

[“Is the Cosmological Argument Still Sound?” With Dr. William Lane Craig and Dr. Stephen C. Meyer - YouTube](#)

1:03:48—1:08:34

Accessed 2/12/23; 3/3/24

Frank Turek (moderator) Stephen Meyers and William Lane Craig

The transcript is in black letters while my comments are in red.

The participants use the terms Old Earth Creation (OEC) and Young Earth Creation (YEC), so my comments use the same terms to stay in context. I dislike the term YEC and always use the term Biblical (6 Day) Creation for 2 reasons: 1) the primary point is not the age of the earth, the primary point is the authority of God’s word and that God specifically tells us that everything that exists was spoken into existence out of nothing (Heb. 11:3) in six 24 hour days and each day contained miraculous events, and 2) the Bible clearly states that God created over 6 days (Ex. 20:11) not over millions/billions of years.

This conversation starts at 1:03:48

Turek:

“OK we know this question is coming up, uh, I don’t know which one of you wanna take this, uh, Robert asks, ‘I understand most agree the universe is 13 or so billion years old. There is another argument that the earth is 6,000 years old. Can those two timelines be reconciled?”

(2 seconds of silence)

Turek:

“OK we’re about out of time, ladies and gentlemen”
(Meyers and Turek laugh)

Craig responds:

"NO, I, frankly no

Craig is correct that the two timelines cannot be reconciled. They cannot both be true; one is right, and one is wrong. Most OEC people claim it is a ‘denominational’ disagreement, that both positions are equally valid (Biblical) and it is akin to differing opinions on subjects like pre/post millennial, pre/mid/post tribulation rapture, predestination vs free will, etc. In denominational differences, each side can quote Bible passages that support their conclusion. The OEC vs YEC difference is different: the YEC position comes from the Biblical text, while the OEC position comes from secular science; it is not found anywhere in the Biblical text. Nowhere in the Bible does it say God created over millions of years; nowhere does it say that there was animal death before sin, and nowhere does it say that Noah’s flood was a local event (the 3 main points of OEC).

and I think that the sooner the Christian community gets rid of young earth creationism the better. This is, uh, an embarrassment for the Christian faith

Dr. Craig has declared YEC an embarrassment to Christianity multiple times before.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gq-j16_3F_E

While he is entitled to his opinion, the passionate manner in which he repeatedly makes this statement shows he has no respect for those with differing opinions.

that is creating enormous obstacles to Christian belief among scientifically educated people. Dr. Craig is obviously ignoring (or is ignorant of) the large number of PH. D. scientists that hold the YEC position. By implying that YECs are 'scientifically uneducated' Craig creates an ad hominem type attack on their intelligence in an attempt to shame believers into agreeing with him.

They, the universe is not, ah, and the earth is not 6,000 years old, ah, and there is no reason Biblically to think that it is,

There is very good Biblical reason to think that the earth and universe are 6,000 years old: the straightforward reading of Genesis 1-3 coupled with the genealogies in chapters 5, 10, 11, and Matthew Chapter 1 are clear. Dr. Craig is also speaking out of ignorance of all the observational scientific evidence that supports a young earth and universe. In a debate he would be required to present evidence for these claims, but since he is giving his opinion with like-minded panelists he makes no attempt to support his claims.

ah, and therefore we need to really shed ourselves of this as a Christian community.

I believe the exact opposite: the sooner we rid ourselves of OEC thinking the stronger the Christian community will become. Many of the Christian 'deconversion' testimonies I have heard happen because they finally learned "the science" (Millions of Years/Evolution), which is the same 'science' that OECs advocate.

Steve, what do you think?"

Meyers responds:

"Well, I, sometimes, when talking to people that have been raised with this belief, who have a very high view of scripture which I know you and I both share,

