

October 2011

IMPLICATION OF FINDING OF NOAH'S ARK

By Javier Valdivieso

Even though Noah's Ark has not been discovered yet, we have the Word of God that records in the Hebrew book of B'resheet (Genesis) that the Ark rested in the Mountains of Ararat. This emplacement implies an altitude high above the current sea level, the result of the catastrophic and universal Deluge, that in biblical chronology happened about 4400 years ago. This universal flood refaced the earth's surface (mountains, oceans, rivers, valleys, caves, fossils, sedimentary layers, volcanoes, etc.). Furthermore, Noah, his seven family members, and pairs of land dwelling animals that were carried in the Ark survived the catastrophe. No water dwelling creatures or insects were included in God's rescue venture.

We do not know with certainty what happened to the Ark afterwards. The Ark may have disintegrated or rotted, or perhaps the lumber was reused, or it may still exist intact somewhere on those mountains.

Scoffers have mocked the Bible entirely. The secular theory of evolution has its own version of the origin of life that allegedly happened millions of years ago. Several branches of science have been developed under this secular but also religious worldview.

If we think for a moment, most of western culture developed its standards for society from biblical principles. The founders of the United States brought to life the American Exceptionalism Experiment based on principles found within biblical knowledge. The US Constitution is one example of this thinking. Most western societies were built on some sort of biblical concepts. We can predict that the further away a western society goes from its roots (biblical principles), the more likely that society will end up with progressive degradation, loss of identity and extinction.

I want to bring up the strong and unchanging authority of the Bible. That authority is not from human initiative but from God's. With the advance of modern technology and science, most histories narrated in the Bible have been supported with some scientific evidence from archeology, radioisotope dating, satellite exploration, life science and more.

The Bible has *history* and mentions places, people, events, and even dates. If skeptics are right, and those histories are just-so histories, then why has modern science and archeology been finding more and more evidence to support those histories? The discovery of Noah's Ark would not only provide profound confirmation of the authority of God's Word but carry profound implications for many fields of science (geology, biology, astronomy, anthropology, archeology) that have been hijacked by the secular evolutionary mindset. This article is based on the claims made in the Bible, and we have a history to tell. The discovery of Noah's Ark and its official recognition (for example with the support of UNESCO), will carry several implications.

a. Noah's flood was not a local flood but a universal one. Finding Noah's Ark in the mountains of Ararat will settle the question of the size of Noah's Flood as being global and not merely local. Even though the argument for a local flood is silly by logic, the explicit narrative of the biblical text and common sense tell us that God did not tell Noah to build a colossal boat over 100 years while patiently listening to the mockery of his contemporaries, to fill up the vessel with land dwelling animals and then stay for a year inside the Ark just for a local flood. If the Flood had been local, God would have just told Noah to *move*.

b. All humans are from Noah's lineage, the only one on Earth after the Flood. This would leave the modern human evolutionary tale as just that, a fairy tale for grownups. The missing link would be forever missing (as it always has been), and all those imaginary ape-like creatures displayed in secular museums would be (as they always have been) just the fruit of the imagination of mislead minds.

c. Most secular geology books will need to be rewritten. With the proof of a universal and catastrophic flood, all geologic features of the Earth would be understood as a result of such an event narrated in the Bible. Fossil formation, plate tectonics, erosion, glaciers, volcanism, continental drift, cave formation, sedimentary rocks and most of the geologic concepts and features

would finally have the right basis for interpretation, understanding and analysis.

d. The millions of years ideas will vanish. The “once upon a time” or the “millions of millions of years ago” timescale for earth history would just become a secular yet religious fairy tale. The chronological timing of the Bible gives a date of about 4400 year ago for the event of the universal flood, which is totally incompatible with the purposely distorted millions of years of secular science.

e. All evolutionary biology and anthropology books would become useless. If the Flood was global and recent, then the fossil record is not a record of evolution, so those evolutionary trees of life that adorn the biology textbooks will end up in the trash. Surely someone will ask, “Where did Noah fit the huge dinosaurs?” Noah (being 600 years old) possibly took juveniles, which eat less, sleep more, and are more flexible for long journeys. What happened with the dinosaurs (called “dragons” in scripture) after the Flood? They possibly were hunted, starved, or turned to cannibalism, and eventually became extinct, although there may still be some alive in remote jungles and deep oceans.

f. The Ark would become the oldest existing manmade structure. Effectively, the biblical timetable puts Noah’s Ark as the oldest manmade structure on Earth. The global flood destroyed all previous manmade structures leaving the Ark as the oldest in existence.

g. As a corollary, Noah’s Ark would be the only manmade structure in existence from the pre-Flood lost world. The Ark would give us some information on the technology and general knowledge of the pre-Flood world. Who knows what technology was used in constructing the Ark itself or what other articles were left inside.

