^{48}\) He is pointing directly to a notion of theistic evolution, which has since fallen out of favor with many scientists.

From a scientific standpoint, the matter was all but settled. In the January 1880 edition of *Popular Science Monthly*, Professor O.C. Marsh from Yale University wrote, “It is now regarded, among the active workers in science, as a waste of time to discuss the truth of evolution. The battle at this point has been fought and won.”\(^{49}\)

While the scientific community began to embrace Darwin’s theory, it was still possible to believe in the account of Genesis and be a well-regarded scientist. Many scientists subscribed to the day-age theory of Creationism or some hybrid of Theistic
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Evolution. Day-age theory of Creationism is the belief that the days of Creation could have been thousands or millions of years. This theory is also referred to as Old Earth Creationism. By contrast, Theistic Evolution is the belief that God created the world and used evolution as the process of development. G. Fredrick Wright, a professor from Oberlin Theological College, suggested that God forming Adam from the dirt could have been a veiled reference to evolution in the Bible. He could be called a Christian Darwinist, and one of the first. Numbers points out that one group who did not make an impression at the time was Young Earth Creationists:

To find a creationist who insisted on the recent appearance of all living things in six literal days, who doubted the evidence of progression in the fossil record, and who attributed geological significance to the biblical deluge, one has to look far beyond the mainstream of scientific thought.\textsuperscript{50}

While the scientific community, including the Christians who counted themselves as part of it, embraced Darwin’s theory, religious leaders loudly decried it.

The theological debate between Christians about Creation was very much one of temporal implications. Regardless of where someone stood on the interpretations of Genesis, be it an old earth or new earth interpretation, eternal matters were not at stake. As a result, there was certain civility in the debate between Christians on creationism. George McCready Price wrote, “No charges of heresy or of unbelief should be hurled by

\textsuperscript{50} Numbers, The Creationists, 11.
any one against those on the other side. Personally, I do not know of any clear statements of Scripture which positively settle the matter either one way or the other.”

By the late 19th century, many of American church leaders came out against the theory of evolution. According to Gaustad and Schmidt, on the Roman Catholic side, James Cardinal Gibbons said evolution was a false science, “for between true science and religion no conflict is possible.” T. DeWitt Talmage, who was a popular pastor from Brooklyn, New York, said evolution was “atheistic and absurd.” One of the strongest and most popular critics of evolution was revivalist Billy Sunday. Sunday had a huge following through his revivals and he had an uncanny ability to whip up a crowd.

Within the Christian community, there were pastors and authors who sought to reconcile science and religion. The debate was playing out all the more on Christian campuses as well. In 1919, Charles Blanchard, the president of Wheaton College, the standard bearer of evangelical higher learning, put out a questionnaire to his fellow Midwestern college presidents about how they handled evolution, and fifty-three responded. Thirty-nine responded that they taught evolution (though they often identified it as theistic). Ten gave ambiguous responses. Four claimed to be strict Creationists.


53 Ibid., 303.

54 Numbers, The Creatonists, 40.
In the survey the definition of strict Creationists did not necessarily mean they adhered to a young earth interpretation of Creation, as it made no distinction between Old Earth and Young Earth Creationism. Prior to the 1960s, few American Christians believed in “such restrictive views of earth history.”55 And as Numbers points out, those who did express an opinion on the age of the earth tended to express a view more compatible with the science of the day: “Most creationists who expressed themselves on the subject embraced the interpretations of the book of Genesis that allowed them to accept the evidence of historical geology for the antiquity of life.”56

As the momentum of evolution was steadily rising on the collegiate level, by the 1920s a full-scale war was raging on the primary and secondary levels of public schools. Tennessee, Mississippi, and Arkansas all banned teaching evolution in schools in the 1920s. Leading the charge was three-time Democratic nominee for president William Jennings Bryan. Bryan was a brilliant politician and orator. He served as Woodrow Wilson’s Secretary of State, a position he resigned because as a pacifist he disagreed with the nation’s march to World War I. He became a hero for a movement that was starting to be seen as anti-intellectual.57 His involvement brought intellectual clout to the movement.

55 Numbers, from the series introduction to Creationism in Twentieth-Century America, vii.
56 Ibid.
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Bryan was a Christian and as a politician fought for the underprivileged, the poor, and those marginalized by society. He was dubbed “the Great Commoner.” He blamed World War I and the massive loss of life on the teachings of evolution, because he said evolution de-valued life. For him, the opposition to evolution was not only religious in nature but also moral. In 1922, he spoke of a push to ban the teaching of evolution in all public schools saying, “The movement will sweep the country and will drive Darwinism from our schools.” The movement did come, but perhaps not in the way Bryan and his compatriots would have preferred.

**The Scopes Monkey Trial**

In 1925, the Tennessee state legislators banned the teaching of evolution with the Butler Act. It made it a misdemeanor “to teach any theory that denies the story of the Divine Creation of man as taught in the Bible, and to teach instead that man had descended from a lower order of animal.” The bill was signed into law by Governor Austin Peay and led to what would be called “the trial of the century.”

In short order, the American Civil Liberties Union set out to challenge the law in the courts. They searched for a test case and a teacher in Tennessee who had violated the act. What they found was a sleepy southern town eager for publicity in Dayton, Tennessee. After the ACLU posted an advertisement in the Tennessee papers looking for

---
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They brought into the drug store John T. Scopes, a 24-year-old teacher at the local high school and part-time football coach. Ironically, Scopes was not even the full time biology teacher, but had only been filling in. He used a state-issued textbook for his lessons, and the book included portions on evolution. Scopes agreed to be the defendant for the test case for the ACLU and was then charged by local prosecutors with violating the Butler Act. A speedy indictment paved the way for a hot summer jury trial.

If the businessmen were after publicity for the town, they got it with what was dubbed the Scopes Monkey Trial, a reference to the evolutionary theory that man descended from primates. It was not viewed simply as a local misdemeanor case, but rather as the grand spectacle of creation vs. evolution. Gaustad and Schmidt point out that in the course of America’s religious history the trial was a turning point: “For so many the question was not state law but the authority of the Bible and the authority, thereby, of the churches not just in Tennessee but across the nation.”62 William Jennings Bryan signed on to assist the prosecution, and famed criminal defense attorney Clarence Darrow joined with the ACLU to defend Scopes as the lead attorney. Members of the national media descended on the tiny town and the trial of the century was on.

Bryan arrived early to town in the heat of July with a white sun helmet as the trial began. He gave a speech at the Dayton Progressive Club at a banquet held in his honor.

61 Ibid., 55.

and said, “The contest between evolution and Christianity is a duel to the death.”63 Prior to his departure for Dayton, Darrow put the matter in stark terms as well: “Scopes is not on trial. Civilization is on trial.”64

The trial began on July 10, 1925, commanding front-page stories in newspapers across the country. One of the most famous journalists in the country, H. L. Mencken, covered the trial for The Baltimore Evening Sun and proclaimed the trial was a religious orgy. “[I]t is a sober fact that a sound Episcopalian or even a Northern Methodist would be regarded as virtually an atheist in Dayton.”65 Mencken introduced his audience to the idea that this was a battle not just between believers and non-believers, but also between believers and other believers. As Bryan, Darrow, and Scopes arrived at the courthouse, they were photographed for newspapers and filmed for newsreels. When Bryan entered the courtroom, the spectators broke into cheers. Religious signs could be seen in photographs near the courthouse. “Read your Bible!” exclaimed one. “Sweethearts, come to Jesus” another. There was a carnival-like atmosphere to the trial. Shopkeepers hung pictures of apes and monkeys drinking sodas in their windows. Mencken wrote that the pastors in town were ready to tackle Scopes and save him once the trial was ended.66

The trial took just twelve days. Experts debated whether evolution was compatible with Christianity and whether Scopes had violated the law. The trial was

63 Larson, Summer for the Gods, 143.
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broadcast live on the radio, over WGN out of Chicago, the first time that such an event had been broadcast. The biggest highlight was when the prosecution called Bryan to the stand as expert witness on the Bible. After a debate on whether or not it was legal to do so, Bryan consented, saying in testimony, “They did not come here to try this case,…they came here to try revealed religion. I am here to defend it, they can ask me any question they please.” 67 By this point, the heat had forced the trial outside and the crowd swelled to nearly 3,000 people eager to see the grand spectacle of Bryan and Darrow going toe to toe. The New York Times reported boys from the town walked through the crowd selling soda pop like at a ballgame.68

For two hours Bryan and Darrow went back and forth. “Do you claim that everything in the Bible should be literally interpreted?” 69 Darrow asked early on. “I believe everything in the Bible should be accepted as it is given there,”70 Bryan responded, making an exception for illustrative passages. The topics ranged from the miraculous to the mundane aspects of the Bible. The court transcript records that after Bryan’s answers there was often laughter and applause as the two matched wits. The testimony shifted to the Flood and the Creation stories, specifically the dating of the earth using Ussher’s calculations. Darrow handed Bryan a Bible that listed the calculations in

67 Larson, Summer for the Gods, 5.
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the notes, likely a Scofield Reference Bible. Bryan expressed belief in the flood calculation by Ussher.

As the examination of Bryan continued, Darrow asked a wide range of questions pointing to other civilizations and societies in existence during the time of the flood calculation. The questions continued to back Bryan into a corner. Darrow then asked about Ussher’s calculation that the earth was created in 4004 BC and made reference to the Scofield Bible as printing that as the date of creation. Bryan responded by saying he thought the earth was much older. Darrow asked pointedly, “Do you think the earth was made in six days?”71 Bryan responded, “Not in six days of twenty-four hours.”72

From there the examination quickly devolved into what amounted to a shouting match, with Bryan insisting he was defending all believers against the atheistic advances of Darrow, and Darrow insisting he was protecting science from small minded religious bigots. Eventually the judge ended the questioning and the next day threw out the testimony as irrelevant to the case. While it may not have been pertinent to the case against Scopes, the testimony and questioning achieved its specific purpose. Darrow came across as erudite and deft, whereas Bryan came across as simplistic and rigid. The two men each represented their respective ideological camps and the testimony shaped how Creationism and evolution would be viewed for decades to come.73

71 Mencken, Religious Orgy, 190.
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In the end, Scopes was convicted and fined. On appeal, the case never made it as high as the ACLU had hoped, stopping well short of the Supreme Court. Though it scored a victory for the prosecution in the court, the Creationism movement was dealt a crushing blow in the public square. They were now viewed across the country as narrow minded, anti-science and ignorant.

**After Scopes**

In the movie based on the trial, *Inherit the Wind*, Bryan died in the courtroom as the trial ended. In reality, Bryan died in Dayton, four days after the trial had ended. His passing brought an official notice from the White House, and President Calvin Coolidge ordered flags in Washington to be flown at half-staff on the day of his funeral to honor his passing. With his death, one of the great orators for the Creationism movement fell silent, and after the Scopes Monkey Trial, Creationists retreated from the public square for decades. But it was not surrender for the Creationist’s movement, rather a time to retreat and prepare for the next phase. Numbers points out:

> ...they turned their energies toward developing a separate institutional base from which to evangelize the world: radio ministries, colleges, and the all-important Bible institutes, the greatest of which was the Moody Bible Institute of Chicago.

In large numbers, Fundamentalists and conservative Protestants who made up the early Creationist movement cloistered together in their groups and developed new strategies.
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Protestant denominations split over the Creationism debate following the trial. “Some formed separate denominations; others stayed in existing denominations but developed networks of parachurch organizations outside denominational control.”

