

# A Strict GGU-model Interpretation of Genesis 1, The Fall and The Flood Scenarios

Robert A. Herrmann, Ph.D.\*

14 DEC 2015

*Abstract:* In this article, I present a strict interpretation of the creationary events depicted in Genesis 1-8. Such an interpretation closely adheres to the known meanings of the terms as understood by the original scribes and audience. This interpretation satisfies the GGU-model. Although this is but one of many GGU-model theological interpretations, at present, I believe that it is the most likely representation for a strict Genesis 1-8 account. Whether it is factual depends upon other considerations such as actual physical evidence or modes of judicious thought. (Note: It should be evident that details for future events may be only suggestive or entirely missing. However, it is deceptive to allow individuals during a particular Biblical time period to accept specific meanings and then to alter the meanings for a later group.) Previously, each section of this article was written as a separate article and, hence, repetitive information appears.

## I. A DVD-model for the Observable Portion of a GGU-model Interpretation of Genesis.

*(In 1978, a mathematical model was constructed that establishes that the non-creationary attributes of the Biblical God are scientifically rational. A 1979 recently refined mathematical model also establishes that the strict Genesis creation account is scientifically rational (3d). Originally, motion picture film, VCR tape, and DVD mimicking illustrations were not used to obtain the GGU or GID-models. The GGU-model is created by mathematically encoding general languages that describe sequences of physical-events. The processes that yield such event sequences can be modeled after observed human behaviors that occur trillions of times a day. It was not until after 1995 that the DVD is used to present the observable portion of a physical-event sequence. This illustration also relies upon the modern notion of computer "animation" where such procedures are employed to reproduced the images.)*

This article presents a highly revised version of the creationary model presented in (1, pp. 199 - 207) and replaces my other interpretations. It is a theological interpretation using the refined scheme (S) (3a, p. 28) for

---

\* Professor of Mathematics (Ret.), The United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD, U. S. A. *E-mail* drrahgid@hotmail.com

the creationary aspects of Genesis 1 - 8. In the world of scholarship, individuals tend to apply their own expertise to Biblical notions. I reject various “scholarly” attempts to display a superior comprehension via any highly specialized analysis of Biblical terms. Few model builders seek the correct information. What do the Biblical terms signify when they were first presented? Many times the Bible clearly states that God is truthful, that He does not deceive unless He specifically tells us when or where He employs a deception for some specific purpose. Hence, he does not hid from His created the correct meanings for the terms. He does not delay the “true” meaning until some future special nuance is applied nor allow it only to be known by a chosen few. Any alterations in the common meanings or obvious nuances as understood during Biblical times would make the entire Bible not trustworthy and even contradictory and, hence, useless except for some historical information.

*To preserve God’s truthfulness, prior to Moses (about 1450 BC) being given the specific words to use in the Genesis description, God would most certainly make sure that His people properly understand their meanings so that His stated methodology is correctly comprehended.*

What follows is based upon a strict (plain) interpretation of Genesis 1 as described in Herrmann (3c). As mentioned, such an interpretation appears to adhere closely to the meanings of the terms as understood by the original scribe and audience.

The General Grand Unification Model (GGU-model) is a mathematical **cosmogony**. That is, via mathematical reasoning and interpreted mathematical symbols that represent collections of processes, it produces many distinct physical universes in many distinct ways. Various symbols are termed as “operators.” In the secular model, these operators represent physical or physical-like processes. Each has a signature that signifies that intelligent agency is responsible for the production of and alterations in the behavior of every physical or physical-like system. Such characteristics yield the General Intelligent Design Model (GID-model) interpretation. As with other areas of physical science, these signatures can be ignored. One form of universe creation parallels the strict theologically interpreted creationary mode expressed in Genesis 1. This article is a further illustration of that form.

