

History and Bible

Ancient Man

Neanderthal
99.5% Human

Who was Nimrod?

The Tower of Babel

Clay City Pottery



"Uncle Neando"

Volume One: Chapter Two

September 7th, 2009

History and Bible

New!

Online Subscription

Now Available

Only \$3 a year!

Chapters viewable as Adobe PDF
documents in original form,
complete with extras and photos!

www.History-and-Bible.yolasite.com

History and Bible

Feature Photo



Streams of Living Water Flowing from the Rock

Psalm 78:16

**He brought streams also out of the rock,
and caused waters to run down like rivers.**

Ancient Man

Ancient man and his civilization may be buried deep under the ground we now stand on, but that does not mean that we cannot know anything about him. Even opening our Bible's to the the very first book, itself a remnant passed down from our ancient forefathers, we find information on this shadowy topic. Here we see the origin of much of what we now know: sin, anger, jealousy, pride, murder, tyranny, religion—even the beginnings of agriculture, animal husbandry, tent-making, metal-working, music, and clothing design. Everything worked itself out from these first men, children and descendants of Adam, the first ever man.

From the very beginning of ancient civilization, right after the fall, we see the effects of sin. So much is beginning at this time—even God is establishing a sacrificial system with correct and incorrect methods (as established in the story of Cain and Abel, Genesis chapter four) designed to specifically lead up to the Messiah, the Lamb of God. But, even immediately, Satan begins to counteract all the work of God. Sin spreads through mankind like poison through veins. Distrust goes against faith, pride against humility, hate against love, polygamy against monogamy, self against simple obedience, tyranny against justice, wrong against right. Pleasure, power, and pride begin to seep into and poison society, becoming tools to lift man up and leading to idolatry. Everything is falling apart and building up at the same time.

Civilization may be becoming more advanced and the arts and skills more refined, but sin is spreading and lifespans are decreasing. Skills and arts are put to evil purposes, used to glorify man or idols. Men try to take over the world, even issuing decrees for supposed divine protection (as Lamech did after murdering a young man, Genesis chapter four), and eventually we see the emergence of nations with kings who claim to be God (such as Egypt, for example). There is even a pattern to be observed here:

1. There are no consequences, and there is no supreme ruler; I can do whatever I want

2. Survival of the fittest, and he who conquers rules; I am on top without competition
3. There is no God, and no one to stop me; I must be god

(I don't believe in any supreme God → I am the most powerful → I must be god)

Here we see the development of tyrannical thought—man being lifted up to the point that he is on top and has the supposed right to do whatever he wants or, basically, to be god. So man becomes god, with each ruler a king of the gods (rather like Zeus), and the other men as variously ranking lesser gods. “Self” is worshipped. But God is not made in man's image; we are made in His.

Besides all this, we can assume that civilization was developing and advancing quite rapidly, and, with lifespans and likely child-bearing periods roughly ten times their modern counterparts, that the population was growing at a similar rate. These were no small groups of primitive ape-men wandering around with little intelligence and sophistication. Even just about 1,500 years after the creation, Noah had the means to create the gargantuan ark that was longer than a football field and three stories high. And not long after the flood, mankind gathered together to build a tower that would reach to the heavens—they must have had significant technology to have even considered such an idea! This is a far cry from the millions of years of development taught by evolution. Better yet, all those old stories of highly developed ancient civilizations now lost—sometimes buried underwater—finally make sense!

So we see, in the end, that ancient man had a highly developed civilization. It is from these first people that we get so much of what we have now. Government, culture, arts, religions, even the different races (starting with the dispersion of nations, Genesis chapter eleven)—it all comes from them. Some things we may want to thank them for, others we hate them for. It is important, however, to always remember that anything good we may perceive as coming from them (such as metal-working or music) really originates with God. He is the ultimate Giver, and our praise and thanks should always be upon His ears.†

Who was Nimrod?

Krysta Denzer

Nimrod the Mighty One

Out of all the men listed in the tenth chapter of Genesis, the name of Nimrod seems to stand out more than all the others. Nimrod was a “mighty hunter before the Lord,” a “mighty one in the earth,” who founded Sumer in Babylonia and instigated the Tower of Babel.¹ But what does all this mean? Who was Nimrod, really?

