YOU've no doubt heard the hubbub. Supposedly, the ancient Mayans predicted that the world would end on December 21, 2012, at 11 p.m. A recent poll found that “nearly 10% of people believe that the year 2012 on the Mayan calendar signifies an apocalyptic collapse” (“New Mayan...,” 2012). What is one to make of such claims? How concerned ought we to be?

In reality, the only reliable source of information concerning end-time events is the Bible. It is, in fact, the only book on the planet of divine origin (cf. Burnett, 2007). All other books that claim to be from the one true God do not bear up under objective scrutiny. Only the Bible possesses the attributes of inspiration. Only the Bible can provide humans with accurate insight into the future. That being the case, one would hardly expect a pagan, idolatrous civilization to serve as a legitimate source for ascertaining the truth regarding the end of the world.

So what does the Bible say on the matter? Throughout the thousands of years of human history, bona fide representatives of the one true God frequently predicted future events with complete accuracy. The Old Testament is filled with prophecy and prediction concerning a host of historical occurrences—all of which came true as predicted (cf. Thompson, 2003). In stark contrast, however, the Bible goes out of its way to avoid setting a date for the end of the world. In fact, Jesus stated unequivocally the truth on the matter: “But of that day and hour no one knows, not even the angels of heaven, but My Father only” (Matthew 24:36, emp. added).

The Mayan Calendar

S
SO what are the specific details surrounding the Mayan calendar? One must turn to the experts—the scholars who have spent their lives studying Mayan civilization. The fact is that they speak with one accord. The 2012 hype comes—not from the studied authorities of Mayan civilization—but, as noted by Susan Gillespie, University of Florida anthropologist, “from media and from other people making use of the Maya past to fulfill agendas that are really their own” (MacDonald, 2007). Maya archaeoastronomer and curator of the Florida Museum of Natural History, Susan Millbrath, explained: “It would be impossible [that] the Maya themselves would have known” (MacDonald). What’s more, she says, “we have no record or knowledge that they would think the world would come to an end at that particular time (emp. added).”

The facts of the matter are that December 21, 2012 on the Mayan Long Count calendar is simply the day that the calendar will go to what scholars call the next “b’ak’tun” or cycle. Sandra Noble, executive director of the Mesoamerican research organization FAMSI, noted that “for the ancient Maya, it was a huge celebration to make it to the end of a whole cycle” (“The Long...,” n.d.). Hence, she considers the alleged December 2012 hoopla to be “a complete fabrication and a chance for a lot of people to cash in” (“The Long...”). The Mayan calendar simply shows the ancient Mayans’ fascination with ongoing “cycles of time”—with no specific indication that they even entertained the notion of the end of the world (Vance, 2012). Further, scholars have just recently discovered wall writings in Guatemala show Mayan calendars that go well beyond 2012 (Vegano, 2012; Porter, 2012).

Nothing New

I NEED, such sensational allegations are not new. Legion are the instances over the last 2,000 years in which individuals and groups have set “firm” dates for the end of the world. Consider a few. [NOTE: The following is taken from “Library of Date Setters...,” n.d.] Events leading up to the year A.D. 1000 were viewed by many as harbingers of the end. These included a solar eclipse in 968 that created panic in the German army of Emperor Otto I and Hailey’s Comet in 983. The decade preceding January 1, 1000 saw people giving their worldly goods to the poor, pilgrims massing in Jerusalem to meet Jesus, buildings left in disrepair, fields unplanted, and even criminals released from jails. Thirty years later, the approach of A.D. 1053 was believed by many to be the onset of the millennium, since they thought it marked 1,000 years since the crucifixion of Christ. A terrible famine struck France in 1030, together with an eclipse and a massive earthquake the same year, convincing many of an imminent end, eliciting penitential processes, including a mass pilgrim-age to Jerusalem.

To Londoners in 1666, the end of the world must have seemed self-evident. In addition to the bubonic plague, which killed some 100,000 people, the Great Fire of London swept the city the same year. Since 1666 was a millennium, 1,000 years coupled with the mark of the beast (666), many were firmly convinced the end was near. In 1843, William Miller attracted much attention and many followers when he announced the return of Christ between 1843 and 1844. Though a spectacular meteor shower in 1833 was seen as a harbinger, the predicted date of March 21, 1843 passed without incident. In 1910, the return of Hailey’s Comet was again seen by some to be an indication of the end. Impetus was gained when the Earth actually passed through the comet’s gaseous tail. Charles Tate Susc, along with the establishment of the Jehovah’s Witnesses and the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society, commenced an end-times movement that has repeatedly set the time of the end, the first in 1914—with many to follow. With each failure, recalculations are made, and the prejadiction adjusted accordingly.