The mathematical theory was developed first and the following is a translation of the results obtained for one collection of **event sequences**. (Recall that an event sequence is what produces, in a step-by-step manner via a specific realization process, real physical entities, real physical behavior, or physical-like events that are associated with real physical events or behavior.) A somewhat more detailed explanation requires the language of the GGU-model. An in-depth explanation is highly technical and complex and involves mathematical analysis using a rather new mathematical process called “Nonstandard Modeling,” a portion of a model for modern set-theory. Also,

the phrase “rather sudden” is used in some cases, where some entities may not appear instantaneously, but rather they occur over a “short” period of Earth-time during a specific creation-day. *The underlying predicted processes that yield this DVD-model should not be considered in any great detail. The DVD-model is concerned with the visual or visual-like displayed images produced by the processes.*

This DVD-model linguistically describes the presentations of mostly observable images as they are produced on a monitor via a DVD. These images correspond to written and, hence, interpreted Biblical statements. In order to comprehend the following, the statements between the [[ and ]] can be ignored if not understood. If the symbols [[[ and ]]] are used, then, for comprehension, one needs to know the definitions of more than a few technical terms in order to comprehend the technical material bound by these symbols.

[[In this article, the term “subparticle” was previously used. To prevent incorrect mental images as to models for subparticles, the term “properton” replaces the term “subparticle.” Without visualizing, a properton is an entity characterized only by a list of properties. Propertons have “properties.” These are not assigned some form of human visualization that is intended as a model for behavior. Such visualizations often imply incorrect information that needs to be ignored.]]

(A) Consider a modern large flat-panel TV screen and a DVD-machine.

In Genesis 1, the phrase “God said” is used and this is followed by a descriptive statement. The actual translation should be “God **thought (thinks)**” (thinks within Himself) as the corresponding Hebrew ‘amar is translated elsewhere (Genesis 44:28). (This is a special Hebrew idiom and one would think that Biblical translators would properly express it, unless they actually wish to depict God as a sorcerer, as an entity that uses spoken incantations to create physical objects.) The description that follows the “God thought” is preparatory in character and indicates the pre-designed aspect of the GGU-model. The statement “And it was so,” (Hebrew “Began to be”) obviously, indicates when physical realization occurs. Rather than simply use our imagination to turn such thoughts into physical reality, the DVD illustrates this process. Insert and play any DVD, then push the pause button. The “next” portion of the DVD and the internal electronics of the DVD machine can be considered as the “thought” portion of the DVD. Indeed, the DVD does present a language that the machine will logically translate. Now push the “next” or play button. The DVD language, “its thoughts,” are transformed (And it was so) into a physical reality that, at least, is an image on the monitor. The DVD presents a better presentation than the previous illustrations employed.

A DVD has a much greater capacity to reproduce since it uses much less corrective information. Via a more intense form of data compression and presentation it produces much greater clarity. The data compression employed partially models the actual objects that can be employed as a basis for the GGU-model - ultrawords. One has greater control over the step-by-step presentation of the images. However, it can only partially reproduce the GGU-model's step-by-step process. Indeed, no physical entity can fully reproduce such a process. A process that, in certain cases, cannot even be fully described via human languages; a process that cannot be experienced since it is not physical.

(B) A 3-dimensional imaging process is used. The screen is divided into two unmarked regions; a bounded region R located at the center position, and a larger 3-D region S containing R. Each image that appears on the screen represents an observable portion of a universe-wide frozen-frame. The screen is viewed only using the human observational abilities available during the time period the development is depicting.

Each universe-wide frozen-frame (UWFF) (a slice of a universe at a moment in the primitive sequence that yields its development) is pre-designed. As they development, we have been given the mental capacity to recognize that the entities displayed also satisfy certain rationally stated regulations. These regulations, the physical laws, serve three purposes. They allow us, as Scripturally required, to subdue the animals and the earth. They display, in restricted form, the major signatures that all aspects of our physical existence are designed by a higher-intelligence and, from this, they indirectly reveal **His eternal power and divine nature**.

In the beginning, there are no visible images in either location. In Genesis 1, "ghost-like" images are used to indicate "thoughts" not physically realized. What is described is from a fixed viewpoint external to the monitor screen and the viewer uses an external sequence notion - the primitive sequence. A portion of such a step-by-step sequence does correspond to a measurable time, a portion of "observer-time." What follows is a theological interpretation for one GGU-model universe-generating scenario. A DVD is loaded into a player and begins to produce images.