The name Nimrod means “the rebel” or “let us rebel,” so it seems unlikely that he was righteous and in favor with the Lord; he appears to have been bred and raised for rebellion, in the shadow of his rebellious grandfather Ham. Also, when we read that Nimrod was “a mighty hunter before the Lord,” we should note that this means not that he was a mighty hunter in the favor of the Lord, but that he was rather a hunter *against* the Lord, perhaps even seeking to usurp Yahweh's position by attempting to come “before” Him in rank.²

The Hebrew phrase used to describe Nimrod as a “mighty one” is the same as that used to describe the “mighty men” of Genesis 6:4.³ These “mighty men,” these “men of renown,” were the giants or Nephilim produced between the “sons of God” and the “daughters of men”. So it would appear that Nimrod was at least similar to these Nephilim. However, this knowledge does us little good unless we know who the Nephilim were. In light of this, I wish to suggest that these mighty men of renown, and indeed even the “sons of God” themselves, were tyrannical rulers claiming divinity for themselves.

Divine Kingship

Divine kingship, in which an all-powerful ruler declares himself to be either the god, the god's son, or the god's earthly representative, was very common among the ancients. Such systems existed all across the ancient world, in Egypt, Babylonia, Sumer, and Palestine. It was a belief system that told the

people that they were created to serve the gods, and which thus held them in bondage and servitude to the king they believed was the son of God, a sort of god in human form. So they were the property of the king, and he was free to do whatsoever he wished with them.⁴

But what evidence is there that the “sons of God” and the “mighty men of renown” were such “divine” kings, claiming godship for themselves? The first evidence is the pattern that we already see developed in the early chapters of Genesis, the pattern of rebellion against God. We see this with Cain, who refused to follow God's will regarding the manner of sacrifice but sought to create his own sacrificial system. This is continued with Lamech, who arrogantly issued his own type of divine decree, his protection for himself, that “if Cain shall be avenged sevenfold, truly Lamech seventy and seven fold.” Cain's protection had been issued by God, and Lamech had no right to issue such divine protection for himself. Besides this, Lamech also rebelled against God by taking two wives, thus starting his own marital system of polygamy.

So we see clearly that pride already was prominent, causing men to lift up themselves while disobeying God. Their pride of life was also accompanied by the lust of the flesh and of the eyes, by the desire for pleasure and for power. These three characteristics, when combined, make a wonderful recipe for self-worship, for worshiping mankind in place of God (see the article “Ancient Man” for greater detail on this). In fact, some scholars even translate “then began men to call upon the name of the Lord” from Genesis 4:26 as “then men began to call themselves by the name of Jehovah.”⁵

In light of these things, the “sons of God” could indeed have claimed to be just that—the sons of God. In a rather ironic manner, scripture could almost sarcastically be giving them the name that they claim, though their claim would be far from the truth. Genesis 6:3 humbles this claim as God points out that He will “not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh.” In other words, despite arrogance and claims to divinity, man is yet nothing but flesh. The

Hebrew phrase used here for the “sons of God” also implies that, rather than being strictly “sons,” the description may refer to beings of the *class* of god(s). (For example, a nobleman could be called a son of nobility.) If this is the case, then the “sons of God” are clearly those who claim to be divine.⁴

We also read in Genesis 6:2 that the “sons of God” “took them wives of all which they chose.” This, too, fits perfectly with the description of a tyrannical divine king. Scripture itself tells several accounts in which kings did this; the stories of Sarah and Esther, both taken by kings, are just two of these accounts. The Genesis 6:4 description of the children of these “sons of God” as being “mighty men which were of old, men of renown,” also fits with the divine kingship model, for the sons of such men would certainly have had plentiful opportunity for such greatness.

Unlikelihood of the “Sons of God” being Non-Human

Although some believe that the “sons of God” refer to either angels or a specific, non-angelic group of heavenly “lesser gods” of pagan and idolatrous type (and that it is these whom the pagans worship), these theories pose little harm to my argument. For, firstly, the usual understanding from scripture seems to be that the gods of the pagans are demonic, fallen angels leading men into idolatry and away from God. Secondly, why would God create a whole class of lesser “gods” if He did not want us to worship them (which He clearly doesn't)? It makes no sense that He would have deliberately created false gods. And if you wish to say that these “lesser gods” were only intended to glorify God, and not to be worshipped themselves, then is that not the purpose of the angels? Are not gods for worshipping?