More and more creationists retreated from secular society and academia and created their own systems of education and religious expression, apart from what they viewed as the scourge of modernism and with it the threat of evolution.

Once they were safely cloistered in their colleges and associations, a new science began to emerge, Creation Science. It arose after the humiliating defeat in the public eye following Scopes, where across the country they were viewed as firmly and willfully anti-intellectual. Now instead of arguing the Creation story was true only because it was the revealed word of God, Creationists begin to form scientific societies and peer reviewed journals to prove their theories on the basis of science as well. But, their methods and practices of banding together in their own communities took them even farther from the scientific mainstream.

During this timeframe of scientific examination of Creationism, the age of the earth started to matter much more to Creationists. One of the key components to the theory of evolution is the conviction that the process of evolution took place over the course of millions of years. More and more after the Scopes trial, the argument for a
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young earth emerged. In a 1937 pamphlet titled “The Creationists” written by Dudley Joseph Whitney, the secretary-treasurer of The Religion and Science Association, three divergent views on the age of the earth were explored showing the argument was in full swing a decade after Scopes:

Members will recall a request by the secretary for the views of the nature of the creation of the earth as given in the first chapter of Genesis. Three ways to take this account were mentioned: 1. The six periods of Creation Week were geological ages. 2. They were literal days of an original ordering of the earth and the fossils came from the Flood. 3. They were literal days of the recording [sic] of a ruined earth. 78

Whitney noted in his pamphlet the group was beginning to lean more towards a YEC interpretation: “A clear majority of members reporting stated that they believed that the periods of creation were literal days and that the fossils came from the Flood.” 79 The Religion and Science Association appears to be the first Creation scientific society in the U.S.

It had many different viewpoints on creation, though, and imploded a short time after it began. The outcome was the formation of the Deluge Geology Society founded by George McCready Price, who was a Seventh-day Adventist and a strict Biblical literalist. Their creed read:

…the founders of this professedly nonsectarian organization limited membership to persons who believed that the week of creation lasted no more than ‘six literal
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days, and that the Deluge should be studied as the cause of the major geological changes since creation.\textsuperscript{80}

It was a divisive line from a scientific standpoint and was a way to limit opposing views on Creation.

This movement was largely filled with Protestants at the time. Numbers suggests that part of the literal interpretation of Genesis at this point stemmed from an “ultra-Protestant” desire for individual interpretation versus the Orthodox and Catholic interpretation that comes from a centralized body of clergy.

The emphasis on six literal days for Creation was also a departure from Bryan and many likeminded Creationists during the early part of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. The one-time hero of the Creation movement did not believe in a biblical construct of six literal 24-hour periods for creation, as he testified in the Scopes trial. His subscribed to belief in the Day-Age theory, that each day mentioned in Genesis could have been metaphorical and been thousands or millions of years in actuality. That theory drew the ire of Price. Writing in the October 1942 issue of \textit{The Bulletin of Deluge Geology and Related Sciences}, Price attacked Bryan:

[Bryan] committed himself to the day-period theory of interpreting Genesis, and needlessly allowed himself to be cross-examined by Darrow, in which he conceded the entire geological argument to the evolutionists, with the pitiful results known to all the world. No wonder he died a sad and disappointed man. But he is a good example of the outcome of every form of argument which does not take the record of Genesis at its full face value.\textsuperscript{81}

\textsuperscript{80} Numbers, \textit{The Creationists}, 118.

\textsuperscript{81} Numbers, \textit{The Creationists}, no. 2, 280-1.
Price went on to call the Scopes trial “a turning point in the intellectual and religious history of mankind.” Price would later write that Bryan invited him to testify at the Scopes trial, but he declined because he was under contract for a debate in London.

Price’s tone is important to note, as it marks two shifts in the debate. While Bryan and Darrow could disagree vehemently, the two could share a meal and be civil to one another. With the debate cloistered internally among creationists, the language and civility began to sour. Price was beginning to erode that civility and, in essence, declaring war, not just on evolutionists, but on other Christians who did not share the same view he did.

One of the main opposing theories to early Young Earth Creationism to emerge was the theory of theistic evolution. Theistic evolution sought to reconcile faith and science and suggested that God used evolution as His creative formula. The Catholic Church’s position on evolution was coming into view in the late 1940s and moving more towards a theistic evolution position. On August 12, 1950, Pope Pius XII formally clarified the church’s position on evolution in his encyclical *Humani Generis*. He carefully noted the church did not forbid the “research and discussion” of evolution. While he was clear in his encyclical that parts of evolution were contradictory to church
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doctrine and that the soul was purely the creation of God, he opened the door for the church to fully embrace a position of theistic evolution. Over the next few decades, many mainline Protestant denominations also followed suit and embraced theistic evolution. Conversely, in the same time period, many conservative Protestant denominations rejected theistic evolution and embraced Creationism.85

The YECs’ objection to theistic evolution was rooted in their understanding of the Fall. J. F. Huenergardt, a Seventh-day Adventist minister, wrote his objections in The Forum for the Correlation of Science and the Bible, a magazine/journal many creationists contributed to in the 1940s. He noted that Creation and the Fall are important for Christians because the purpose of Jesus was to bring redemption from the Fall. “The consistent evolutionist cannot accept a fall. For him man is on the upgrade.”86 If man is on the upgrade, his argument continued, he needs no salvation and no Jesus. He continued and expanded his criticism toward Rome. “Let us be frank, no man can believe in the word of God and also believe in Evolution. They are mutually exclusive. It is impossible to straddle the question, as the Roman Catholic Church attempts to do.”87
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Cold War Creationists

While the YEC movement remained largely underground and cloistered in their own groups, there was a “defacto truce” within the broader scientific community, Eve and Harrold noted. This truce remained intact from the 1930s, following the Scopes trial, until the early 1960s. The truce was largely the result of the withdrawal from the public square by Creationists. But things began to change during the Cold War. The Russian launch of the Sputnik satellite led to a building up of the United States’ study of science. If publishers had diluted the teaching of evolution in biology textbooks to sell books in the Bible Belt, as Numbers and others suggest, that quickly changed after the Russian satellite took flight. Shortly after Sputnik, the National Science Foundation created a new science curriculum that brought a biology curriculum with evolution to the forefront.

The return to an emphasis on science in the public school system led to several changes in the Creationist movement and the broader religious community in the United States. One result of the new movement in the public schools to teach evolution could be the rise of private Christian schools and Christian textbook publishers. The movement to teach evolution came at the same time the Supreme Court was refining the establishment clause in the constitution. In the 1962 case, *Engle v. Vitale*, the court banned mandatory
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prayer in schools and in the 1963 case *District of Abington Township vs. Schempp*, the court banned public recitation of the Bible and the Lord’s Prayer.

In *Effective Christian School Management* published by Bob Jones University Press, the authors suggest, in part because of the court and other movements in society, Christian teachers withdrew from public schools, and humanistic or atheistic teachers became bolder and more vocal. This, they argue, led to major problems in public schools. “Christian parents became concerned about the teaching of evolution, the increased availability of illegal drugs, sexual promiscuity, vandalism, violence, and a general breakdown of order in schools.”90 As a result, the authors claim, it led to the rise of private Christian schools and a need to provide them with Christian based textbooks, a gap that was filled in part by Bob Jones University, which was and still is firmly in the Young Earth Creationism movement.

The teaching of evolution was clearly seen as the new enemy in the 1960s and has continued to frustrate the Creationism movement as evolution further cemented its position in the scientific establishment. The main reason it was seen as the enemy, Eugenie Scott wrote, “Conservative Christians who are strongly literalist in their views fear that if their children learn evolution, they will cease to believe in God. Without God to guide them, children will grow up to be bad people.”91 How deeply they feared this


was motivated in part by Creationists like Henry Morris, who in 1963 wrote, “Evolution is at the foundation of communism, fascism, Freudianism, social darwinism, behaviorism, Kineseyism, materialism, atheism, and in the religious world, modernism and neo-orthodoxy.”92

**Creationists Today**

The clear alternative to the teaching of evolution became a strict literalist interpretation of Genesis. From the late 1960s through the 1980s, the debate focused on public schools and Creationism vs. Evolution. As a result, Young Earth proponents began to grow and framed their argument as *either/or*. Eve and Harrold stated, “Strict-creationist writers generally either assume or state that one must be *either* an atheistic evolutionist *or* a biblical-literalist Christian.”93 Any remaining civility in the debate between the two camps gradually eroded in this period as well. “Proponents of both viewpoints have grown increasingly vocal and vehement in their assertions that their opponents are at least deluded, if not downright malicious.”94 Young Earth Creationists, like Ken Ham, insisted that the very soul of the nation was at stake. When he was working with the Institute for Creation Research as a fulltime speaker, the Australian native said:
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If humanistic educators in the State’s schools and colleges can gain control of the minds of young people and train them to reject God as Creator, a totally pagan culture will result. All Christians need to know the tactics being employed to accomplish this, so they can fight the battle.\textsuperscript{95}

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s the Creationism movement, in particular the Young Earth movement, focused its attention on the lay public versus the scientific establishment. By 1984, authors connected to the Institute for Creation Research, a YEC think tank, had sold a total of 1 million books.\textsuperscript{96} While they failed to remove evolution in the scientific curriculum presented to students, they shifted their emphasis to a doctrine of fairness. Instead of a winner take all notion that had been the argument prior to this one, they said Creationism ought to be taught in schools \textit{as well} as evolution in science classes. This tactic of fairness played well in the public square.

Creationists advanced the idea that evolution was merely a scientific theory and that the theory of Creation science was on par with it. On the state level, many legislatures in the South pushed an equal treatment laws with Creationism as an alternative to evolution.

In 1982, a district court judge in Arkansas struck down a law titled, “Balanced Treatment for Creation-Science and Evolution-Science Act.” The judge said the law promoted a sectarian point of view and violated the establishment clause of the constitution. The Supreme Court looked at another “balanced treatment” law in Arkansas and struck it down as well. Then, in 1987, the high court took \textit{Edwards v. Aguillard}, a
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case that looked at a balanced treatment law in Louisiana. The court ruled the law was paramount to advancing a specific religious doctrine.\textsuperscript{97} While the matter seemed to be settled in the public school arena from a legal standpoint, the public square seemed to move in a different direction.

Creationists had retreated and refined their message in the time since the Scopes trial. They argued Creation science was scientific, they argued evolution was flawed, and they polished their argument, skillfully presenting it. An argument that half a century ago was laughed out of the public square, was now succeeding, in large part, because of “Americans’ sense of fair play; their growing mistrust of the scientific establishment; and their generally poor understanding of science.”\textsuperscript{98} While they may have lost in the science classrooms and the courts, Creationists, and in particular Young Earth Creationists, began to win in the court of public opinion.