Circumstances surrounding the formal establishment of the modern state of Israel in May of 1948 unleashed a flood of endless predictions, speculations, and allegations that continue to this day—all claiming the end is near. These include Hal Lindsey (Late Great Planet Earth, 1970); Ron Reese (“In the Twinkling of an Eye”), Moses Davis (“The Children of God”); the True Light Church; Walter Simon (“The Day of the Lord, 1978,” The Final Warning...”).
Lord is coming. But know this, that if the master of the house had known in what part of the night the thief was coming, he would have stayed awake and would not have let his house be broken into. Therefore you also must be ready, for the Son of Man is coming at an hour you do not expect (Matthew 24:42-44, emp. added). Why? Jesus said, “For as the lightning comes from the east and flashes to the west, so also will the coming of the Son of Man be” (Matthew 24:27). Similarly, when God brings about the end of time, no one will have any input from any other human to know of it in advance; the end will be so cataclysmic that it will be evident to all (2 Thessalonians 1:7-10).

While the world may well end this year— it will not be due to the Mayan calendar or any other calendar being prophetic it knows. But do not take the scholar’s words for the truth about the Bible or Mayan calendar. Just wait until 11:00 p.m. December 21 to see for yourself. When the alleged end fails to materialize, rather than breathe a sigh of relief and go on your merry way, you would do well to turn to the Bible for the unchanging truth and solid Rock of God’s Word. We are again reminded of the unending words of the Savor of the world in His assessment of His return: “Therefore, stay awake, for you do not know on what day your Lord is coming. But know this, that if the master of the house had known in what part of the night the thief was coming, he would have stayed awake and would not have let his house be broken into. Therefore you also must be ready, for the Son of Man is coming at an hour you do not expect” (Matthew 24:42-44, emp. added). Why? Jesus said, “For as the lightning comes from the east and flashes to the west, so also will the coming of the Son of Man be” (Matthew 24:27).
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The laws of nature have been discovered through extensive scientific investigation—gathering mounds and mounds of evidence, all of which has proven consistently to point towards creation. They are, by definition, a concluding statement that has been drawn from the scientific evidence, and therefore, are in keeping with the rule of logic known as the Law of Rationality (Hazen, 2005, emp. added). The Law of Rationality can be said to be “scientific,” it is the laws of science, and to hold to a view or theory that contradicts the laws of science is, by definition, irrational, since such a theory would contradict the evidence from science.

The laws of science explain how things work in nature at all times—without exception. The McGraw-Hill Dictionary of Scientific and Technical Terms defines a scientific law as “a regularity which applies to all members of a broad class of phenomena” (2003, p. 1182, emp. added). Notice that the writers use the word “all” rather than “some” or “even” or “many.” There are no exceptions to a law of science. Wherever a law is applicable, it has been found to be without exception.

Evolutionists endorse wholeheartedly the laws of science. Evolutionary geologist Robert Hazen, a researcher at the Carnegie Institution of Washington’s Geophysical Lab, who graduated with a Ph.D. from Harvard, in his lecture series on the origin of life, states, “In this lecture series, I make an assumption that life emerged—[M] from basic raw materials through a sequence of events that was completely consistent with the laws of natural chemistry and physics” (Hazen, 2005, emp. added). Even on something as unfounded as postulating the origin of life from non-life—a proposition which flies in the face of all scientific evidence to the contrary—evolutionists do not wish to set out to calling such a phenomenon an exception to the laws of nature. After all, there are no exceptions to the laws of science. They hope, without evidence, that their claims will prove to be in keeping with some elusive, hitherto undiscovered, scientific evidence in the future that will be “completely consistent with the natural laws.” [Note: Such an approach is the equivalent of brushing aside the mounds of evidence for the existence of gravity in order to develop a theory that asserts that tomorrow, all humanity will start levitating up from the surface of the Earth, Science has already spoken on that matter, and to postulate such a theory would be unscientific. It would go against the evidence from science. Similarly, science has already spoken on the matter of life from non-life, and shown that abiogenesis does not occur in nature, according to the Law of Biogenesis (see Miller, 2012), or in the words of Hazen, abiogenesis is “completely inconsistent with the natural laws of chemistry and physics.” And yet he, along with all other atheistic evolutionists, continues to promote evolutionary theory in spite of this crucial piece of evidence to the contrary. Evolutionists believe in the natural laws, even if they fail to concede the import of their implications with regard to atheistic evolution. Richard Dawkins, a world renowned evolutionary biologist and professor of zoology at Oxford University, put his stamp of endorsement on the laws of nature as well. While conjecturing (without evidence) about the possibility of life in outer space, he said, “But that higher intelligence would, itself, have to have come about by some ultimately explicable process. It couldn’t have just jumped into existence spontaneously” (Stein and Miller, 2008). Dawkins admits that life could not pop into existence from non-life. But why? Because that would contradict a well-known and respected law of science that is based on mounds of scientific evidence and that has no exception: the Law of Biogenesis. Of course evolution, which Dawkins wholeheartedly subscribes to, requires abiogenesis, which contradicts the Law of Biogenesis. If evolutionists do not subscribe to the laws of nature, that respects the laws of nature that he cannot bring himself to consciously and openly admit that his theory requires the violation of said law. Self-deception can be a powerful narcotic.