A high view of scripture would be that it is inerrant, infallible, and sufficient in conjunction with 2 Timothy 3:16,17. Craig, Meyers and Turek all seem to forget that when they deal with Genesis and engage in the errant hermeneutic of eisegesis (forcing their own ideas into the meaning of the text) rather than exegesis (extracting or drawing out the meaning from the text), which is the common approach of all OECs. It is my conclusion that all OECs need a refresher course in basic hermeneutics. All their 'Biblical' arguments violate the standard rules of hermeneutics (most notably context and exegesis not eisegesis). Dr. Jason Lisle has pointed out that all OEC arguments are circular (begging the question) because they generally use the presuppositions of uniformitarianism and naturalism in constructing their age estimates. Of course, these presuppositions are contrary to Scripture, so any argument based on them has tacitly assumed that the biblical timescale is wrong, to then conclude that the biblical timescale is wrong. They are using the presuppositions of secular science to interpret the text (eisegesis), as clearly shown by OEC Hugh Ross in his conversation w/Eric Hovind of Creation Today.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rkpN_C-mRek&t=4697s
start at 1:24:46—1:25:42

I'll take them to the day 4 part of the creation account in Genesis 1, because my view is, has long been that the Bible does not teach a young earth, ah, because when you get to that passage in day 4 we learn that God either created or caused to appear the sun and the moon and they were given as markers of the days and the seasons. The Hebrew verb there is 'hayah' which can mean either created from nothing or caused to appear, but either way, we, God has already established the days of creation, the 'yoms' of creation, and we don't have

any way of measuring time from a human point of view in the day 1, day 2, day 3 as those days are being established.

This is blatantly incorrect. On day 1 God creates light, calls the light day (a secondary definition of yom), and then declares there was evening and morning the first day (the primary definition of yom). OECs tend to gloss over the words evening and morning and flippantly disregard their distinctive definitions (evening = dusk, a covering of darkness, morning =dawn, the break of day) and instead claim them as indicators of a beginning and ending to an indeterminate period of time. From a human point of view, evening and morning is an unmistakable description of a 24-hour day, and a very clear method of measuring time. This method of describing a 24-hour day continues in the exact same manner AFTER day 4 as it did in the previous 3 days, so there is no hermeneutical reason to think anything is different after the sun, moon and stars are given as markers of days, seasons, and years. Time was already in existence before the celestial bodies were created to mark (or govern) the time. In other words, all 6 creation days are described the exact same way with evening and morning = a day, therefore they are all the same. God created light itself and established the 24-hour day in Gen 1:3-4, even though he does not tell us what the light source was. The light source was obviously NOT the sun, because the sun was not created until day 4. Can God do that? Revelations 22:5 tells us that there will be no need for the sun because God will be (provide) the light in the new heavens and earth. If He can provide light without the sun in the end time He can provide light in the beginning of time as He clearly told us he did. Many make the mistake of thinking that you cannot have a 24-hour day without the sun, but days are actually determined by the rotation of the earth on its axis, not by the source of light. God created light first and separated it from the darkness so that evening and morning (due to the earth's rotation) could be understood from a human point of view from the beginning.

So there is a very good Bible scholar at Covenant Seminary, Jack Collins, who is often been asked the question, "Are the days of creation old Hugh Ross days or are they young Ken Ham days" if people are familiar with the figures in the debate, and he says "Neither, they are days of indeterminate length from a human point of view." The days were established before there were ways, a way of, of, of keeping time from a human point of view.

This is the same faulty argument repeated, only this time with a faulty appeal to authority. I know of a very good Bible scholar at Westminster Theological Seminary named Jonathon Gibson, who says all OEC arguments are wrong and that Genesis 1 clearly describes six 24 hour days.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9q9UotUUZ50&list=PLRI_cvqk1-RnlbPaMt8aOvpqgE6_tp1gx

Again, evening and morning are a valid method of expressing (keeping) time from a human point of view.

We keep time with the movement of the sun across the ecliptic or the movement, the, the, phases of the moon on a monthly basis. Those time markers were not present when God established those days

The celestial bodies were not present, but there was light (from an unknown source) and the normal day cycle (evening and morning) consistent across all 6 days of creation. God confirms this in Ex. 20:11 where He makes an apples-to-apples comparison between the work week of man and the 'work week' of creation. Meyers actually destroys his own argument by appealing to the astronomical methods of measuring time: a year is measured by how long it takes the earth to go around the sun; a month is measured by the moon going through its phases; and a day is measured by a full rotation of the earth on its axis (not by a light source).

and so it's really impossible, I think, to impose on the Genesis account our ideas of time and we net, we need to be careful about, uh, uh, about doing that

Yes, I agree that the unbiblical and secular idea of millions of years should not be imposed on the Genesis account. All three panelists should heed his caution here.

and also means that if we want to get the temporal questions answered we really do need to look to the scientific evidence,

The 24-hour question is answered by the authority of God's word, and the observational scientific evidence is consistent with this conclusion. There is no need for modern science to help us understand Genesis 1.

and as Bill said I also agree that the evidence is very compelling for a very old earth and, uh, a very old universe.