The Gallup Organization began to measure the public opinion on the topic of evolution and Creationism in 1982. The questioners posed the query to respondents in terms of a broad Young Earth Creationism, strict evolution, and theistic evolution. In the 1982 survey, 9\% said humans evolved but God had no part in it; 38\% said humans
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evolved, with God guiding and 44% said God created humans in present form at one time within the last 10,000 years or so.99

For the past thirty years, the numbers have remained fairly consistent, though there has been a slight decline in the number of people who associate with Creationism, and the percentage of people who believe in a strict evolution has nearly doubled. In the December 2010 survey, Gallup asked the same set of questions. Forty percent of respondents said they believed God created humans in present form at one time within the last 10,000 years or so, 38% believed in the equivalent of theistic evolution, and 16% believed in strict construct of evolution.100 At two points in the history of the survey, in 1993 and 1999, the Young Earth Creation percentage reached 47% of respondents.101 Frank Newport from Gallup noted in the most recent 2010 survey, that education and religiosity were major factors in how people viewed the topic, “Those who are less educated are more likely to hold a creationist view. Those with college degrees and postgraduate education are more likely to hold one of the two viewpoints involving evolution.”102 Their survey showed 37% of respondents who agreed with the YEC question on origins held at least a college degree and 22% of those respondents held post
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graduate degrees. He also noted the survey found a split among weekly churchgoers that mirrors the denominational split on the topic as well. The 2010 survey was based on telephone interviews with 1,019 adults and had a margin of sampling error of +/- 4 percent. With that margin of error taken into consideration there is virtually no shift in the prevalence of people who believe in YEC.

The Gallup survey questioners in August 2005 also asked what should be taught in public schools when it comes to origins from the standpoint of evolution, Creationism, and Intelligent Design, the notion the world is too complex to have happened by accident but the theory falls short of saying there was direct theistic involvement. Sixty-one percent said evolution should be taught compared to 20% who said it should not and 19% who said they were unsure. Fifty-four percent said Creationism should be taught in school, 22% said it should not, and 23% said they were unsure. On Intelligent Design, 43% said it should be taught in schools, 21% said it should not, and 35% said they were unsure.103 These numbers attest to the fact that YEC strategies of fairness are in large part effective with the general public. The majority of respondents seemed willing to have both Creationism and Evolution taught side by side in public schools.104

Other recent surveys of the public and clergy by the Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, the Public Religion and Research Institute, and Lifeway Research have


104 Ibid
shown similar breakdowns in the population when it comes to evolution, Creationism, and Young Earth Creationism. While their questions on the topic vary, Young Earth Creationism continues to be extraordinarily popular with Protestant pastors and the lay public.

It is also interesting to note that Young Earth Creationism is uniquely Western in its appeal, and even more specifically, largely an American phenomenon. Eve and Harrold suggested this is in large part due to its strains of Protestantism and “commonsense” philosophy, “it can be found elsewhere in the world, but it is most visible as a potent social and political force in the United States.”

Philip Jenkins, a professor of History and Religious Studies at Pennsylvania State University who studies the global movement of Christianity, writes that while Christianity is booming in the global South, Creationism is not. Jenkins classifies the global South as Africa, Asia, and Latin America. While in the U.S., Creationism, which he notes is used as an “acid test for religious loyalties,” is sometimes viewed as an entanglement of theologies between fundamentalists and evangelicals, the notion is virtually nonexistent in the global South:

While Creationist beliefs are widely held, members of many large and influential churches, including Catholics and Anglicans, are quite at liberty to believe in the

---

105 Eve and Harrold, introduction to The Creationist Movement, xi.
principle of evolution, however literalist they might be on other biblical matters.\textsuperscript{106}

One of the main reasons Jenkins points to the limited importance of the debate, in addition to the prominence of Catholic and Anglican theologies which tend to lean more towards theistic evolution, is because evolution plays little role in education in the global South.

Into this history of Genesis interpretation and rise of Creationism it becomes clearer to see how Young Earth Creationism develops theologically and organizationally.

\textsuperscript{106} Philip Jenkins, \textit{The New Faces of Christianity: Believing the Bible in the Global South} (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 11-12.
CHAPTER III
CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF PRIMARY SOURCE MATERIAL

At the heart of the YEC movement is a deeply held belief that the Bible is the infallible and inerrant word of God. For them, it is an unshakable truth that informs their worldview and consequently their view of science. The Bible, and in particular the first eleven chapters of Genesis, are in essence their absolute zero. It is the mark by which they measure science and their faith. This chapter will explore several types of primary sources describing how Young Earth Creationists communicate their message. While the movement is vast and varied, here the focus is on the two largest guideposts: the book *The Genesis Flood* and the expansive ministry of Answers in Genesis, ranging from their books to the Creation Museum.

*The Genesis Flood* is largely credited with the being the start of the modern YEC movement. In it, the authors seek to put scientific validation to the Genesis narrative of the Flood. As a result of the book, Creationism groups like the Institute for Creation Research (ICR) emerge. Still in operation today, ICR tours the country and publishes books and magazines, touting the scientific merits of YEC.

The ICR is also important to the development of Ken Ham. If there were a titular head or papacy of YEC in the United States, Ham would hold the seat. Ham is the president of Answers in Genesis (AIG), the biggest YEC group in the country. Several methods they use to spread their message are through books, through multimedia like DVDs and their website, and the Creation Museum. The Creation Museum in
Petersburg, Kentucky serves as a living monument to the movement. The museum regularly hosts conferences where the message and theology of the movement are spread.

The movement of YEC has also brought about a cottage industry of criticism of the movement among evangelical publishers. One popular title in particular, *The Bible, Rocks, and Time: Geological Evidence for the Age of the Earth*, explores how other Christian groups view YEC as a threat to the Christian witness of those who do not hold YEC views.

*The Genesis Flood*

*The Genesis Flood* is widely recognized as the most important Young Earth Creation publication to date. When it was first published in 1961, the authors sought to harmonize the emerging YEC movement with science by reexamining the scientific evidence surrounding the Flood and the story of Noah’s Ark through the framework of scripture. The book is widely cited in YEC books and literature. It is required reading for those who follow YEC. Since its first printing in 1961, there have been fifty total printings and the book has sold nearly 300,000 copies, all this despite lukewarm reception by the broader Christian community and a flat out rejection by the scientific community. ¹

John C. Whitcomb and Henry M. Morris authored the text. Whitcomb taught Old Testament at Grace Theological Seminary and was responsible for the theological framework for the text. Morris, a civil engineer, wrote much of the book while heading

¹ Marvin Padgett, e-mail message to author, February 6, 2012, regarding Presbyterian and Reform Publishing Company sales figures for *The Genesis Flood*.  
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the civil-engineering program at Virginia Polytechnic Institute. He was responsible for much of the scientific framework in the book.

Initially, Moody Press agreed to publish the book, but backed out after the manuscript continued to grow in length and the authors had a hard time finding accredited geologists to validate their conclusions. So, Morris and Whitcomb moved to Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company and published their work in 1961.²

In the forward to the book, John C. McCampbell, the head of the Department of Geology at the University of Southwestern Louisiana in Lafayette, Louisiana, wrote that readers of the book should approach the pro and con arguments, “willing to make a careful and open-minded study.”³ He continues, “whether one prefers the Biblical framework or that of modern historical geology,”⁴ the reader should diligently consider both sides. McCampbell frames this approach as a matter of fairness. In doing so, he is putting the historical approach to geology and the one presented in the text on equal footing, saying both are worthy of careful study.

The book is written in scientific language but is clearly aimed at the layman versus the scientist. The goal was to prove that the Flood narrative in the book of Genesis is the best explanation for the geological record and therefore shows that the earth is young. In their introduction, the authors write about a plain reading of Genesis

² Numbers, *The Creationists*, 222.


⁴ Ibid., xvii.
and the importance of the Flood story to Christian theology. They also acknowledge their approach will be castigated because they will be using the same data others use, but reexamined through a biblical framework. “Our conclusions must unavoidably be colored by our Biblical presuppositions, and this we plainly acknowledge.”\(^5\) They continue to say their critics will similarly view the objections to their scientific interpretations through the lens of religion. “We believe that most of the difficulties associated with the Biblical record of the Flood are basically religious, rather than scientific.”\(^6\)

Morris and Whitcomb begin by examining the Flood account in Genesis and drawing an if/then analysis from a plain reading of scripture. They argue, if the mountains were covered as the Bible says, then the flood was global and had be at a depth of at least the height of the tallest mountains. They continue, if the ark was as big as recorded, then the flood must be global rather than local because the ark was so large. If there are human fossils all across the globe then it supports the biblical narrative it was a global flood for the purpose of destroying humanity, except for Noah and his family. They are putting scientific details into the relatively sparse flood narrative. Their book is nearly 500 pages, while the Noah narrative in Genesis 6-9 is just four chapters.

They also seek to address some of the contrarian viewpoints. When others point to similar Mesopotamian flood narratives as proof of the Noachian flood, they brush them off as circumstantial. When critics suggest a family of eight could not possibly care for a

\(^{5}\) Morris and Whitcomb, in the introduction to *The Genesis Flood*, xxi.

\(^{6}\) Ibid., xxii.
pair of every kind of land and flying animal in the world for a year, they point to the possibility of a divine hibernation and cite the danger in “removing every supernatural element” from the story.\(^7\) When critics say the ark was too small for all the animals, they reverse engineer animal groups into smaller and smaller families, or “kinds” as the Bible calls them, and suggest the number of young healthy adolescent animals would be smaller in number and in physical size. They even suggest young dinosaurs could have been on the ark but likely died out because of hostile post-flood conditions.\(^8\) To this point in the text, the authors are dealing in extrapolation of the text and challenging other arguments that do the same.

The most significant aspect of the book is their challenge to modern geology. In their step-by-step treatise against modern geology, they consistently come back to their biblical framework. They say acceptance of geology is easier for non-Christians: “But the instructed Christian knows that the evidences for full divine inspiration of Scripture are far weightier than the evidences for any fact of science.”\(^9\) Because of their plain reading of scripture and literal interpretation of Creation as six, literal, 24-hour periods and a global flood, the age of the earth must only be approximately six thousand years old. Modern geology shows the earth is much older, and therefore Morris and Whitcomb must dispel it.

\(^7\) Morris and Whitcomb, *The Genesis Flood*, 64.

\(^8\) Ibid., 60.

\(^9\) Ibid., 118.
The authors dutifully make their case citing geologists and scientists, reexamining their data through a Biblical lens. When they do this, fossils buried deep in sediment are the result of a global flood that stirred up the earth and deposited complex layers, instead of a process of millions of years as geology suggests. Erosion, sedimentation, glaciation, and volcanism have not changed in principle and thus point back to evidence of a catastrophic global flood as a better explanation. The Grand Canyon was not slowly carved over millions of years but rather quickly, as a result of the yearlong global deluge. According to the authors, disagreements in the geological community on dating are proof the process is fatally flawed:

In the light of such frequent flagrant contradictions to the established geologic time sequences…the writers feel warranted in contending that the data of geology do not provide valid evidence against the historicity of the universal Deluge as recorded in the book of Genesis. It is thus legitimate to attempt a new interpretation of these data which will be in harmony with the Biblical account of Creation and the Flood.\(^{10}\)

From this conclusion, they go on to reimage the geological record through their Biblical framework.

Morris and Whitcomb are heroes to the movement because they made science fit the Biblical record, instead of trying to make the Biblical record fit the scientific one. By holding to a plain literal interpretation, they enhanced the emerging field of Creation science. Adherents could still hold to the absolute authority of the Bible, the authorship of Moses, and a plain interpretation, and have a “scientific” footing to stand on. They addressed issues like whether God created things with the appearance of age and how

\(^{10}\) Morris and Whitcomb, *The Genesis Flood*, 209.
evolution falls apart when there are not millions of years for things to change. They did it all with copious footnotes from respected scientific sources; however, those citations were later criticized by many of the scientists whose work they cited, who said it was used out of context.

Morris and Whitcomb also sought to build a movement of study in this area. They wrote they expected their work would be continued by others because the Bible provides “considerable latitude of opinion about the details,” by only giving a basic outline of the history of the earth. Their hope was that if they could make a solid argument based on fairness and open-mindedness, then people could be convinced to reexamine the Bible text and science.