Famous atheist, theoretical physicist, and cosmologist of Cambridge University, Stephen Hawking, highly revere the laws of science as well. In 2011, he hosted a show on Discovery Channel titled, “Hari- osy: Did God Create the Universe?” In that show, he said, “[T]he Universe is a machine governed by principles or laws—laws that can be understood by the human mind. I believe that the discovery of these laws has been mankind’s greatest achievement... But what’s really important is that these laws are universal, as well as being unchangeable. They apply not just to the flight of the ball, but to the motion of a planet and everything else in the Universe. Unlike laws made by humans, the laws of nature cannot ever be broken. That’s why they are so powerful” (“Curiosity...,” 2011, emp. added).

According to Hawking, the laws of nature are “completely consistent (i.e., without exception), and apply to the entire Universe—not just to the Earth. Again, the atheistic evolutionary community believes in the existence of and highly respects the laws of science (i.e., when those laws coincide with the evolutionist’s viewpoints) and would not wish to consciously deny or contradict them. Sadly, they do so, and often, when these laws go against the human’s origin theories. But that admission by the evolutionary community presents a major
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A COMMON quibble laid at the feet of the creationist is that he/she is not qualified to speak about scientific matters relating to the creation/evolution controversy. For instance, Mark Isaak, the editor of <i>The Indes to Creationists</i>, stated that “for every creationist who claims to know anything about science, there is a law like gravity, the universe must have been created by God.”

Just as the evidence says that you cannot have a poem without a poet, a finger print without a finger, or a man-made effect without a cause, a law must be written by someone. But the atheistic community does not believe in the “Someone” Who alone could have written the laws of nature. So the atheist stands in the dark mist of irrationality—holding to a viewpoint that contradicts the evidence. However, the Christian has no qualms with the existence of the laws of nature. They provide no problem or inconsistency every time the Creation model is used. Even the laws of thermodynamics were formally articulated in the 1850s and long before the Law of Biogenesis was formally proven by Louis Pasteur in 1864, the laws of science were written on the stone and set in place to govern the Universe by the Being in Whom we believe. Recall the last few chapters of the book of Job, where God commenced a speech, humbling Job with the awareness that Job’s knowledge and understanding of the workings of the Universe were extremely deficient in comparison with the omniscience and omnipotence of Almighty God. Two of the humbling questions that God posed to Job to ponder were: “Can you know the ordinances [“laws”—ESV] of heaven? Can you set their dominion [“rule”—ESV] over the earth?” (Job 38:33). These were rhetorical questions, and the obvious answer from Job was, “No, Sir.” He could not even know all of the laws, much less could he understand them, and even less could he have written them and established their rule over the Earth. Only a Supreme Being transcendent of the natural Universe would have the power to do such a thing.

According to the Creation model and in keeping with the fact that Supreme Being is the God of the Bible, Who created everything in the Universe in six literal days, only a few thousand years ago. In the words of the 19th-century song writer, Lowell Mason, “Praise the Lord, for He hath spoken; worlds His mighty voice obeyed; laws which never shall be broken, for their guidance He hath made. Hallelujah! Amen” (How- and, 1977, #427).