(0) [[[Technically, all results come from the activation of intelligently designed ultra-logic-systems applied to intelligently designed ultra-hypotheses. A "sustaining" process that must be continually applied to designed combinations of propertons maintains all physical processes. Distinct from the reductionism methods used in (1), it is now possible to eliminate one of the ultimate ultrawords for the four general types of cosmologies, one eternal, two modified eternal, and the one that has a beginning and

ending in observer-time (3). This single type ultraword approach is what can now be applied. All of the physical events that, in primitive sequence order, occur prior to the creation of the “stars” (“dim twinkling lights”) are represented by universe-wide frozen-frames identified by an ordered set, the primitive sequence identifiers. Except in one case, it is not important to assume that these identifiers are not observer-time identifiers. For an eternal universe with no beginning in observer-time, these identifiers come sequentially prior to the non-observer primitive sequence beginning.]]]

*The following is but one of various types of DVD-illustrated behaviors that satisfy, to various degrees, Biblical statements. There are other possibilities. The one presented here is a very strict (common understood) interpretation. [[As described in The Eden Model [E], the Rapid-Formation Model (RFM) process is used at moments in the development. Other important aspects of a development are the product of the participator mechanism.]]]*

Linguistically, the **rule of reciprocation** needs to be applied to Biblical statements. This rule states that comprehension of a collection of words does not come from the meaning of a single word, but that words in a statement alter their meanings relative to the “neighboring” words and conversely. (The meaning often depends upon the written context.) When this rule is applied additional comprehension is gleaned from the informational content of the collection of words employed. From this, further detailed descriptions can be properly made.

Unfortunately, since the Vulgate and except for one translation, this law cannot be properly applied to the known Bible translations. Such translations as KJV, NIV, etc. choose word meanings, for the oldest Greek, that tend to force additional doctrinal concepts upon the reader. These additional concepts were first described during the second century. The Concordant Version of the Bible (0) was specifically constructed so as to avoid such special word choices. It allows for the proper application of the law of reciprocation to Bible passages via fixed and strict meanings. Another example of the application of the rule of reciprocation is to be found in reference (3c).

Consequently, in all that follows, extensive research is employed in order to express in English the meanings of the Biblical words and phrases as they would commonly be understood during the ancient Hebrew period 1350-1600 BC (say 1450 BC). One of the most important is the Hebrew word *rûach* (wind, breath) - often translated as referring to the Spirit of God. The Bible describes the wind as producing many different effects. “[T]he gentle, refreshing evening breeze so well known in the Near East. . . . It can mean a strong constant wind . . . . It can also signify an extremely strong wind: . . . [and] represent a gale or tornado. . . .” (5, p. 393). And, as mentioned, it is also used to represent the Spirit of God. For ancient Hebrew comprehension as to

the behavior of this Spirit, the Bible indicates that experiences with the invisible wind illustrate some of this behavior. In fact, this is exactly what occurs with aspects of the Genesis 1 creationary scenario.

There have been various interpretations as to the “beginning” of day-one. Genesis 1.1 gives an overview of what is to come next. The Hebrew translated as “heaven” can also be translated as “heavens.” Without any other “number” being stated, this term when interpreted as a plural implies two items. Although the Bible does mention the third heaven and the composition of the first heaven, there is no mention as to the purpose or composition of the implied second heaven.

In this theological interpretation, the second heaven is considered as composed of various created GGU-model entities and processes that have not been defined as physical. These may carry the prefix “ultra,” or “hyper” among a few other special names, and include all pre-designed ultrawords \*developmental paradigms, \*instruction-entities as mental constructs, propertons, info-fields and relations between entities as discussed in [F]. Recall that **pre-design** signifies **the thoughts that are transformed into various realities**.

(0.5) (In all that follows, the term “earth” or “Earth” refers to the entire “globe” both the water and non-water part, the third planet from the Sun.) Day-one begins suddenly at the instant the second heaven is formed. (Various choices are possible.) As described in (G), the waters and Earth of Genesis 1:2 are in two GGU-model special ghost-like forms that suddenly appear in R.

The form in which the ghost-like water first appears is a type of confused animation. It resembles a disjointed seeming unpredictable churning, agitating, stirring-up of the water. It seems to behave chaotically. It is a prototype that illustrates the notation that such entities such as the \*instruction-entities need to be produced in order to create comprehensible behavior. If you pause the DVD and then you push the “next” button a few times you see that the images seem to correspond to no “humanly” predictable behavior. Hence, although the water appears to be structured, the chaotic behavior occurs for a few of the next “frames.” The term “chaos” or “confusion” is used to indicate this in the actual Genesis 1:2 statement.

