

## **How far have we fallen?**

by Adrian C.

Many Young-Earth Creationists make the claim that, due to the fall, mans understanding has been darkened and no human can properly and accurately interpret the natural world. Commonly we hear statements such as "scientists can't be trusted" because they have a "fallible methodology" that has been tainted by the fall. How are we to respond to such views?

I think the best way to respond to this view is to turn it on its head. Logically, if we humans are so fallen in our mental powers that we cant interpret nature, then how can we have confidence in our ability to accurately interpret the Bible? How can we trust any of our interpretations at all? A common way to respond to this is to suggest that this "darkness" is lifted when one becomes a Christian and that Christians can properly interpret the Bible. This escape attempt fails because many Christians believe in an old earth and reject young-earth views. Still, some argue that old-earth creationists are not "true" Christians. However, this does not work either because Christians from all denominations say the same thing to those who disagree with their doctrine. Thus it forces one into the irrational position that unless a person has proper doctrine and interpretation of scripture, he/she is not a Christian.

The problem is actually worse then that. If humans have such a fallen nature, then how can we trust non-Christian doctors to properly treat us? How can we trust architects to build stable structures? How can we trust teachers at school to teach our children mathematics and physics? The reality is, if our nature is so fallen that we cant understand the natural world, then we cant properly understand anything about anything! Thus it makes no sense to claim that humans can't interpret the natural world because, when that claim is made, the same logic applies in every situation including to the one making that statement. And if we can't trust his logic, how can we take such views seriously?

Many young-earth creationists suggest that old-earth creationism compromises the integrity of the Bible. They say that old-earth Christians are attempting to marry the secular science with the Bible. But I would argue that it is the other way around. Young-earth proponents are the ones who resort to suggesting that all scientists cant be trusted in order to deliver them from the findings of modern science. It is the young-earth creationists who suggest massive conspiracy theories to explain the acceptance of old-earth views in the sciences. And it is the young-earth creationists who suggest that there were different laws of physics and that science operated differently in the past. It would seem to me that they are so committed to their interpretation of scripture that they are unwilling to consider the possibility that they could be mistaken. Thus, they view their own opinions as being scripture, and in doing so, they themselves reinterpret science to fit their own views at any cost. In short, they attempt to force science to fit their interpretation of scripture and thus commit the same error that they charge old-earth proponents of committing. But

logic tells us that if general revelation can be trusted, then we can trust that the natural world will reveal the creator to us in such a way as to not contradict the correct interpretation of scripture.