You don’t need to become a qualified expert in relevant evolutionary subject matters—JL—but you should endeavour to know as much or more about these subjects than your opponent does (which is often a surprisingly easy task, since most creationists learn only the barest superficialities of any given scientific principle before feeling confident enough to pontify casually, otherwise). As do many creationists, Miller has no business speaking out about it and should be silenced (see Butt and Barker, 2009). Even Charles Darwin, the “father of the General Theory of Evolution, only had a degree in theology; having dropped out of the only other field of formal education he at one time pursued—the medical and law professions (Thompson, 1981, p. 104). Based on the standards being imposed by some in the evolutionary community, he had no business speaking out about biology and should not have been taken seriously. And yet his free-lance work as a nurse and lawyer was considered substantial enough to gain him credibility upon writing The Origin of Species. We would argue that his qualifications were irrelevant. He was not the best choice to determine their worth, rather than castigating him for his lack of a science degree. However, in order to be consistent, the evolutionist should scrutinize their own qualifications before attempting to determine their worth, rather than castigating him for his lack of a science degree. It is important to realize that when a person can be considered qualified in a certain topic, they are preferred to speak out about it.

Consider further: should an atheist be required to have credentials in theology in order to speak about God? Should he be required to have a theological degree in order to speak about Jesus? An atheist has no business speaking out about it and should be silenced (see Butt and Barker, 2009). Even Charles Darwin, the “father of the General Theory of Evolution, only had a degree in theology; having dropped out of the only other field of formal education he at one time pursued—the medical and law professions (Thompson, 1981, p. 104). Based on the standards being imposed by some in the evolutionary community, he had no business speaking out about biology and should not have been taken seriously. And yet his free-lance work as a nurse and lawyer was considered substantial enough to gain him credibility upon writing The Origin of Species. We would argue that his qualifications were irrelevant. He was not the best choice to determine their worth, rather than castigating him for his lack of a science degree. However, in order to be consistent, the evolutionist should scrutinize their own qualifications before attempting to determine their worth, rather than castigating him for his lack of a science degree. It is important to realize that when a person can be considered qualified in a certain topic, they are preferred to speak out about it. And yet his free-lance work as a nurse and lawyer was considered substantial enough to gain him credibility upon writing The Origin of Species. We would argue that his qualifications were irrelevant. He was not the best choice to determine their worth, rather than castigating him for his lack of a science degree. However, in order to be consistent, the evolutionist should scrutinize their own qualifications before attempting to determine their worth, rather than castigating him for his lack of a science degree. It is important to realize that when a person can be considered qualified in a certain topic, they are preferred to speak out about it.
whose thoughts and research should be considered and whose should be ignored? Who will be the qualifica-
tions police? Who determines what qualifications the qualifications police-
men must have to declare who is or
is not qualified? And what credentials do those who ordain qualifications police-
men have to have? If scientists were held to such standards, progress toward new
civilizations could never be made, since by
definition, there are no experts in such areas! Thomas Edison received no more
higher education than the average ele-
mentary school student, yet he invented
the light bulb, founded General Electric
Company, and filed 1,093 successful U.S.
patent applications for his inventions.
("Edison’s Patents," 2010). In 1997, the
American Society of Mechanical Engi-
ers saw fit to establish the “Thomas A.
Edison Patent Award” in his honor, again,
in spite of his lack of higher learn
(McKivor, 2010). Sir Isaac New-
ton received a bachelor’s degree, but
without honors or distinction (Hatch,
2002). Should his work be disregarded?
Consider also that his area of study was
mathematics. How was he qualified to
discuss physics, mechanics, dynam
ics, or thermodynamics? Sir Isaac New
ton received a bachelor’s degree, but
did not receive regular high school
education. Most of his education was
received by attending the university.
(Thompson, Bert (1981), “Sir Isaac Newton,”
Men of God: Great Scientists Who Believed
in the Bible, New Leaf Press). Even
Wernher Von Braun, the father of the
space program at NASA, was a strong
believer in God and creation, as well
as Louis Pasteur, the father of biology,
Lord Kelvin, the father of thermody
amics, Sir Isaac Newton, (“Cre-
ation Scientists and Other Specialists
of Interest,” 2010), Creation Min-
isters International posted a list of some 187 scientists alive today (or recently deceased) who believe in the
biblicism. Sir Isaac Newton, (“Cre-
ation Scientists and Other Specialists
of Interest,” 2010), the scientists who
are listed all possess a doctorate in a sci-
cence-related field. Over 90 different sci-
centific fields are represented in the list,
including several types of engineers,
chemists, geneticists, physicists, and
biologists. Astronomers and astrophys-
ics; geologists and geophysicists; phy-
sicians and surgeons; macro-
logical and neurobiologists; paleontologists and zoologists are represented, and
the list goes on. Jerry Bergman amassed a list of over 3,000 names including Nobel Prize win
ners, but, unfortunately, a large num-
ber of persons that could be added, accord-
ing to Bergman. On my list I have well over 3,000
names including Nobel Prize win
ners, but, unfortunately, a large num-
ber of persons that could be added, accord-
ing to Bergman.