The basic LXX translation for such behavior reads, “unsightly and unfinished.” But, for something to be classified as “confused” requires it to be compared with other forms. Hence, most likely, it is not any of the usual observed water experiences. That is, the behavior of water stated in Genesis 1:2 is confusing in that it does not behave as the ancient Hebrews had previously experienced it. There is no “depth” concept applied to this water region and, hence, a special water-depth should not be assumed when it appears in the DVD-model R-region. But, something else is mentioned as also being “confused.”

The Bible states that “darkness was on the surface of the submerged chaos.” It

does not state that darkness is on the surface of the water (0, p. 41). What is the submerged chaos?

The submerged chaos is the confused, unsightly, unfinished Earth. Relative to the forthcoming Earth, it is described as a “submerged chaos.” It does not resemble anything one experiences relative to the Earth of 1450 BC. It is vacant, or undistinguished. It is not a “nothing.” Certainly, this idea is not foreign to the ancient Hebrews. This is modeled directly by the notion that the original Earth was not, as yet, physically realized. [[Intuitively, the term “energized” can be used in place of “realized.”]] Physical realization occurs when the realization operator is applied. Hence, for Genesis 1.2, the submerged Earth is in an undistinguished unrealized state.

In general, applying the rule of reciprocation, Genesis 1:2 and first part of 1:3 (3c) briefly state that there is water that should be considered as “confused” and the undistinguished unrealized earth is submerged in this water.

(1) Day-one continued. (This is a change from my previous interpretation. The next few portions are taken from the Genesis 1 article.) *Yet the Spirit of God is brooding over the surface of the water.*

The invisible “Spirit,” *rûach*, besides producing results similar to those of a wind, also, for comprehension, always needs to carry the additional notion of being the “origin of God’s mental actions, the origin of His thoughts.” This is the needed comparison with the concept as related to the human being, where, in this context, it corresponds to the origin of our mental action, our thoughts. (“Let us make man in our own image.” This, of course, means aspects of God that are comparable.) I am very aware of the problem that develops when one attempts to clearly understand, via a translated word or phrase, what the early Hebrews meant relative to the human soul, *nephesh*, (some say spirit). One idea is that, in various verses, it means an “inner self,” as compared with the “outer appearance.” Certainly, one major aspect of our “inner self” is our thinking, our thoughts. This human aspect is often not revealed by our appearance. Further, from the GGU-model construction, all human thoughts are known to God, there is a medium through which communication takes place, and He and other entities can mentally influence us via this medium. Whether or not this includes an “everlasting” invisible human spirit as a major part of God’s creation has no effect upon the aspects of human thought as presented here.

An actual wind-like movement notion is next in the Genesis description and it corresponds to how a bird prepares its eggs so that they will hatch. The “brooding” is usually translated as “moving, vibrating” (its wings) and other such terms. However, these miss the mark since the term means doing such a procedure but with “tender loving care.” Thus, with loving care, God is preparing to “hatch” His creation.

It is during this period that all of the GGU-model mechanisms and thoughts are

created. Nothing is yet realized. No observer-time transpires. There is a two stage process employed - the “mental creation,” the mental pre-design, and then realization. There is no need to add further to the Genesis 1 article for the first day. Various Biblically described entities first appear in a ghost-like form. For the remainder creation days, the operative phrase “it was so” triggers the realization process and on the screen the entities that previously appeared in a ghost-like form now appear as fully realized. (This may be the only model that recognizes the Scriptural placement of this statement and its relevance to the actual creation events.)

(2) Day-two. The water is divided into two parts. During this creation-day, the firmament is not as yet activated portion of the GGU-model’s “ultra-properton info-fields” (a classical field concept). The field exists at all points where physical entities exist. It is from this field that the “waters above” and “waters below” emerge (are realized). At this moment in physical creation, the field between these waters can be inactive in that, as yet, no other physical entities are observed; that is, in this illustration, no other entities are “observable.” The inactive portion is not part of a physical universe and has certain “simple” properties.