If there was any thought this book was just a cold scientific argument, that notion is dispelled at the book’s conclusion. This is a text intended to win converts, not just to a scientific viewpoint, but also to a religious one. Their argument is as much theological as geological. “And as we have seen, the evidence of the reality of these great events, the Creation and the Deluge, is so powerful and clear that it is only ‘willing ignorance’ which is blind to it, according to Scripture!” From there, the authors say these events are a clear message of the truth of the Bible and the need for man to repent and be saved. They quote John 3:16 and verses in 2 Peter, that amount to a firm admonition to Christians that their arguments are integral to the Biblical plan of salvation and an altar call to non-believers, to heed their evidence and change their ways.


12 Ibid., 453.
YECs hailed the reception of the book while other Christians did not. It brought academic weight back to the YEC argument and energized the field of Creation science. “Strict creationists praised it for making biblical catastrophism intellectually respectable again to some Christians, while progressive creationists and theistic evolutionists denounced it as a travesty on geology that threatened to return Christian science to the Dark Ages.” The book turned Morris and Whitcomb into rock stars in conservative Christian circles. They were constantly fielding requests for speaking engagements. While they were famous in their Christian community, the book made little to no impact in secular, scientific communities. The scientific community ignored the work in total, which sent a clear message that they did not even consider the argument worthy of a rebuttal. Many Christian publications that chose to review the book said it was filled with technical errors and took others’ work out of context.

From The Genesis Flood to Answers in Genesis

In 1970, Morris parlayed the success of the book, his academic credentials, and influence into starting the Institute for Creation Research (IRC). Its purpose was to create a place for scientific exploration of Creationism, education, and communication of their positions. Still in operation today, IRC says its scientific research has led multi-year projects at the Grand Canyon, Mount St. Helens, Yosemite Valley, and the Santa Cruz River Valley in Argentina. Financial disclosure forms filed with the IRS showed the

13 Numbers, The Creationists, 229.
group brought in $8.7 million dollars in revenues in 2011, largely from contributions.\textsuperscript{14}

The group publishes curriculum for K-12 students and conservative apologetic lessons for adults. A team of speakers, including Morris, fanned out across the country for decades spreading the message of Young Earth Creationism. In 1992, IRC opened the Museum of Creation and Earth History in Southern California.

One of the most popular speakers to join the IRC was an Australian science teacher named Ken Ham. He was a public school science teacher in Queensland, Australia, and was working part time as a “creation speaker” through his church, Sunnybank Baptist, in Brisbane. Ham said he grew up bouncing between mainline churches in Australia. When his father disagreed with what he viewed as a liberal interpretation of the Bible, he pulled the family out of the church.\textsuperscript{15} In 1979, Ken Ham left his job as a teacher and co-founded Creation Science Foundation, a book and teaching ministry he ran out of his house. In 1987, Ham and his family moved to the west coast of the United States, where Ham served on loan as a speaker for the Institute for Creation Research. Seven years later, Ham and several others would go on to form Creation Science Ministries, a non-profit Christian ministry which later changed its name to Answers in Genesis (AIG).

AIG moved to Cincinnati and began plans for their own Creation museum. AIG has become the most well recognized and well-funded Young Earth Creation group in the

\textsuperscript{14} Internal Revenue Service, \textit{IRS Form 990}, Institute for Creation Research, 2010. Provided by Ministrywatch.org via email to the author.

\textsuperscript{15} Ken Ham, interview by author, Petersburg, KY, October 20, 2011.
country. Based in Petersburg, Kentucky, the group operates as a non-profit resource ministry that brought in over $22,000,000 in revenue in 2009, according to financial disclosure forms filed with the IRS. They describe their mission this way; “We proclaim the absolute truth and authority of the Bible with boldness. We relate the relevance of a literal Genesis to the church and the world today creatively. We obey God’s call to deliver the message of the Gospel, individually and collectively.” Ham is the current president of the group and the architect of much of their success.

The ministry’s crown jewel is the Creation Museum, a 70,000 square foot museum dedicated to a strict literal interpretation of the Bible, and aimed at bringing YEC to Christians and the masses. “The Cincinnati-area location was chosen because almost 2/3 of America’s population lives within 650 miles…this strategic location was very important in determining where to be situated.” The museum cost $27 million to build in 2007, and in 2009, it cost $8.5 million to operate. In four years since opening its doors, the museum has hosted over 1.5 million visitors. By comparison, the Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History’s 2011 budget, which comes from Federal monies and a trust, was $98.8 million and the museum has 6.97 million visitors in 2010. The

16 Internal Revenue Service, *IRS Form 990, Answers in Genesis*, 2009.


Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago, Illinois, had a budget of $68 million in 2010 and had 1.26 million visitors.\(^{19}\)

Ham says, the goal of his museum and entire ministry is to equip Christians.\(^{20}\) In addition to the museum, AIG produces curriculum, books, radio spots, DVDs, and conferences to achieve their goal. The radio spots are heard on over 900 stations in the U.S. and Ham estimates he spends 30% of his time on the road speaking to over 200,000 people a year.\(^{21}\)

Ham is the group’s most popular author and editor. According to his publisher, Master Books, Ham has sold over 2.1 million copies of the twenty-four books for adults and children that he has authored or edited. In his books, he explores the theological basis for YEC, laments a generation lost to the teaching of evolution, and takes toddlers through the alphabet explaining \textit{D is for Dinosaur} and how Adam, Eve and the dinosaurs roamed the earth together as vegetarians before the Fall.

One of the most popular books from Ham is the \textit{Answers} series. The first book, \textit{The Answers Book: Answers to the 12 most-asked questions on Genesis and creation/evolution}, was co-written by Ham with Andrew Snelling and Carl Wieland. It was first published by the Creation Science Foundation in Australia in 1990, then later


\(^{20}\) Ken Ham, interview by author, Petersburg, KY, October 20, 2011.

\(^{21}\) Aubrey Peden, e-mail message to author, February 6, 2012 regarding New Leaf Publishing Group sales figures for Ken Ham.
republished in the United States by Master Books in 1991. In the book, they lay out an argument rooted in Creation science, “there has been a tremendous upsurge in the number of scientifically trained people who believe that God’s Word in Genesis reveals a totally true (though not exhaustive or detailed) outline of the origin and history of all things.”22 Their aim, like Morris and Whitcomb, is to reinforce a theological argument scientifically.

The purpose of the *Answers* book was two fold, to give believers scientific answers to their questions and to reach out to nonbelievers. The authors specifically note their commitment to science and point to Creation institutes, like ICR, to legitimize their arguments from a scientific standpoint. “This in itself refutes the common caricature that a creationist has no need for research, and simply goes to the Bible for glib answers.”23 It is an intriguing juxtaposition but one further explained. If the Bible is true, they argue, then science will bear that truth out:

> [O]ur prayer is that God will use these ‘answers’ to enable many to humbly accept God’s sacrifice of His Son, Jesus Christ, as the price for their rebellion, the reconciliation between themselves and their Creator. And that in doing so, they may cross the line from eternal death to eternal life.24

Like Morris and Whitcomb before them, the authors give a clear indication their aim is not solely scientific, but deeply rooted in a desire to share their faith.


24 Ibid., 7.
The Answers Book also explains, “What happened to the dinosaurs?” For YECs dinosaurs are problematic. History, geology and paleontology have said dinosaurs roamed the earth millions of years before humans. In the book they point to the fact that scientists have gotten things wrong about dinosaurs, in particular the reconstruction of skeletal remains and placing the wrong head on a dinosaur’s body. They also say the scientists are merely giving their opinions and coming from an evolutionary standpoint. This language is used to discredit the scientists by emphasizing the scientists’ beliefs, theories, and past mistakes. The writers turn the argument by saying, “The only way anyone could be sure of what did happen in the past, would be through the testimony of any reliable witness who was there. And that is what the book of Genesis is.”25 From there they go on to test the claims of Genesis and cite the writing of Morris and Whitcomb on the story of the Flood as an example of Genesis being reliable text.

According to a YEC interpretation of Genesis, dinosaurs, being land animals, were created by God on the same day as humans. Both would have to be in the Garden of Eden at the same time and both would have to get on Noah’s ark. To explain this, the authors note people live with dinosaurs today and they say the reptiles of today are like the extinct dinosaurs of yesterday. They say many of the families of dinosaurs were small. They point to legends of dragons and giant beasts in ancient cultures and ask,

“Were these dragons really dinosaurs?” They note if the tale of the Loch Ness monster were true it would be bane for evolutionists and a boon for creationists.

Answers in Genesis as a ministry spends a lot of time and energy looking at dinosaurs. The Creation Museum is filled with exhibits and models of dinosaurs. The gift shop has dinosaur Christmas ornaments, dinosaur puppets, and a considerable amount of dragon paraphernalia. They look to the Bible for examples of dinosaurs and to myths and legends as proof that man and dinosaurs could have roamed the earth together.

Ham often points to the book of Job and its mention of Leviathan and Behemoth. In Job 40 and 41, God and Job are having a debate. God gives a long speech asking Job, “Will you even put me in the wrong?” He tells Job to look at Behemoth and describes a giant powerful animal with a long tail like a tree. He then points to Leviathan, a violent sea creature that breathes fire. Biblical scholarship is torn on these two creatures. Some see Behemoth as representative of the hippopotamus and Leviathan as a crocodile. Others point to Leviathan as a mythical Near East chaos monster, which is also found in other Mesopotamian literature.

Ham says throughout the book of Job, God is talking about real things and real events, like snow and other animals. He questions why God, speaking to Job, would shift from speaking about real things to mythological things when referring to Leviathan and Behemoth. “I suspect the main reason is because it also talks about a fire breathing

27 Job 40:8, NRSV.
creature. People say, ‘that’s ridiculous to have fire breathing creatures.’ There are fire-breathing creature legends by the way.”28 He points to fish that can generate electricity and bugs that light up as nature’s current parallel to fire breathing creatures. For him, the literal interpretation means the author of Job recognized dinosaurs roamed the earth with people and it is not allegorical, “so why is it that we would say this is a mythical creature when God is pointing to all these real things? That doesn’t fit with the context of those passages.”29

Ham has expanded the Answers book into a franchise with The New Answers Book 1-3. The books continue to be one of the best sellers in the Ham cannon. The books question the conventional wisdom and current practices of modern science. In The New Answers Book 1, Mike Riddle writes a lengthy article refuting many methods of scientific dating used to determine the age of the Earth. He writes, “The best way to learn about history and the age of the earth is to consult the history book of the universe—the Bible. Many scientists and theologians accept a straightforward reading of Scripture and agree that the earth is about 6,000 years old.”30 Riddle is listed in the book’s “about the authors” section as a former U.S. Marine with a Bachelor of Science in mathematics and an Master of Science in Education. At best, it is an odd statement of scientific certainty coming from a source with no scientific pedigree. Many of the contributors to the book

28 Ken Ham, interview by author, Petersburg, KY, October 20, 2011.

29 Ibid.

hold neither an advanced degree in a field of science nor religion. This likely grows out the ultra-Protestant model of self-study and insistence on personal interpretation. Ham has said as much, “I’m not a scientist and I don’t consider myself a theologian. Although everyone who is a Christian should be a theologian.”