Probably Noah or his children kept some log or wall writings that would give us the knowledge of the only language that was spoken in the pre-flood world. Let’s remember the extraordinary event that happened after the Flood at the Tower of Babel and the supernatural confusion of languages. It has been speculated that Hebrew was the pre-flood world’s language.

CONCLUSIONS

The older the biblical history, the more difficult it is to find proof that such events ever happened (e.g., Israel’s captivity in Egypt, the historicity of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, or the Tower of Babel). The most difficult event to prove would be the six days of creation. We have only the Word of the One who created everything; He is the only witness of such events. Even though scientific evi-

dence is mounting for God’s creative activity and the historicity of many biblical events, critics still remain skeptical. The bottom line is that skeptics would deny the history of creation even if we had proof of the original six days of physical creation, because it is not a convenient truth for their relative mores. They will never admit the existence of absolutes, nor God.

Finally, if Noah’s Ark is discovered, that would be shocking worldwide. Fundamental philosophical ideas upon which entire branches of modern science have been built such as the Theory of Evolution, Humanism, Atheism and their denial of a Supreme Being would be in question. However, the Creator of Heavens and Earth, with his set of *absolutes*, would be confirmed. ☩

THE GRAND DESIGN AND FREE WILL

By Henry Middleton

In their new book, *The Grand Design*, Stephen Hawking and Leonard Mlodinow defend scientific determinism, which they define as follows:

Given the state of our universe at one time, a complete set of laws fully determines both the future and the past. This would exclude the possibility of miracles or an active role for God. ...It is, in fact, the basis of all modern science, and a principle that is important throughout this book. A scientific law is not a scientific law if it holds only when some supernatural being does not intervene (30).¹

They essentially argue that the laws of nature must hold true in all cases without being overridden by divine intervention. Scientific laws must operate without exceptions, except “under a stipulated set of conditions (28).”

The authors then apply scientific determinism in rejecting human free will. They reason that humans live in the universe and interact with it. Therefore scientific determinism must apply to them just as it applies to the rest of the universe. They argue, “Though we feel that we can choose what we do, our understanding of the molecular basis of biology shows that biological processes are governed by the laws of physics and chemistry and therefore are as determined as the orbits of the planets” (31-32). For support they point out that electrical stimulation of the brain can create false sensations. They conclude, “...so it seems that we are no more than biological machines and that free will is just an illusion (32).”

¹ All citations refer to Hawking S and Mlodinow L (2010) *The Grand Design*, Bantam Books, New York.

They then argue that human behavior, though it is determined by nature, is impossible to predict in practice due to the complexity and the numerous variables involved. They instead propose applying an “effective model” (a model which can explain an overall phenomenon without explaining all underlying processes in detail) to human behavior. For example, we cannot calculate all the gravitational attractions between the atoms of a human body and the atoms of the earth, but we can still describe the overall gravitational attraction between a person and the earth. Chemistry provides an effective model to explain how atoms and molecules interact without the explaining the interactions in complete detail. Hawking and Mlodinow argue:

In the case of people, since we cannot solve the equations that determine our behavior, we use the effective theory that people have free will. The study of our will, and of the behavior that arises from it, is the science of psychology. ... That effective theory is only moderately successful in predicting behavior because, as we all know, decisions are often not rational or are based on a defective analysis of the consequences of the choice. That is why the world is in such a mess (33).

If a person begins with scientific determinism and a no-exceptions view of the laws of nature, then it makes sense that he would conclude that free will is illusory. However, this still causes many problems for the Hawking and Mlodinow argument. No doubt they would try to persuade people of the veracity of their view. Presumably this is at least one reason for writing this book. However, if free will is an illusion, what is the point of persuasion? If Hawking and Mlodinow are correct, then a person agrees or disagrees, is persuaded or not persuaded, only because he was scientifically determined to do so. Hawking and Mlodinow hold their view and wrote their book only because they were scientifically determined to do so.