As was mentioned above, some evo-
nutionists assert that “there are dozens of
scientists (probably more), all with
far greater professional qualifications
than creationists (Isaak, 2005)—quite
a bold statement, to say the least. It may
be true that most scientists have bought
into the modernist view of evolution, an
case when scientists believed in geo-
centricity, or that blood-letting was an
appropriate prescription for curing all
illnesses, but appealing to these
cases, and using such an argument
cases to one fall victim to yet another
logical fallacy—the ad populum fal-
cacy (i.e., appeal to the majority) (“Fa-
lacies,” 2007). As was mentioned above, some evo-
nutionists assert that “there are dozens of
scientists (probably more), all with
far greater professional qualifications
than creationists (Isaak, 2005)—quite
a bold statement, to say the least. It may
be true that most scientists have bought
into the modernist view of evolution, an
case when scientists believed in geo-
centricity, or that blood-letting was an
appropriate prescription for curing all
illnesses, but appealing to these
cases, and using such an argument
cases to one fall victim to yet another
logical fallacy—the ad populum fal-
cacy (i.e., appeal to the majority) (“Fa-
lacies,” 2007).

Although numbers ultimately mean
thing in regard to truth, creationists
can certainly put an impressive list of
“qualified” scientists who have examined
the scientific evidence and concluded
that the atheistic evolutionary
model is without flaw. (See Keith
Calvin Johnson, the father of modern
astronomy and modern optics, was a
fmr Bible believer. Rob Blosser, a
Bible believer. Samuel F.B. Morse, who
invented Morse Code, was a believer.
certainty of one’s credentials, and the truth
is not how many scientists are standing
on either side of the battle line. Major
ities or “consensus” is not the deciding
factor (c.f. Miller, 2012). The question
is who is speaking the truth? Who is
taking the scientific evidence and draw-
ing reasonable, accurate conclusions
from the facts? The answer is clear to the
untutored observer. Science supports
creation—not evolution.

There is certainly something to be said
about the value of having credentials
and such scientific expertise in one area
in which one is speaking, because that person
will often have a broader perspective about
a subject than the next person. But it is
also true that that person should not be
blindly accepted without critical think
regardless of one’s credentials, the audience
must still consider the validity of the argu-
mation. When all is said and done, the theory—not
the person discussing it—should be the
primary issue. As always, we challenge the audience to disprove our
contentions. Truth will always win. It will set us free.
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New Early Reader Book

Children are naturally curious about their own bodies. “Why do I have two eyes?” “How do my ears work?” “Who made me?” Parents are regularly pummeled with such earnest inquiries. The Bible says that the human body is “fearfully and wonderfully made” (Psalm 139:14). Our bodies were masterfully designed in a way that proves there is a loving, intelligent God. This message simply must be presented to children at an early age in order to impress upon them the reality of the great Ruler of the Universe. One tool to do so is our newly released Early Reader book God Made You. This book helps children understand more about God and the well-designed human body He created.

The Apologetics Press Early Reader Series is a set of books aimed at children in kindergarten through second grade. Depending on the age of your children, this series is flexible enough so that parents may choose to read to their children, read along with their children, or listen while their children read aloud to them. With interesting, understandable text and captivating pictures, your children will fall in love with reading and with their Creator. Don’t forget the other volumes in our Early Reader Series: God Made Animals, God Made Dinosaurs, God Made Fish, God Made Insects, God Made Plants, and God Made the World. And don’t forget our two other reader series—the Learn to Read books as well as our Advanced Readers. Please consider introducing children, grandchildren, nieces, nephews, neighbors, and other youngsters in your acquaintance to these effective volumes.

Dave Miller
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