Answers in Genesis holds to a strict literal interpretation of the Bible. An examination of their statement of faith helps explain what they mean when they say:

The account of origins presented in Genesis is a simple but factual presentation of actual events and therefore provides a reliable framework for scientific research into the question of the origin and history of life, mankind, the earth and the universe…The 66 books of the Bible are the written Word of God. The Bible is divinely inspired and inerrant throughout. Its assertions are factually true in all the original autographs. It is the supreme authority in everything it teaches. Its authority is not limited to spiritual, religious, or redemptive themes but includes its assertions in such fields as history and science.

Because of this theological tradition of inerrancy, Ham and other YEC supporters strictly adhere to the notion that the Earth was created in six, 24-hour days. They say Adam was a literal man in the Garden of Eden, and he named every kind of living creature. Because they take the creation account in Genesis 1-3 at face value, they take it to mean every kind of creature that ever roamed the earth was in the garden with Adam and Eve before the fall, including dinosaurs, kangaroos, and penguins. There is an important distinction made by AIG between evolution of a species and a variety of kind. Looking at the example of the penguin in the garden helps better understand this.

31 Ken Ham, interview by author, Petersburg, KY, October 20, 2011.

While there are numerous kinds of penguins waddling around the world today from the Arctic Circle to South Africa, in their Garden theory there only needs to be one kind of penguin. From time to time, scientists have discovered different iterations of penguins. On their website, Answers in Genesis is quick to point back to their understanding of the situation seemingly anytime an article about penguin evolution comes into the public sphere.

While the old-earthers duke it out over the specifics of penguin migrations and habitat tolerances many dozens of alleged millions of years ago, we’d like to point out that, despite their differences, these giant penguins were still penguins, and show one of many possible adaptations God ‘built into’ the original created penguin kind. And another explanation when the subject of penguins was in the news again, “Both types of penguin are descended from the original pair of penguins that emerged from the Ark after the Flood. It should be no surprise that both types of penguin share a similar feather design.”

For AIG, everything hinges theologically on the Fall. Much of their supporting scientific evidence is reverse engineered around the Fall. With their literal reading of Genesis chapter 1, death does not enter the world until after the Fall. They would go so far as to say Adam, or a Tyrannosaurus Rex, did not even step on an ant. In part, they point to the death and disease in the fossil record. It is why they think men and dinosaurs roamed the earth together, despite a fossil record and an entire field of science that says
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otherwise. While some Old Earth Creationists, like Bryan, have suggested the Hebrew term for day “yom” in Genesis 1 is a symbol and could suggest a period of time, possibly as long as millions of years, that theory is resoundingly put down by AIG. Ham writes on their website:

If the days of creation are really geologic ages of millions of years, then the gospel message is undermined at its foundation because it puts death, disease, thorns, and suffering before the Fall. The effort to define ‘days’ as ‘geologic ages’ results from an erroneous approach to Scripture—reinterpreting the Word of God on the basis of the fallible theories of sinful people.35

So for AIG, dinosaurs, penguins, and man were all created on the sixth day of creation and lived in perfect harmony until the Fall and the introduction of sin, pain, and death.

For Ham, the basis for the no death before the Fall argument comes from the text of Genesis. In The New Answers Book 3, he dedicates a chapter to the question of death before Adam. Ham builds his argument based on the timeline in Genesis 1:30 when God tells Adam and Eve He has given them and every living thing, “every green herb for food.” Ham then points to the fossil record, which shows animals had eaten other animals. The argument for these fossils being millions of years old is flawed he says because, “This is contrary to the Bible’s clear teaching that animals were vegetarians originally (before sin).”36 Ham turns again to the fossil record where he said there is evidence of disease and tumors. He argues at the end of the creative process before God

35 Answers in Genesis, “Could God have really created everything in six days?” http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/nab/could-god-have-created-in-six-days (accessed on May 1, 2011).

rests He calls all of Creation good. This, Ham argues, is impossible since the Bible clearly recognizes disease and tumors as decidedly bad. “These diseases simply could not have existed before sin, if the Bible is true (and it is).”

Theologically this understanding of the Fall, sin, and death are critical for YECs. Their plain reading and high view of scripture make this an argument for salvation. If death precedes the Fall, then it changes nothing. There is no need for redemption in this idea. In their interpretation of the Bible, death is the penalty for sin, as spelled out by the Apostle Paul in Romans. If death occurs prior to the fall, then death is no longer the penalty for sin, and there is no need for Jesus to be the savior. This is why the age of the earth is paramount in this understanding of the Bible.

For AIG, if the notion of “day” is incorrect, or anything else in Genesis account does not speak to historical and scientific fact, then the rest of the Bible must be called into question. Historian Michael Roberts sums up YEC’s theological position as shoe horning their science into the Genesis text. “If T. Rex had actually attacked and killed herbivores 100 million years ago, then the whole Christian Faith will collapse like dominoes, hence the geological timescale must be false.” So, they say the geological record is false because it directly contradicts the Bible, which they say dates the earth around 6,000 years.

**The Creation Museum**

---


The Creation Museum in Petersburg, Kentucky, is a sprawling complex. In its 70,000 square feet of space there is the full museum, planetarium, restaurant, conference space and office space for AIG’s nearly 300 employees. It sits near the convergence of three states (Indiana, Kentucky and Ohio); state road signs point the way to the museum.

The museum is designed to take visitors on a tour through the first eleven chapters of Genesis, as viewed by YECs in a plain, literal interpretation. When the museum was being built, the scriptwriter for the signs and videos asked Ham if the presentation was geared to Christians or non-Christians. Ham said he responded, “We’re going to present it the way God does in the Bible. You start at the beginning and go all the way through. It’s for everyone. It doesn’t matter if you’re Christian or non-Christian. And that’s the point, it’s for everyone.”39

One of the first stops is at a mock paleontological dig complete with dinosaur bones. A video shows a paleontologist explaining how he believes in YEC, even though his colleagues do not. From that point, there are videos, displays, and portraits explaining the finer points of Creation science. You then enter into the museum’s “Walk through History.” There is a gigantic video presentation, taking visitors through the seven days of Creation with booming narration and sound effects. Visitors then exit into the Garden of Eden exhibit, a life-sized diorama displaying Adam in the Garden naming the animals.

39 Ken Ham, interview by author, Petersburg, KY, October 20, 2011.
In their Garden of Eden exhibit at the Creation Museum, their theological interpretation is on display. Adam is holding one hand out for a lynx and the animal is gingerly approaching. Under the other arm, Adam cradles a lamb. In the foreground, a penguin looks on. Off to the side, a dinosaur is eating some leaves. For a modern observer, this image brings to mind several questions. Does the lynx not see the penguin? Why isn’t the dinosaur trying to eat Adam or the lamb? In this pre-Fall Eden, Adam can stare a lynx in the eye and hold out his hand and not worry about having his face bitten off. The exhibit shows the perfect harmony God intended when he looked over Creation and said it was “very good,” then rested on the seventh day. Peter Williams, after a visit to the museum and looking at their arguments, writes that what they are presenting is, “an alternative universe to that accepted by mainstream science and mainline religion, but presented in the idiom of contemporary mass culture and museology rather than the fusty world of an older generation's fundamentalism.”

Continuing through the museum, Adam is shown lying down at Eve’s creation and then the pair are embracing seductively in a waterfall, while the title card explains God told man to be fruitful and multiply. The museum presents a bleak view of sin. Adam and Eve are shown with the forbidden fruit in hand. It is worth noting, the fruit here is not an apple, as it has been depicted historically. Instead it is portrayed as nebulous red fruit bits. This plays into the museum’s careful and literal study of the story.

of the Fall, which does not specify the type of fruit that was on the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil.

For the introduction of sin, the museum tour turns to a dark room. Adam and Eve are now clothed but the central focus of the exhibit is the two slaughtered sheep God has killed to make clothes for Adam and Eve. The dead, skinned sheep, one with its tongue sticking out, stare visitors in the face at eye level. As the ministry aims to “proclaim the truth with boldness,” it does not shy away from the shocking. The next room goes even farther as it explains what this introduction of sin and death has brought. Snarling wolves, gunshots, nuclear war, and holocaust images are flashed rapidly in black and white in a long hallway.

The “Walk through History” also snakes past a talking Methuselah, then onto Noah and his sons building the ark. In their interpretation of Genesis genealogies, Methuselah lived long enough to have known both Adam and Noah.

The museum goes on to show how it views culture’s abandonment of God’s word, in particular the abandonment of a literal interpretation of the Bible. A wrecking ball is shown embedded in a church to represent the church’s demise brought on by abandoning a literal interpretation of Biblical truth. A display talks about the Scopes Monkey Trial and how Christianity was made to look foolish. There is also a dig at Bryan and his Old Earth Creation views.

Like their books, the museum is evangelistic in its approach. The arc of the tour crescendos with a video titled “The Last Adam,” which explains the connection between
Adam and Jesus. The video presents an invitation to “receive the gift of salvation,” in the classic Protestant American style.

As you exit the theatre you can continue on into the hall of dinosaurs or back to the gift shop. Tucked off to the side, just past the theatre, there is a display with a small black wooden ark, a Bible, and a picture of Ham’s parents. Ham’s father made the ark and the Bible belonged to the elder Ham. The display neatly sums up one of the driving forces for YECs, and Ham in particular: the notion of legacy. If the infallibility and inerrancy of the Bible is eroded, Ham fears, then there will be lasting temporal implications. If the culture abandons the Bible, he says sin will run rampant and with it abortion, murder, gay marriage, and pornography. Each is subtly depicted in this part of the museum.

Ham said he has often asked people standing in front of the Bible and small ark what it means to them. “Without exception they say, ‘What legacy we leave our children.’ Cause really that’s what that exhibit is for.”41 Ham’s father was hugely influential in his life and to his strict literal understanding of scripture. With the museum Ham is trying to pass that on to the next generation. “He would never knowingly compromise God’s word. He was very sure in what he believed. He defended his faith. He would give answers to skeptical questions. So that has great influence on me, and a

41 Ken Ham, interview by author, Petersburg, KY, October 20, 2011.
lot of people." 42 That, he said, is the challenge he would like to give to parents visiting the museum: what legacy they are leaving their children?

It also bears noting that the Creation Museum and Answers in Genesis do not see themselves as anti-science. They view themselves as anti-evolution and anti-millions of years. With regard to origins and the philosophy of Darwinism, they see things radically different, but from recorded history and moving forward, they seem to be on the same page as their secular and religious brethren with whom they disagree on origins. By and large they are not guitar strumming hillbillies, as their critics like to portray them. Their arguments come across as heartfelt, well reasoned, and are sophisticatedly presented.

Ham embraces new technology; in particular, technology that makes it easier to spread their message. He noted their website received 11 million visitors in 2009 and 17 million in 2010. At the 2011 Answers for Pastors conference at the museum, Ham was constantly plugging Apple products, which he says he swears by. His presentations were filled with graphics and videos projected on two giant, theatre quality, 16x9 high definition screens above the stage. When one presenter had trouble connecting his laptop to the projection screens, Ham joked that Mac stands for “Macs Are Christian,” and PCs are “of the devil.” One Ham presentation included a detailed explanation of how disbelieving evolution and historical scientific theories does not make a person anti-science for all things. It went on to cite medical advancement, observational sciences, chemistry, physics, and technology as areas where he and many scientists saw eye to eye.