Hawking and Mlodinow say that decisions are often irrational and that this is why “the world is in such a mess (33).” If someone’s decision is irrational, should we try to persuade him to be rational? What is the point if he is only doing what he is scientifically determined to do? Strictly speaking, he is not even making a decision. How do we judge what is and is not rational if we do not even choose one option over another? Rationality and persuasion are meaningless in such a system. (For an analysis of the foundation of logic, see *The Foundation of Logic in the Nature of God*.²) So what if the world is in such a mess? Even if standards of mess vs. non-

mess have any meaning in a Hawking-Mlodinow model, each person would only be holding his scientifically determined standard and either following or violating it in a scientifically determined manner.

Also, what is the point of employing an “effective theory” of human free will? Hawking’s and Mlodinow’s examples of gravity and chemistry do not provide a helpful analogy. In these illustrations, gravity and chemistry provide generalizations of observable processes. However, if free will is ultimately an illusion, as Hawking and Mlodinow argue, then an “effective theory” of free will is no more than an illusion, applying what Hawking and Mlodinow have already rejected.

Hawking and Mlodinow also seem to contradict themselves near the end of this book. They speculate on the possibility of meeting an alien being and how to determine that it has free will and is not simply a robot. They say:

The behavior of a robot would be completely determined, unlike that of a being with free will. Thus one could in principle detect a robot as a being whose actions can be predicted (178).

However, they say that there are too many particles in a complex being to do calculations to predict its behavior. We can say it has free will but merely as “an admission of our inability to do the calculations that would enable us to predict its actions (178).”

Now hold on a minute. Did they not argue that human behavior is causally determined due to scientific determinism and a no-exceptions view of the laws of nature? That being the case, why do they even speculate about determining whether an alien has free will? If free will is an illusion, then an alien has no free will. Of course, if Hawking and Mlodinow do meet an alien, they may conclude that it has free will, but only because they were scientifically determined to make that conclusion. On the other hand, it is possible that Hawking and Mlodinow consider the possibility of an alien with free will in a purely hypothetical manner, but this raises the question of why they would do so if they believe that free will is ultimately an illusion.

Maybe they would try to resolve this contradiction by appealing to model-dependent realism. They explain:

Model-dependent realism short-circuits all this argument and discussion between realism and anti-realism schools of thought. According to model-dependent realism, it is pointless to ask whether a model is real, only whether it agrees with observation. If there are two models that both agree with observation, like the goldfish’s picture and ours, then one cannot say that one is more real than another.

² Middleton H (2010 Mar) *The Foundation of Logic in the Nature of God*. < <http://tasc-creationscience.org/sites/default/files/newsletters/2010/mar10.pdf> > Accessed 2011 Sep 09

One can use whichever model is more convenient in the situation under discussion (45-46).

They also say that the simpler theory has an advantage (47, 52) and that whichever model that best explains present observations is the best theory (50-53). So would they vacillate between denying and affirming free will according to the circumstances? However they attempt to resolve this problem, it seems that Hawking and Mlodinow find it difficult to live with the consequences of their arguments.

Christians, however, affirm that God created mankind and created them in His image, which includes a will. Christians disagree on the extent to which mankind's fallen nature has affected his free will and reasoning ability and on the exact relationship between human free will and divine sovereignty, but Christians nonetheless

reject a strict determinism that precludes free will in any form. Under the assumption of mankind's creation by God, the existence of free will makes sense, both in theory and in practice. ☞

COMING EVENTS

Thursday, October 13, 7:00 P.M., Providence Baptist Church, 6339 Glenwood Ave., Raleigh, Room 631

We will see the Answers in Genesis video: *Lucy, She's no lady!* Confused about the discovery of Lucy, a "missing link" between monkeys and humans? Anatomist Dr. David Menton leaves no doubt that the famous "Lucy" fossils belong to a knuckle-walking, apelike creature...who was not a lady!

Contributions can be made at the TASC web site at www.tasc-creationscience.org through any of these major credit cards or through PayPal.



Or mail your contribution to: TASC, P.O. Box 12051, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2051