

## Should the YEC/OCC<sup>1</sup> Factions<sup>2</sup> Simply Call a Truce?

Many Christians on each side of the *aisle* referenced above have cordial relationships with friends who differ from our OCC position on the relationship between scientific knowledge and the first chapters of Genesis. And most of us wish to further these friendships as much as possible. Indeed, Scripture too seems to affirm that goal by giving high priority to living in harmony with each other as brothers and sisters in Christ (John 17:20f, Philippians 2:1-2), instead of being needlessly divisive. For these reasons it can be very uncomfortable to elevate such matters as are clearly controversial.

Nevertheless, it is the contention of this essay that, in one specific context (for which Scripture also assigns high priority—Luke 24:47), we who are old-cosmos creationists (OCC) *must* lay claim to the superiority of our position over young-earth creationism (YEC). That context entails the employment of controversial truth-claims in our proclamation (Matthew 10:34). To be specific, whenever we engage in the Great-Commission-task of urging secularists to embrace their faith<sup>3</sup> in our Redeemer Jesus Christ, who is also our Maker, it is urgent that we stand firm in our perspective on creation for the reason that doing so is the *only* means for employing that very body of evidence<sup>4</sup> which undergirds *our* position. The solitary way to verify the truth<sup>5</sup> of our perspective is to name the *specific* ways by which scientific evidence (the witness of nature that St. Paul identified in Romans 1:18-20) confirms that the true God is the Creator of all existence in the manner that the Bible declares in Genesis 1. Why must this be so?

1. Limiting the case for the existence of the universe to abstract assertions by severing it from evidential support implies that (in contrast to Psalm 19:1-4) no such case can be made at all. On the other hand, identifying supporting scientific evidence affirms the validity of Psalm 19.
2. The neglect to appeal to factual evidence from nature as it pertains to creation illegitimately favors, by default, the YEC position over the OCC perspective.<sup>6</sup>
3. The same failure (in contradiction to Romans 1:18-20) undermines St. Paul's assertion that God's "*eternal power and deity [is] clearly perceived in the things that He has made.*"<sup>7</sup>
4. On the other hand the scientific evidence<sup>8</sup> points inescapably<sup>9</sup> to a beginning of the universe out of nothing in a manner that utterly refutes atheism. At the same time, the Big Bang can easily and beautifully harmonize with Genesis 1:1, while YEC cannot be reconciled with this passage.<sup>10</sup>

Rev. Gary Jensen, Zion Lutheran Church, Snohomish, WA.

© July 30, 2018

---

<sup>1</sup> "Young Earth Creationist/Old Cosmos Creationist."

<sup>2</sup> I do not employ this term in a pejorative sense, but in the acknowledgment that each party under consideration is clearly controversial.

<sup>3</sup> The classical understanding of saving faith entails three aspects which include not only assent (agreement), and trust (entrusting ourselves to the finished work of Christ for our sins), but also knowledge (which entails our intellect).

<sup>4</sup> Despite the fact that *evidential* apologetics has fallen out of favor in certain Christian circles in our day, the Bible clearly employs this strategy in both Testaments. See my two papers, "How Did the Early Church Grow?" and "The Pervasive Employment of Apologetics in the Bible," both of which can be accessed, together with all my writings, at my website: [www.christianityontheoffense.com](http://www.christianityontheoffense.com).

<sup>5</sup> See both my essays, "Truth Can Never Be Less than One," and "Truth is Falling Everywhere *Except*."

<sup>6</sup> The YEC position doesn't depend on scientific evidence to support its position while OCC, by contrast, does.

<sup>7</sup> See my paper, "Romans 1:18-20."

<sup>8</sup> See my paper, "Was the Big Bang the Big Beginning?"

<sup>9</sup> I don't deny that certain scientists who are committed to materialism seek to escape this reality. Yet they can only do so by evading the hard scientific data in favor of abstract speculations that cannot be grounded in empirical knowledge. (Ibid).

<sup>10</sup> See my paper, "Only the Big Bang Reconciles Genesis 1:1 with the Rest of Genesis 1 (And Everything Else as Well!)"

Once it is granted, in agreement with the Apostle Paul's words in Romans 1:18-20 (see also Isaiah 40:22, 26, and Psalm 19:1) that the testimony of nature is a truthful indicator of the majesty of God, then OCCs cannot remain silent about the particulars of the evidence of nature which point to His "*eternal power and deity*" (Rom. 1:19). For an OCC to settle for employing the *abstract* statement that "*the facts of science 'prove'*<sup>11</sup> *there is a God,*" will almost certainly be perceived by the secularist to mean the tenets of YEC, that is to say, that the earth we created only about ten thousand years ago, and that, prior to the stars and galaxies which scientific instruments, to the contrary, can document to have been expanding for nearly 14 billion years.

As long as an alleged case for

1. It remains a mere abstraction and consequently poses no intellectual leverage for believing in creation. An allegation severed from concrete evidence remains merely an allegation.