42 Ibid.
Conference attendees were similarly connected to technology. They grumbled loudly on the first day when the wireless Internet connection was too slow, prompting the museum to open a second wireless access point. One pastor saw me recording the conference on my iPhone and regaled me with his story of spending a day last week waiting in line at the Apple story to purchase the latest model. Another asks me what my name was on Twitter, the social networking site. He promptly navigated to the website on his tablet computer, looked me up, and started following me.

**A Cottage Industry Against Young Earth Creationism**

Young Earth Creationism has spawned a separate community of spirited Christians who oppose it, both on the scientific front and also on the religious front. One of the most popular titles is *The Bible, Rocks, and Time: Geological Evidence for the Age of the Earth*, written by two geology professors at Calvin College, a Christian liberal arts college in Michigan. Davis Young and Ralph Stearley argue in the book that YECs pick and choose which parts of geology they use for their arguments, instead of looking at the entire body of science. They also argue the approach has fatal flaws in sharing the Gospel with scientists and in educating young Christians.

As academics who specialize in geology, the dismissal of the science is particularly galling to them, specifically when it comes to dating the Earth. “Young-Earth creationists, however, have said relatively little about igneous and metamorphic
rocks. Such rocks, however, provide compelling evidence that the Earth is considerably more than a few thousand years old."43

They argue YECs have blinders on to the full body of evidence:

They are unwilling to abandon their young-Earth, global-Flood hypotheses even when the evidence shows it to be untenable. They have ignored or distorted a vast body of evidence that is contrary to their preconceived notion of what Earth history must have been like…They claim continually to argue from the evidence of nature, but they have repeatedly ignored what is inconvenient for them.44

From a social standpoint they argue if a Christian youth is taught that YEC is on par with mainstream geology and that belief in YEC is a scriptural tenet, than when that youth is confronted with the overwhelming facts against YEC, their entire Christian faith could crumble. “To them the Bible now becomes a flawed book.”45

They also say mainstream scientists likewise will not come to faith. “if the scientific profession is attacked or technical knowledge is ridiculed any more than Christians will have success in converting dentists by attacking the dental profession or ridiculing what dentists have to say about teeth and dental care.”46


44 Young and Stearley, The Bible, Rocks, and Time, 472.

45 Ibid., 477.

46 Ibid., 479.
Young and Stearly are not alone. There is a growing subset of science faculty at Christian schools who reject YEC and are writing about it as a flawed science and one that could potentially be dangerous to the faith.
CHAPTER IV

YOUNG EARTH CREATIONISM THEOLOGY AND INTERPRETATION

For YECs, their theology is based on how they understand the first eleven chapters in the book of Genesis, from authorship to interpretation, and this guides the application of their faith. Understanding how they apply this theology to their faith is critical to understanding where the movement is headed. Their theology directly informs their practice, and how it relates to other Christians, while living in a pluralistic society in the United States.

At the Answers for Pastors conference in October 2012, pastors from around the country came to the Creation Museum for three days of teaching and preaching training on Creationism. One of the marquee speakers was Dr. R. Albert Mohler, Jr., the president of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Mohler is a conservative systematic theologian by training and has headed the flagship seminary for the 16-million member Southern Baptist Convention for two decades. He is well respected in the evangelical community, often quoted in the national media, and unequivocally a Young Earth Creationist. “The gospel story begins with Creation,” he told the crowd in the Legacy Conference Center in the basement of the museum. “We cannot have gospel without Creation and salvation.”

1 R. Albert Mohler, Jr., “Opening Session” (lecture, Answers in Genesis -Answers for Pastors Conference, Petersburg, KY, October 18, 2011).
Mohler spoke passionately at the conference in defense of the YEC position. His position comes from a theological understanding of scripture rooted in a Protestant tradition that believes in the inerrancy of Scripture. He takes the first eleven chapters of Genesis to be a true, accurate, and historical telling of the Creation, the Fall, and the Flood. He said the Christian response to a Darwinian evolutionary understanding of origins typically goes two ways: to stand firm on the Bible or to make peace.

“Theological liberalism is a defense mechanism that comes from those who attempt to make peace with Darwinism,” he told the crowd. When Darwin’s theories first emerged in the late 1860s, he said Christians “looked at evolution and said, ‘scripture is divine’ and totally committed [to Darwinism], but they were naive conformists.” He continued, “They thought there could be peace.” But for Mohler and YECs, there can be no compromise from their understanding of the Creation story. There can be no peace with evolution. The biblical story of Creation is only what it says. Genesis says what it means, both the “who” of Creation and the “how.”

For Mohler and other YECs, how Genesis begins is key to their understanding of salvation. “If you change how it begins you change how it ends,” Mohler said. “You cannot have the Gospel without the Fall and you can’t have the Fall without a historical Adam and Eve.” Mohler told the pastors at the conference that this theological understanding was paramount to their understanding and application of their faith. “We
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2 Mohler, “Opening Session.”
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
have to be people willing to die for words,”⁵ he said. Mohler believes in a 24-hour application of the Hebrew word for day in the Creation account. As a result, he thinks the earth is approximately 6,000-10,000 years old. He, like Ken Ham, thinks this is a critical point in Christianity that should be battled out between believers. When Ham took the stage at the conference he further explained this point as it relates to other Christians, “They want unity in relation to man’s words, we want unity in relation to God’s words.”⁶

Authorship

YECs hold to a single author interpretation for the book of Genesis. For them, God, in the person of the Holy Spirit, is the single author. They do not subscribe to the long held pre-Enlightenment notion that Moses was the sole author of the text of Genesis. Instead, they view Moses as a divinely inspired editor, who, under the Holy Spirit’s direction, complied several ancient histories of the Jews into one cohesive narrative.

YECs strict adherence to the text of the story leads them to dismiss the historical tradition of Moses as the author of Genesis. Tradition said for centuries that Moses sat under a tree with a blank scroll and God dictated him the text of the Pentateuch. Ham is not entirely dismissive of this as a possibility, based on his understanding of the scripture. “God could have just dictated to Moses the whole thing, but that doesn’t seem to be what the scripture is saying at all. God uses everyday people and brings to their mind the

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ken Ham, “Compromise, Six Days, and the Authority of Scripture – Part 1” (lecture, Answers in Genesis -Answers for Pastors Conference, Petersburg, KY, October 18, 2011).
things that He wants.” Instead, Ham says the most likely interpretation of the text is Moses as an editor “we see no reason why he couldn’t have these writings handed down as history and Moses takes those and writes what God wants written for us, compiling them together.”

Ham points back to the text of Genesis to support his argument for the various sources Moses used to create the text in its present form: “You’ve got those little phrases there like, ‘This is the book of Adam,’ in Genesis 5:1 and ‘This is the book of Generations,’ and so on. And we say they’re signatures, if you like.” For YECs this means some written, or oral, history had to be passed down to Moses. Ham said the fact that God, Adam, and Eve converse in the Garden of Eden can be seen as a potential clue Adam and Eve were created intelligently and could have also been given the ability to write. When pressed on the issue he questioned back, “who says writing wasn’t invented till say the time of Moses or something else? Who says they couldn’t make musical instruments? You just take the history as written.”

Ham and other YECs point back to the genealogies found in Genesis as evidence of how the historical texts could have been passed down to Moses. In their understanding of the book of Genesis, all of humanity, with the exception of Noah and his family, were

7 Ken Ham, interview by author, Petersburg, KY, October 20, 2011.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
10 Ibid.
wiped out in the Flood. Therefore the pre-Genesis histories had to be aboard the ark. The oldest person recorded in the genealogies in Genesis is Methuselah. According to Genesis 5:27, “all the days of Methuselah were nine hundred sixty-nine years; and he died.”\(^{11}\) In YECs construction of Biblical genealogies, Methuselah was old enough to have overlapped both Adam and Noah. With this overlap, Ham surmises a chain of custody theory: one or several pre-Genesis histories could have passed from Adam to Methuselah, then from Methuselah to Noah in some form.

The Genesis text does not make any specific reference to Adam and Methuselah knowing each other or Noah and Methuselah knowing each other. At the Creation Museum, between the exhibits for the Garden of Eden and the Flood, there is an exhibit with an animatronic Methuselah that talks to the guests. He is seated at a table. Around him are parchment scrolls, musical instruments and various fruits. Each object has a direct correlation to the chain of custody theory. The scrolls and instruments point to high human intelligence from the start of the Creation story. The fruit is a reminder that meat was not permitted by God to be eaten until after the Flood.\(^{12}\) Ham is clear about raising the theory as a possibility for visitors, “we weren’t there, we can’t say for 100%, what we’re saying is the possibility is there, when you understand scripture, that there

\(^{11}\) NRSV.

\(^{12}\) Genesis 9:3.
were writings that were handed down to Noah, that were handed down to Moses, under
the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.”

This portion of YEC theology on authorship is much closer to contemporary
Biblical scholarship than many might think. Moses, as an editor of multiple sources, runs
nearly parallel to the Documentary Hypothesis theory. While the two sides differ on
whom the potential editor was and where the potential sources came from, and when the
editing happened, they both are approaching the final document from the same framing.
Both say the text of Genesis is not the work of a single hand, human or otherwise.

This point of similarity is not lost on Ham. He notes the difference is in
approaching the text from a secular academic standpoint versus a faithful believer
standpoint. “I think the difference is in what they’re saying with different authors and
claiming that there are some contradictions and things, we’re saying there are no
contradictions, that it’s all part of a whole.” Ham and YECs say the Bible has a single
author, “in the sense it’s God,” who then used man to write the message. Where
Biblical scholars who adhere to Source Criticism and JDEP see contradictions, Ham sees
signatures of different sources from authors God used at different times in the book of
Genesis: “Their philosophy, I would say, is more to discredit and not take it as the
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infallible inerrant word of God. Where as we’re saying, ‘this is totally supported.’”16
This framing of the argument leads YECs to a complete and utter rejection of Source
Criticism and the Documentary Hypothesis theory, despite the similarities.

The authorship question for YECs does not end in Genesis or at the conclusion of
the Torah. Instead, their belief is that God is the sole author of the entirety of scripture.
As a result this impacts how they interpret Genesis and the other sixty-five books of the
Bible.

**Interpretation**

YECs interpret the first eleven chapters as they do the entire Bible, as the divinely
inspired, infallible, and inerrant Word of God. For them, God is the single author who
has passed down a complete work from Genesis to Revelation. When it comes to the
central stories in Genesis 1-11 of Creation, the Fall, and the Flood, they interpret those
events as a historical narrative. Other denominations and sects of Christianity have
viewed the Creation story, for instance, as a holy metaphor or an allegory – some literary
device to show the “who” of Creation, versus the “how” and “when.” Others have said
the Creation account unfolds like poetry. These interpretations leave room for other
theories like Theistic Evolution or Old Earth Creationism.