Besides all of that, how would any such heavenly beings (either angels or something else), presumably spirit beings, have produced children with mankind? That makes no sense. Some claim that the “sons of God” could not have been humans because, in their view, humans are incapable of producing giants as Genesis 6:4 appears to say that these beings did. However, Jude 1:6, a

verse often used in support of the angels as the “sons of God,” in fact makes the view illogical. The verse says that the angels which “kept not their first estate” (supposedly those angels that reproduced with mankind) were “reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.” But, if the mention of not keeping the first estate is truly a reference to angels leaving their heavenly spirit world for sexual relations with mankind, would God not have given the stated punishment immediately, at about the same time as the flood? And if God did this (and the giant-producing angels were thus unable to reproduce any longer with mankind), then how were the giants (such as Goliath) of the early days of Israel produced? Also, the Bible tells us that all humans are descendants of Adam and Eve, all of “one blood”.⁶ Scripture makes no mention of any sort of angelic or other interbreeding.

As for the ability of mankind to produce giants, we can easily say that man originally began with much greater genetic potential. (This is similar to the fact that a mixed-breed dog has greater genetic potential than a very fine-bred dog. For example, a dog whose mother had long ears and whose father had short ones would have the genetic potential of either type of ear, whereas a dog parented by two short-eared dogs would be unlikely to manifest anything but short ears.) Around the world we can see evidence of this—fossils not only of pygmy men (and a few of these still living), but also of men with giant stature. To be sure, mankind could have produced giants. And, in any case, the argument that the “sons of God” were some sort of heavenly or spirit being certainly does not mean that they and their children could not have been “divine” kings setting themselves pridefully up to take the position of God. The pagan gods do this anyway, and this is also what Lucifer attempted.

Origin of Divine Kingship

Divine kingship must have had an origin, some point in time when it first began. It also must have had some cause and basis, and there certainly must have been a reason why the people tolerated its tyranny. Perhaps, as I will

suggest, it all has its basis in a terrible perversion of the truth.

The Bible tells us that mankind was originally in commune with God (before the fall), and thus it is not unreasonable to suppose that man at this time had knowledge, writings, and traditions of God, much as we have today in our Bible. Much of this, however, must have been corrupted, twisted into false religions and wickedness. It is not unreasonable to say that the claim to divine kingship and “son-or-representative-of-God-ship” was based upon knowledge of the future Son and representative of God. Indeed, even the very first chapters of Genesis hint at the coming Messiah. And what better way for a power-hungry rebel against God to win over and control the people than by claiming that he was the son of God, the promised Messiah? Little did these first “divine” kings understand that the true Messiah was not to be loved, followed, served, and idolized, but to be hated, scorned, mocked, and eventually crucified. And, not surprisingly, their version of the story of the son of God would also be different. Their story would raise up themselves as the giver of absolutes, and would glorify wrong in the place of right.

Actually, the very first “divine” king may have appeared outwardly righteous. This is the case with many in this modern world who claim to be Christ or a Christian. Such an early king could have fooled people into believing that he was the Messiah by his outward righteousness. But how easy it would be, once the people were firmly in control, to change that righteousness to wickedness! After all, who would go against the king that they all believed was the son of God?

And yet, somehow, a righteous remnant remained, despite the wickedness of mankind. Noah was the remnant, and it was his family that God graciously preserved, though even they were far from perfect, to continue the human race. But, only shortly after the flood, divine kingship was started again. We see the first mention of this with Nimrod.

Nimrod a Divine King

The Bible tells us that Nimrod was indeed a king, for Genesis 10:10 speaks of “the beginning of his kingdom”. We are told that he was the founder of “Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar.” Shinar is Babylon, or Babylonia, and this is the same location as that of ancient Sumer, the kingdom of city-states of which he appears to be the founder. We are also told within the next few verses that he went from these lands into Assyria and built Nineveh, Rehoboth-ir, Calah, and Resen. (The King James Version seems to say that it was a certain Asshur who built these last cities, but most other versions read that it was Nimrod.)

In addition to the knowledge of the various kingdoms and cities which he began, we can also know with fair certainty—based on the comparison to the Nephilim and “sons of God” in Genesis 6, and also on the knowledge of the common practice of ancient kings—that Nimrod claimed divinity. His pride and rebellion shows clearly in the rally call of the Tower of Babel, “Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.”⁷ He is clearly in opposition to God, and the tower reaching into heaven seems to convey a desire to exalt oneself on high and perhaps even to control heaven and earth.