This ignores all of the scientific evidence for a young earth/universe, such as short-term comets, the decay of the earth's magnetic field, C14 in diamonds and coal deposits, soft tissues in dinosaur bones, etc.

I'm sympathetic to the view that, um, that cognitively advanced, anatomically uh, modern man is a fairly recent vintage, however, and I think that's another question. I think we can't tell the history of the human race without also looking at the archaeology as well as bones on the African savannah so I think there are some issues there to wrestle with yet."

Again, he is practicing the bad hermeneutic of eisegesis over exegesis by placing the claims of modern evolutionary science over the authority of God's word about the human race. This is a high view of secular science, not a high view of scripture, which he claimed to have earlier. This again illustrates how the presupposition of millions of years determines how he interprets the Bible.

Turek says:

"Someone should write a book about the Biblical Adam" and laughs (he is referencing Craig's recently published book "In Quest of the Historical Adam")

"John Lennox makes a point on this,

Another faulty appeal to authority. Lennox has doctoral degrees in philosophy and mathematics, not any field of science or Hebrew texts, so he is speaking outside his field of expertise. Lennox once stated about his friend and colleague Stephen Hawking, "Non-sense is still non-sense even when spoken by world-famous scientists." This clearly applies to Lennox in this case.

ah, where he says that the first verse of the Bible leaves the age of the universe indeterminate, because it says "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" and uh, if you want to take a hyper-literalistic view of that verse, the heavens and the earth are created before the days ever begin,"

Gen 1:1-5 are all part of day one. This is a version of the fully discredited Gap Theory, where the claim is made that there is a gap of time between Genesis 1:1 and Genesis 1:2 to allow for millions/billions of years. The use of the Hebrew waw disjunctive eliminates this possibility and requires that Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 be read together, with v.2 providing detailed information about v.1. Besides, we don't take a "hyper-literalistic view" of any verse, we just read and understand it in the normal, straight forward manner called the historical-grammatical approach (taking into account literary style, context, authorship, etc.).

Meyers: "Exactly"

Turek: "so, it is indeterminate even from that perspective. I understand why people try and, and add everything up and say it's 6, 6,000 years old, but I remember when Dr. Richard Howe was asking, who happened to be a young earther himself, asked Ken Ham at the SCS, one of the SCS uh, apologetic conferences, Why do you think from scripture that the earth goes around the sun and not the other way around

The Bible speaks about scientific things in general terms and does not give those kinds of scientific details because it is not a detailed science book. This is a good thing, because if it was a detailed science book, it would have to be re-written every year or 2 just like science textbooks are because our scientific understanding of the world changes that often!

because you're using, uh, you're using the 2 books God has written. Yes, you're using the Bible but you're also using the book of nature

This is the fallacy of reification because nature is not a book. Nature is the general revelation of God to man while the Bible is special (specific) revelation to man. Yes, there is much to be learned about God's creation from studying the physical world, and we have learned many specific things from that study. However, if what we learn from the physical world seems to conflict with God's special revelation (the Bible), we can be sure we don't quite have the science correct yet because God's physical world will never contradict his written revelation to us. God knows the science of what he did at creation and our observations or experiences will never overturn the truth of God's Word.

and the book of nature re, enables you to understand what the Bible means you, you, you, wouldn't even know what the Bible meant unless you knew certain things about nature

If Turek is implying the Bible cannot be understood without understanding 'modern science' then all the Old Testament authors and prophets, the apostle Paul, the disciples, the early church fathers, and even Jesus Himself would not have been able to understand the Bible because they knew nothing of today's modern science.

like laws of cause and effect for one thing, or language, or many other things you need to know 'prologama' before you can do theology. Anyway, uh, John Lennox's book "7 Days That Divide the World" might be a good book to get for you, Robert, if you wanna go a little bit further in that, but you heard the kinda wishy-washy uh, uh, opinions of our guests here on that" (Craig laughs) "You can go little bit further if you like."