Ham uses two verses from the Bible, in similar ways other conservative
Protestants do, to make his point about the inerrancy of scripture and God as the single

16 Ibid.
author. The first is from 2 Timothy 3:16, “All scripture is inspired by God,’”¹⁷ and the opening of the Gospel of John “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.”¹⁸ He says through those texts, the Bible shows God is the single author. From there, he uses this theological position to attack his critics. If you believe in evolution, Old Earth Creationism or Theistic Evolution Ham says, “then you’re saying Jesus is wrong...and not infallible. So it’s really an attack on the Son. It’s really an attack on the Word of God.”¹⁹

Ham and other YECs argue the text in Hebrew is written as a plain and direct historical narrative and the text is what it says it is. This Ham says is, in part, because of how they interpret how the authors in the New Testament refer back to the stories in Genesis, “we would interpret Genesis the way Jesus does, the way that Paul does, the way that Peter does. So we’re taking Genesis as is, in accordance to the language.”²⁰ In Genesis when the text reads, “God said” followed by “God saw,” Ham sees that as indicative of a narrative as opposed to poetry.²¹

Within this framework of interpretation comes the biggest distinction between Creationists: how to interpret the Hebrew word for day, “yom.” The interpretation of the

¹⁷ 2 Timothy 3:16a NRSV.
¹⁸ John 1:1 NRSV.
¹⁹ Ken Ham, interview by author, Petersburg, KY, October 20, 2011.
²⁰ Ibid.
²¹ Ham has an unlikely ally in Robert Alter, one of the great scholars of literary criticism of the Bible. Alter classifies the both creation accounts in Genesis as prose instead of poetry and says the combination of the two represents a “composite artistry” on the part of the editor, not a contradiction.
word separates Young Earth Creationists from Old Earth Creationists. YECs argue “yom” is consistently translated in the Bible as referring to a 24-hour period of morning and evening, instead of a poetic or metaphoric tool. They note other points in the Hebrew text where “yom” is plural and refers to a period of days often translated, “in those days.” The use of the word in the Creation accounts is always singular. Even though the text in Genesis says the sun and moon were not created until the fourth day, YECs argue the text uses “yom” in the singular throughout the Creation account and therefore the meaning remains the same, a 24-hour period. The translation of this word in the context of the passage and the interpretation of it are also what YECs base their Creation timeline on. Using their interpretation, Adam was created on the sixth day, and using the genealogies found in the text, YECs can affix a near exact date to the age of the Earth. While there are some discrepancies among YECs on the exact date and time of Creation, a foundational belief among them is the Earth was created 6,000-10,000 years ago.

Because of their literal adhesion to the text from beginning to end, YECs believe Adam and Eve were real historical people. They believe sin and death did not enter the world until the Fall. Prior to the Fall, there can be no death in their interpretation. They believe Adam and Eve dwelled in harmony in the Garden of Eden with every kind of animal, dinosaurs included, and both humans and animals were vegetarian. After the Fall, they believe there was a cataclysmic flood that covered the entire world, killing everything in it except Noah, his family, and the animals on the ark. For YECs, rainbows are constant reminders of God’s wrath during the Flood and His promise never to destroy the earth. For YECs the story of Creation, the Fall, and Flood, are the beginnings of
Jesus’ story of redemption by offering salvation to all of fallen mankind who would believe in Him.

This strict literal adherence to the Genesis story has caused tension between Christian groups who hold differing opinions from YECs. Ham has called Christians who hold differing opinions on the interpretation of Genesis 1-11 “compromisers” and “so-called Christians.” Similarly other Christian groups have been dismissive of YECs as “guitar-strumming hillbillies” or “fire and brimstone” evangelists.

There is no question the issue of origins raises sharp differences between many Christian camps. Ham said YECs are unfairly criticized because of their harsh language: “When you speak authoritatively and people don’t agree with you, they often make a false accusation is what I think...The accusation is if you don’t believe in six literal days and a Young Earth interpretation, as these people do, you can’t be a Christian. I’ve never said that.” At the pastor’s conference at the Creation Museum, Ham and other speakers went to great lengths to say other Christians with competing ideas on origins were not automatically damned to hell and out of the Christian communion. Ham often pointed to a central tenet of Protestant Christianity: that salvation is by faith alone and that faith in Christ is what saves you. “We’re not saying you have to believe in six literal days to be a

22 Ken Ham, “Compromise, Six Days, and the Authority of Scripture – Part 2” (lecture, Answers in Genesis -Answers for Pastors Conference, Petersburg, KY, October 18, 2011).


24 Ken Ham, interview by author, Petersburg, KY, October 20, 2011.
Christian. We’ve never said that. Now, does believing in millions of years, does believing in evolution have negative consequences, we would say absolutely.”

A central theme in the theology of YEC is that belief in evolution and/or a timeline of Creation with millions of years, denigrates the authority of scripture. It is a constant theme played out in the museum and in their literature. The enemy is time. Without millions of years, they argue, there can be no evolutionary process. Their strict literal interpretation, leading them to believe in a Young Earth, also continues to a strict interpretation of the moral teachings of the Bible. Their argument is if Genesis is not true, then when does the Bible begin speaking truth? If the story is just a metaphor, why would there be a pressing need for salvation from eternal damnation as the result of sin?

The result in abandoning the authority of scripture, they say, is the collapse of the church and the society around it. The greatest risk they see is for their children, the next generation, and the future of Christianity. Ham says the ideas of millions of years and evolution comes from fallible man, not from the infallible Word of God.

We would see it as an authority issue. If you’re taking ideas from outside of scripture, and forcing that on to scripture…it unlocks the door to say, ‘if you don’t start with scripture you use these ideas to add to scripture.’ We believe that undermines Biblical authority to the next generation.25

Ham is adamant the issue is one for the present life and does not impact a person’s salvation or eternal life.

Reformation

25 Ibid.
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For YECs like Ham and his ministry, one goal of YEC is to bolster all Christians’ belief in the absolute authority of scripture, there by saving a future generation from compromising other Biblical teachings. The other is to present a clear picture of Christian teaching and doctrine through the Creation story to help win converts. Ham said their ministry is focused on seeing as many people in heaven with them as possible.

“That’s the bottom line. So our concern is for people, it’s for lives. We just want to reach as many people as we can.” 26 They say the erosion of belief in absolute authority and inerrancy of the scripture has lead to Christians compromising on what they see as clear-cut cultural issues like evolution, abortion, and gay marriage. All of those, they say, have simple answers if the Bible is taken seriously.

Their propensity for speaking authoritatively against fellow Christians has taken on a new level in the last few years. More and more, Ham and others are using the language of the Reformation to inspire their faithful. At the Answers for Pastors conference and in his writing Ham often quotes reformer Martin Luther. In one presentation at the conference, Ham showed an image of a plaque in Germany at the Diet of Worms where Martin Luther stood and defended his 95 Thesis before the church leadership at one of three trials. Luther, who claimed he was standing up for the authority of scripture, famously said, “Here I stand; I can do no other. God help me. Amen!” Ham showed the conference crowd a picture of him standing in the same place.

26 Ibid.
Ham repeated the Luther quote as his own mantra; “here I stand,” tying it to his YEC theological argument.

Ham has written often, and spoken often, of Christians nailing Genesis 1-11 to the doors of churches, Christian colleges, and seminaries. It is a symbolic notion he insists. “Anyone who listens to me knows I’m not advocating getting an actual hammer, I’m saying symbolically. In other words, call into account in regards to this issue,” he said. While the nailing of paper may be symbolic, the notion of reforming the church is not. Ham uses stark language for his call to reform, “I believe the attack on Genesis 1-11 is the Genesis 3 attack of our era. And the Genesis 3 attack is an attack on the authority of God’s word. ‘Did God really say?’”27 Ham said quoting the serpent tempting Eve in the Garden of Eden. For a person who believes the story of the Garden of Eden to be a factual historical account, he is saying his critics questioning Genesis 1-11 as a historical narrative is on par with the devil tempting Adam and Eve.

Answers in Genesis has taken the reformation language and put it into action in several ways. Ham co-authored a book called *Already Gone* that looked at how Christian colleges taught origins in religious courses and in science courses. The research they found was disturbing to them. Many of the schools were teaching either Old Earth Creationism or Theistic Evolution. As a result, AIG began a website that lists Christian colleges and seminaries who affirm, in writing, the AIG mission statement and adhere to
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a YEC theology.\textsuperscript{28} In his conference presentations, Ham regularly skewered top evangelical pastors, including well known pastors Tim Keller, from Redeemer Presbyterian Church in Manhattan, and John Piper, from Bethlehem Baptist church in Minneapolis, Minnesota. At the pastor’s conference, Ham played dozens of video clips where pastors used the words “evolution” or “millions of years,” and he quickly dubbed them “compromisers” or would look at the audience knowingly and just shake his head.\textsuperscript{29}

YECs view the reformation language as a matter of being faithful to a message they believe can, and will, change people’s lives. Ham said he was fine if that meant driving some people away and fewer people coming to church. AIG, Ham said, pays little attention to polling data and what people think about YEC. They focus on honing their message and its delivery:

Noah was a preacher of righteousness and only eight people in the world believed him and got on board that ark. So it’s not a matter of trying to change public opinion or something like that. For us it’s a matter of staying faithful to God’s word, preaching it, and trusting that there will be lives changed by it.\textsuperscript{30}

This all ties into their theological understanding of Genesis and with it, salvation from eternal damnation; hence their urgency to share it with a world they view as broken and in need of redemption.


\textsuperscript{29} Ken Ham, “Compromise, Six Days, and the Authority of Scripture – Part 1” (lecture, Answers in Genesis -Answers for Pastors Conference, Petersburg, KY, October 18, 2011).

\textsuperscript{30} Ken Ham, interview by author, Petersburg, KY, October 20, 2011.
AIG is adamant it is only a resource ministry aimed at equipping adherents. The goal is to get their message out and by any standard measure; publicity, book sales, museum attendance, it is working. “Christians are to be the salt and light in their culture. As the Israelites were there to influence the world, we are. We are supposed to be influencers on the world,”31 Ham said. The Creation Museum is growing and plans are underway for a massive sister theme park called the “Ark Encounter.” Scheduled to open in 2014, it will feature a life-sized ark, complete with three decks so people can walk in and explore for themselves, a pre-flood village, a Tower of Babel, and a massive petting zoo and aviary. The park will be run as a for-profit enterprise and, thanks to the help of a Democratic governor, will receive large tax breaks from the state of Kentucky in the form of tax credits on monies brought in by tourism. At the time of the announcement, Governor Steve Beshear said in a press release that the theme park could bring in as many as 900 jobs to the region.32 The ministry has already purchased 800 acres of land and raised more than $5 million dollars for the park. They said their research indicates the park could attract 1.6 million visitors to the theme park alone in the first year.
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Ham insists his group exists only to equip, and they have no political motivations. He said they are not interested in lobbying to have Creationism taught in schools. Their approach he said is a bottom up mentality: that hearts and minds change culture, not that culture is changed from the top down by government. “The more hearts and minds we can influence, it’s those that will have an influence on the culture.”\textsuperscript{33} As a 501c3, non-profit group, AIG risks losing its tax exempt status if they endorse candidates or engage in politicking. If their materials are presented at school board meetings or in state legislatures pushing fairness laws to have Creationism taught, Ham says it is not done in their name. “That’s not us. If we provide resources, and they choose to use them, that’s up to them. We’re a resource ministry, not a politically motivated ministry.”\textsuperscript{34}

That does not mean Ham would not like to see Creationism being taught in the public schools in the United States. AIG is developing their own science curriculum, but because of their explicit sectarian approach its likely clients are Christian schools and home school parents as opposed to public schools. Ham frames his argument on this in terms of fairness. He does not think the government should force an atheist teacher to teach Creationism, but he does think that a Christian teacher should be free to be able to teach Creationism should they so choose: “They should have freedom to present different views that they like. In other words academic freedom.”\textsuperscript{35} That doctrine of fairness and presenting both sides in schools has not fared well in court. Ham’s argument, like his
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\textsuperscript{34} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid.
Creationist brethren, is aimed not at constitutional law scholars but rather at every day people. “What are the evolutionists so frightful of? If they think their perspective is right, what does it matter if other people present other ideas?” he said. “Let them look at those things, let them be challenged by that. What are you frightened of? Why do you have to protect evolution?”