So we see that Nimrod must have been very influential, powerful, and certainly famous. Not only does he have Babylon, Sumer, and Nineveh to his name, but he also instigated one of the most famous building projects in the history of the world. And, in addition to this, he even had his own proverb, as stated in Genesis 10:9, “Even as Nimrod the mighty hunter before the Lord.”

Such a man as described above would likely have become the subject of many great tales and legends. The Epic of Gilgamesh, as described by Dr. David Livingstone, is one such tale. “It is a well-known tale, common in Sumerian literature, of a man who fits the description. In addition to the Sumerians, the

Babylonians wrote about this person; the Assyrians likewise; and the Hittites. Even in Palestine, tablets have been found with this man's name on them. He was obviously the most popular hero in the Ancient Near East.”⁸

In reading the Epic of Gilgamesh, one cannot help but notice the apparent similarities between Gilgamesh, king of Uruk, and Nimrod. Both are arrogant, powerful, mighty hunters and warriors, and both claim divinity. The Tower of Babel call to “make us a name” is echoed by Gilgamesh when he says, “I will set up my name in the place where the names of famous men are written.”⁹ Gilgamesh even seems to have lived only shortly after the flood recorded in this Epic (just as Nimrod lived on shortly after the Genesis flood), for he speaks of the flood's survivor as his father (though not in the most literal, father-son sense). But the greatest evidence for identifying Nimrod with Gilgamesh is that Erech, one of the cities which Nimrod founded, is considered to be the same as the Uruk of Gilgamesh.^{10, 11}

With these similarities making it possible to identify the two men with each other, what light can the Epic of Gilgamesh shed on the likely character of Nimrod? Well, firstly, the Epic clearly describes Gilgamesh as taking wives of whosoever he wished, further strengthening the link between Nimrod and the “sons of God” who did the same. Secondly, the character Enkidu describes Gilgamesh in this manner: “He [Enlil, father of the gods] has given you power to bind and to loose, to be the darkness and the light of mankind. He has given you unexampled supremacy over the people, victory in battle from which no fugitive returns, in forays and assaults from which there is no going back.”⁹ This description most certainly speaks of divine kingship and tyranny, and the strength and power described is similar to that of Nimrod in Genesis 10. So we see that he must have had complete control over the people of his kingdom.

Nimrod is also identified with many other various heroes and gods of different cultures. Some identify him with king Ninus, the legendary founder of Nineveh and supposed son of the god Belus or Baal.¹² In this case, he would

indeed have been the son of a god. Ninus is also said to have married his mother, and it is on this marriage that some believe the widespread worship of “mother and son” (such as Madonna and Child) is based.¹³ This is just the beginning of all the possible research that one could do on Nimrod, but already we have a clear picture that this man was certainly no friend of God. He may have been a “mighty one in the earth,” but he will surely not be so in heaven. Rulers would do well to steer far away from his example. †

References

1. Genesis 10:8-10
2. Paul Jehle. *Universal History*. Heritage Institute Ministries. 2005.
3. Author Uncertain. *Alien Intrusion: UFOs in the Bible and Other Questions*. PDF document from the Creation Ministries International website.
<http://creation.com/images/pdfs/articles/sons-of-god-genesis-6.pdf>.
4. David Livingston. "Who Were the Sons of God in Genesis 6?".
<http://www.ancientdays.net/sonsofgod.htm>.
5. "Sons of God, Daughters of Men". <http://www.mt.net/~watcher/enoch5.html>.
6. Acts 17:26
7. Genesis 11:4
8. David Livingston. "Who Was Nimrod?". <http://www.ancientdays.net/nimrod.htm>.
9. *The Epic of Gilgamesh*. Assyrian International News Agency.
<http://www.aina.org/books/eog/eog.htm#c6>.
10. Infoplease. <http://www.infoplease.com/ce6/history/A0850216.html>.
11. Dictionary.com. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/erech?jss=1>.
12. The Free Dictionary. <http://encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com/Ninus>.
13. Morton Edgar. "Mythology and the Bible."
<http://www.agsconsulting.com/menu7.htm>.

The Tower of Babel

Many have likened the Biblical Tower of Babel to the ancient Mesopotamian ziggurats. Assuming the general similarity of the Tower and the ziggurats, the Tower of Babel suddenly becomes even more than a terrible wickedness and symbol of man's effort to reach Heaven by works.