Since the Creation Museum opened in 2007, legislation has been brought up on the state level to have Creation taught along side evolution in science classes in at least nine states. Louisiana and Oklahoma have laws that allow teachers to circumvent a federal ban on teaching Creationism. In 2012, Indiana’s State Senate passed a fairness bill that would have permitted public schools to teach Creationism along with evolution, so long as the curriculum also offered origin theories from Judaism, Islam, Hinduism and other faiths. The bill was removed by the Speaker of the House from consideration by the State House of Representatives, effectively ending the bill. It should be noted that the Indiana state line is just a few miles north of the Creation Museum.

While Ham and Answers in Genesis are attempting to stay out of the battle in the public schools, nearly nine decades after the Scopes Trial, Young Earth Creationists are still actively moving to have Creationism taught in schools through state
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legislatures. The impetus for this movement is rooted in their belief in fairness, that Creationism ought to be taught alongside evolution, and their belief that they are compelled to share their faith by any and all means to save a damned world. If the last three decades are a prelude to the future, this is not an issue that will disappear from the public square anytime soon, as Young Earth Creationists are well positioned financially and logistically to continue disseminating their message.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION AND PROOF OF THESIS

In the beginning, this thesis set out to examine the movement of Young Earth Creationism from its infancy to present day, by focusing on the biggest, most active organizations, looking through the lens of their theology. YEC remains a powerful force in both religious and scientific discussions in the public square. Those who dismiss YECs as “guitar-strumming hillbillies” do so at their own peril.

The movement of Young Earth Creationism has grown steadily in the post-Scopes Trial era. At the time of the trial, Young Earth Creationists were in the minority even among Creationists. This makes their rise all the more fascinating. As Creationists retreated to Christian colleges and abandoned the public arena, change came to the movement. The small number of YECs who were active, most notably George McCready Price, cast William Jennings Bryan and his belief in Old Earth Creationism as the reason Creationists looked foolish at the Scopes trial. While they were on the winning side in the courthouse, they quickly realized the battle was not over the application of the Butler Act, but rather over how their ideas and beliefs were received by the public. They saw an unflattering portrayal of Creationists, viewed as ignorant, over zealous, religious simpletons.

As a result of the crushing loss in the public square Young Earth Creationists were able to build their numbers, at the deceased Bryan’s expense, growing in influence in Creationist circles through the publication of their own books and scientific journals.
Young Earth Creationists began to hone their message, backing up the Biblical narrative with science that fit their argument. They came up with answers to the questions Bryan stumbled on at the trial and they reshaped their argument to fight not just the scientific establishment, but the religious establishment that they felt was no longer following the Bible.

In the late 1960s the movement began to show new signs of life with the publication of *The Genesis Flood*. Despite its lukewarm reception by the broader Christian community and the scorned silence by the secular scientific community, the success of the book galvanized YECs further and led to the creation of the Institute for Creation Research and Answers in Genesis. The book was published in an era of great change in the United States. The cultural shift of the sexual revolution, continued scientific progress, and movements away from organized religion likely prepared the way for a Christian community in need of validation for what it believed. Books like *The Genesis Flood* gave a new kind of scientific credibility inside the movement, and IRC and AIG have used that capital of credibility to their advantage. These two organizations have been the main motivators of growth in the movement in terms of visibility and resources. Their dissemination of ideas and information across multiple media platforms, and willingness to engage both religious and scientific critics with well-tested arguments, have led to even further gains for the movement.

While the reach and finances of Answers in Genesis and the Institute for Creation Research have grown tremendously in the last twenty years, what is most telling about
their influence and success is the tracking poll of American opinions on the topic of origins. Since the Gallup Organization first began asking about Creationism and Evolution in 1982, YEC has maintained its popularity with the American public, with 44% of respondents saying they believed God created humans in present form at one time within the last 10,000 years or so. Using U.S. Census numbers from 2010, when the population total was 308,745,538,¹ would mean there could be as many as 135,848,037 Young Earth Creationists in the United States.

Gallup is right to qualify this percentage calculation by noting that people who identify as YEC often have less education and attend church more regularly than those who hold an evolutionary view of origins, theistic or atheistic. While those who hold an evolutionary view of origins tend to have more college education, 37% of the college graduates surveyed in 2010 held a YEC position. Of those surveyed who held postgraduate degrees, 22% believed in YEC. By any measure these are not statistically insignificant groups. While YECs may be less educated as a whole than their peers, many YECs are college educated and hold advanced degrees.

What is most telling about these numbers is the success of the YEC movement in the face of seemingly insurmountable odds. Teaching evolution is legally mandated in the public schools. Evolution stands virtually unchallenged in the secular scientific arena. The ICR research to further the cause of Creationism is fractional when compared

to the research and resources of universities, colleges, private groups, and the federal government’s research to the further study of evolution. While the Creation Museum aims to tell the story of YEC, there are many more world-class museums in the United States that tell the story of evolution. The scientific establishment dwarfs YEC in every possible metric, except public opinion. The evolutionists have the public schools, more museums, more research, and more funding, but cannot move the needle on public opinion to overtake YECs.

State legislators continue to bring bills to the floor to allow Creationism, in one form or another, to be taught in public schools. While Answers in Genesis may not be actively lobbying for any of those bills, they are informing and equipping other YECs to make those bills a reality. Public schools are also not the only educational arena where this discussion is taking place. As the home school movement and the Christian private schools continue to grow, YECs are actively making new science curriculum specifically targeting those markets.

Ultimately the core issue for YECs is not a scientific one, but rather a religious one. By framing the issue of origins around the infallibility of Genesis 1-11 and back filling the narrative of scripture with science, the science of origins becomes secondary. For YECs science must follow the theology, rather than theology following science. This means science must be bent to fit in with theology, because, for them, God is infallible and man is fallible. At the heart of the movement is the theological framework that the Bible is right and should be examined and applied as the infallible word of God.
YEC theology is based on tenets most Christians agree: namely that the Bible speaks truth, that God created the world, and that because of the introduction of sin, a remedy in the person of Jesus Christ through the gift of salvation is needed. Many Christians and Bible scholars will no doubt be surprised with how similar YEC theology is to their own. They will also be surprised with the level of detail and analysis with which YECs approach the text of Genesis. They are strict adherents to the text, but allow for a good amount of interpretation based on the text itself and its historical context.

How YECs approach the differences with other Christian groups is jarring, especially since they say their motives are based on Christian love. Ham and Mohler are fond of using harsh reformation tinged language when addressing Christian crowds to make their points. Ham is not afraid to say he is on the right side of this argument by comparing himself to famous contrarians Noah and Martin Luther. Mohler is not afraid to remind pastors of the Christian history of martyrdom and the importance of being willing to take their beliefs to the farthest degree. But while they preach a desire for purity of interpretation of Genesis and seek to push adherents to the brink in their defense of YEC, they also reach out a compromise.

On the one hand they argue the Creation story is intertwined with salvation, yet on the other hand they say adherence to a Young Earth Creationism is not necessary for salvation. This is a move to say to other Christians, “we are the same.” It is a move away from division. The notion is to find commonality in shared belief in salvation. From there, YECs can aim to win their Christian brethren to their side. By casting the
argument as one with temporal implications versus eternal ones, the rhetoric can cool somewhat.

Their reformation language is misplaced. When Luther stood at Worms there was something he was breaking from, a united global church. With YECs taking on the banner of a new reformation, the fractured nature of American Protestantism should be considered. After the Scopes trial and the public humiliation the Creationism movement suffered, denominations split and the Creationism movement shifted from church organizations to parachurch organizations. Answers in Genesis is perfect example of this. They are not formally, or even informally, connected to any denomination. Ham has no formal denomination to break from. If anything, a call to reformation could result in an ad hoc unity among splintered American Protestant groups who agree on Young Earth Creationism, rather than any further separation among an already fractured group.

Young Earth Creationism is entering into a new era. The construction of the Ark Encounter will bring more money, more prominence, and more influence to their movement, in particular to Answers in Genesis. It will also firmly cement Ham as the visionary head moving forward. Instead of fighting the state in courts over what is taught in the classroom, now these YECs are partnering with the state and showing their economic might. Regardless of what the governor of Kentucky may think of YEC, 900 new jobs in a down economy is a miracle by any political calculation. The fact that the theme park will even be paying property taxes is a welcome bonus. Despite its tax-exempt status for the Answers in Genesis and the Creation Museum, the ministry will
also continue to be a major economic engine in the region, with or without the theme park. The tourists who visit the museum will still need places to stay, things to eat, and gas to fill up their cars. The employees who work at the museum need houses to live in and all pay taxes on their salaries regardless of their employer’s exemption.

While evolution, in an atheistic construct, has a firm footing in public education and secular science, there are few organizations dedicated to spreading the word about Theistic Evolution. Some will point to the Intelligent Design movement, but despite the publicity for the cause, the size of the groups behind that effort are dwarfed by groups like Answers in Genesis. Evolution has science museums around the world as it’s temples to reason and thought. Young Earth Creationists have their own temple now dedicated to their faith. Theirs is a growing in size, contributions, and influence. While some are content to chop away at state laws and carve out a space for Creationists, Answers in Genesis has their sights set on the broader movement of the Church and its neighbors, one heart and mind at a time.

They have taken the fight from the classrooms to the church and from academia to the lay public. Their fight is not against educators or scientists but with the lay public, with whom they have had much greater success. With faith inevitably comes doubt. YECs combat doubt and insecurity with an unwavering certainty in their position. Their argument that Genesis is factually true can be persuasive for a person of faith who has experienced some other part of the Bible that spoke truth to them. The YEC message does not need to hold up to the scrutiny of secular science because they would say that
scrutiny is flawed. YECs are also not surprised by their success because they believe they hold the truth.

The beauty of the study of origins is that all sides are ultimately guessing. One bases their guesses on observed science and theory. The other bases their arguments on faith in divine inspiration. Both YECs and evolutionists have a sizable trump card in their arguments but fail to see they are not engaging one another in the same argument. YEC is less about science and more about faith and that is the main reason why it has been able to stay in the public square. Scientifically is has been universally scorned by the establishment yet it continues on in the debate. The science of evolution has far more resources devoted to its side. It has the money, standing, and academia on its side yet YECs continue to draw far more adherents than those who support atheistic evolution. YECs tactics are fiery, impolite, and underfunded but they relish the role of being the underdog because, they believe they have the truth, regardless of who agrees with them, and that is why they are winning.
Figure 1. A dinosaur in the Garden of Eden exhibit at the Creation Museum, by Eric C. Marrapodi.
Figure 2. A dinosaur eats a piece of fruit near Adam in the Garden of Eden, by Eric C. Marrapodi.
Figure 3. A penguin looks on as Adam feeds a lynx, By Eric C. Marrapodi.
Figure 4. Adam feeds a lynx as other animals, including a monkey, look on, by Eric C. Marrapodi.
Figure 5. Adam and Eve bath in the Garden as the serpent looks on, by Eric C. Marrapodi.
Figure 6. Eve and Adam take the forbidden fruit, by Eric C. Marrapodi.
Figure 7. A skinned sheep is shown on an altar, while Adam and Eve show remorse for their sin, by Eric C. Marrapodi.
Figure 8. An animatronic dinosaur kills and eats another dinosaur, by Eric C. Marrapodi.
Figure 9. A room shows images as a result of sin: genocide, drug use, and labor pains, by Eric C. Marrapodi.
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