Dr. John Whitcomb tells us that the top room of a ziggurat was designed as a replica of heaven and dwelling place for the god. The room was decorated with blue paint and representations of the five known planets of that time, and the center of the room was occupied by a solid gold god seated upon a throne. Through this room, the people were basically “creating” Heaven and attempting to take charge of the universe!

If you remove the italicized unknown words from Genesis 11:4, you are left with the people building a tower “whose top..?..unto heaven.” Were the people of Babel trying to, worse even than working their way to heaven, take over Heaven and create it for themselves? Were they creating a tower whose top would be [unto] heaven?¹



1. Dr. John Whitcomb. “The Tower of Babel and the Dispersion of the Nations”. From *BC: Twenty Lectures on the Ancient World*. History of the World Mega-Conference. Vision Forum Ministries. 2006.

The Tower of Babel may have looked something like this ziggurat. http://www.iranian.com/History/2005/March/Gutians/Images/gutians_sumer_ziggurat1a.jpg.

StrataFacts

Vertical tree trunks are commonly found running up through several different sedimentary layers—which are largely formed by water—even though each layer is supposedly from a completely different geologic “age”!

“Fossils Show Rapid and Catastrophic Burial”. <http://www.icr.org/fossilization/>.

The same sandstone featured in the lower Grand Canyon is also found in “Utah, Wyoming, Montana, Colorado, South Dakota, the Midwest, the Ozarks, and in northern New York state.” Plus, “Equivalent formations are found across wide portions of Canada, eastern Greenland, and Scotland.”

(Just more evidence for a *global* flood...)

“Geological Evidence Indicates Rapid Formation”. <http://www.icr.org/earth-formation/>.

“Uncle Neando”: Seeing Neanderthal



<http://www.d.umn.edu/cla/faculty/troufs/anth1602/pcneand.html#title>

“Look, children. These pieces have been passed down from generation to generation since God created the first people, Adam and Eve.”



<http://www.d.umn.edu/cla/faculty/troufs/anth1602/pcneand.html#title>.

Poor child. He's been brain-washed by evolution.



What, you don't recognize me?

Model head of a Neanderthal man.

<http://www.nhm.ac.uk/about-us/news/2008/september/neanderthal-diet-like-early-modern-humans.html>.

Image of a man.

http://farm4.static.flickr.com/3068/2479338566_e25d21514f.jpg.

Neanderthal

99.5% Human

A new study, conducted by two different teams of scientists on supposedly 38,000-year-old Neanderthal DNA, suggests that our “evolutionary relatives” were about 99.5 percent human, yet another finding that confirms what creationists have been saying all along—that the Biblical record of one created human race is indeed accurate and reliable.

In the study, each team used a different technique to separately sequence “large chunks of DNA” that were taken from a Neanderthal femur found twenty-six years ago in a Croatian cave. While the genome has only partially been studied, an article by Ker Than from *LiveScience* tells us that “One team sequenced more than one million base pairs and the other 65,000 pairs of the genome.” Based on comparisons of the sequenced DNA and our own human genome, “The results from the new studies confirm the Neanderthal's humanity, and show that their genomes and ours are more than 99.5 percent identical, differing by only about 3 million bases,” a difference that Edward Rubin, leader of one of the research teams, called “a drop in the bucket”.¹ We also know that we are comparing DNA from very, very many humans (for upon so many diverse samples is our average human genome based) with only one Neanderthal—meaning that, while the human DNA is a good average, the Neanderthal genes could be quite abnormal in a population possibly more human than even this 99.5 percent.

The *LiveScience* article (source one) rules out fears of contamination by explaining that the femur fragment, small and uninteresting, “was thrown in a big box of uninformative bones and not handled very much,” according to Svante Paabo (leader of one of the teams), and thus received little exposure to human DNA. In addition, certain chemical damages unique to ancient DNA

help to verify that the material is truly Neanderthal. A statement by Edward Rubin, leader of the other team, is quoted as, “One of the crucial things is that we feel confident that the DNA we have, which we're calling Neanderthal, is truly Neanderthal.”¹

One team, whose work was detailed in the *Nature* article “Analysis of one million base pairs of Neanderthal DNA,” tested over seventy samples in their search for the most retrievable and least damaged DNA, and estimated the contamination at less than about six percent. This group tested mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA), found in a cell's mitochondria and only inherited from mothers, as well as some nuclear DNA (found in a cell's nucleus), and was able to confirm certain mtDNA sequences using polymerase chain reaction (PCR).² In the end, the results from the two different teams were combined—the second team's work being published in the journal *Science*—and the overall figure for human–Neanderthal similarity was said to be about 99.5 percent identical in terms of genetics.¹

While there is definitely room for error, it seems safe to say that these studies can do nothing but support the humanity of Neanderthal, as the *LiveScience* article suggests. Neanderthal humanity is also supported by the fact that “studies have shown Neanderthals used tools, wore jewelery, buried their dead, cared for their sick, and possibly sang or even spoke in much the same way that we do.”¹ In addition, many fossils have been found showing men that appear to be half human and half Neanderthal (not possible if the two did not come from the same “human kind”), as well as instances of the two being found buried side-by-side.

As for genetics, it is quite possible that, as the human genetic variation has slowly dwindled and breakdown has occurred (results of micro-evolution and the death Curse of sin), the genes for typical Neanderthal characteristics such as the heavy and protruding brow, thick bones, and others have simply disappeared or become far less prominent. This is no more troublesome than

finding that breeding a small group of red-haired humans (red hair being recessive) with a large group of brown-haired people will result in a primarily brown-haired population. And as for the typical, prominent Neanderthal brow ridge, I must note that the brow ridge is one of the bones that continue to grow throughout a person's lifetime. Assuming that ancient people lived longer than modern ones (as the Biblical record teaches), we could very well expect them to have larger brow ridges than our own.³ †

References

1. Ker Than. "Neanderthal: 99.5 Percent Human". *LiveScience*.
http://www.livescience.com/health/061115_neanderthal_dna.html.
2. Green, Krause, Ptak, and others. "Analysis of one million base pairs of Neanderthal DNA". *Nature*.
<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v444/n7117/full/nature05336.html>.
3. Brian Thomas. "Neanderthal Babies Were Human Babies". The Institute for Creation Research. <http://www.icr.org/article/neanderthal-were-human-babies/>.

Bonus:

Clay City Pottery



Potshards retrieved near Clay City.

Just outside Fairhope, Alabama, all along the scenic Fish River, old pottery shards—or even entire jugs—can commonly be found. These remnants were apparently dumped here near Clay City because they were flawed and worthless. But what about Clay City?

Clay City, an area named for its rich clay deposits and decades of brick and tile manufacture, first began with a kiln site during the 1850s. Then, in 1894, the community of Fairhope was born. One of Fairhope's founder's, Frank L. Brown, began the Fairhope Clay Productions Company in 1902. Thirteen years later, in 1915, he moved the business to old Clay City along Fish River. It was from Clay City tile produced here that most of the first buildings in and around Fairhope were built. Even wooden houses rested on Clay City bricks.

The clay was also used to produce septic systems, with hollow cylindrical tiles for sewer lines. These tiles, bearing an octagonal shape on the outside and a smooth, circular contour on the inside, can today be used to hold wine bottles.



Barnacles can still be seen on these pottery fragments.

However, Clay City production is not limited to the 1800s or the early 1900s. Clay City tile floors proved a major product line during the 1980s, and today the site is home to Tom Jones Pottery.



The curved handles hooked to the spout show early 1900s style.

Sources of Information

Weeks Bay Reserve Center
Fairhope Museum of History
City of Fairhope Website
Tom Jones Pottery

The

End

(But Keep Going)

Shooting Down Satan

Satan tempts us today, just as he did our ancestors Adam and Eve, in the same way that he tempted Christ in the wilderness: by getting us to doubt the word of God and go after pleasure, power, and pride. But we all must hold firm to the absolute truth of the Bible as God's Holy Word—which requires taking the book of Genesis at face value.

Hebrews 11:3

“Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.”

Evolutionists 11:3

“Through faith we know that the universe began with an explosion called the Big Bang, and that all things which are seen began with this explosion.”

Front Cover Image Credits

1. Humans Cave Painting.
www.geneseo.edu/~blood/cave.jpg.
2. Neanderthals.
www.d.umn.edu/cla/faculty/troufs/anth1602/pcneand.html#title.

*Unless otherwise noted, all articles in this chapter were written by Krysta Denzer.

History and Bible

Is printed by Warriors of the Sword

warriorsoftheword.yolasite.com