The “waters above,” at any moment in its development, are collections of all the necessary propertons that yield actual H<sub>2</sub>O molecules in realized form. The Bible gives no information as to the “waters above.” The “waters above” can act as a type of “place holder” for the objects that appear within our local environment. On the other hand, from the viewpoint of the 1450 BC observers, they can simply form types of special clouds that are not rain clouds. The Living Bible states that they are “vapors.” For this presentation, special clouds, vapors or the like can be employed. The configured properton firmament can be considered as “hard” as well as flexible. For a conceptually expanding universe, it is the entities produced by the sequence of info-fields that appear in the development to “expand” or even accelerates, and from which the apparent expansion of a physical universe follows. [[Today’s notion of dark energy need not be the cause of any acceleration in the separation of gravitationally bounded physical entities.]]

Such a firmament is predicted by the GGU-model and has properties that correspond to the Biblically described properties, even to the Hebrew notion of “for ever and ever” as in Psalm 148. This field is an interface between the first heaven and the second heaven. It can be conceived of as having two three-dimensional faces. One face forms the foundation for the physical world and the second face is connected to the “covirtual world” (i.e. the substratum or background universe or part of the second heaven). It is significant to note that all physical objects would be “in” the firmament.

Depending upon the cosmology that begins when God “cursed the ground,” region S displays different behaviors. This cosmology is formed by application of a GGU-model scheme and rapid-formation. *In general, all known cosmologies, with any necessary alterations, are GGU-model predicted possibilities. Many such cosmologies can be DVD*

*illustrated, including multi-universe cosmologies.* The Bible does not give any details as to how the eternal Eden cosmology or the present day cosmology develops. It does give a few statements as to purposes for their physical existence. If our present universe is an expanding cosmology, which appears to correspond to most of today's accepted cosmological indirect evidence, then this is accomplished via firmament properties. There are valid cosmologies that do not include such an expansion.

Some have suggested that the apparent separation of galactic material corresponds to Biblical "stretching" statements. But, there are others that claim there is no Biblical suggestion that a stretching is occurring. The GGU-model properton info-field allows for apparent expansion at any moment during the development of a cosmology and the Biblical characteristics of this firmament do not change. Indeed, there can be an apparent flowing pattern from a specific location outwards toward the outer edge of S. Depending upon the cosmology selected, this outward flow can appear, relative to a view external to the monitor, to take place starting at a point at the Earth or within or "near to" its local environment. Moreover, the rapid-formation model, if employed for a cosmology, indicates that such a cosmology, as it forms, can appear to encircle the Earth and its local environment. This can also be the case for the Eden cosmology. (This type of encircling has some Biblical support.)

As shown in (2, p. 68), the basic "metric" that cosmologist use that includes such an expansion can be completely derived by considering only two light propagation properties and a substratum expansion speed. If viewed from "inside" a soon to be produced universe, the universe can be considered as "on" the firmament although, as mentioned, "in" the firmament is also a significant way to describe the relation.

(3) Day-three. The R-region's waters "below" appear in distinct regions in R and the "dry" land suddenly appears in mature or functional form. That is, a portion of the waters below are transformed into or replaced by the dry earth. Various observed water events can, indeed, appear as if land is emerging from the water. Although the ancient Hebrews do not need to know why it happens, when the Mediterranean tide is viewed from say Joppa (Tel Yafo, Jaffa), submerged land is uncovered. It can be observed to emerge. "Look, see how that piece of land seems to just come out of the water." The remaining water, as stated, forms the Earth's seas.

The objects described in Genesis 1: 11-12 then appear in mature or functional form (And it was so). Hence, the original Earth is realized in a mature form by application of the realization operator. When the universe is created, it is noticed that the waters and Earth in R are slowly rotating relative to a stationary waters above. Using "hour" units, this measure is a 24-hour rotation period. In this article, the result of these R-region formations is termed as the "original pre-Fall Earth" (with its local environment).

(It is during day-three that the original pre-Fall Earth is physically realized. And,

significantly, it is during day-three that vegetation such as grass, herbs, fruit trees, etc. appear. Other biological entities appear in mature or functional form during day-five and day-six. Once again these items are first in covirtual (pre-designed) form and then the forms are activated. To be consistent with 1450 BC physical observations, to preserve God’s statements as presenting truth, the “sudden” formation can actually come about through application of the RFM. I mentioned at this point, that some distort the intended Biblical meaning by claiming that there is a gap in day-one where a more extensive earth is formed over many “years.” This completely alters the logical implications that the sequence of creation-days is trying to convey. God creates a very special original Earth that is distinct from any other such object that may appear in other created external universe. Those that adhere to such a gap theory are altering what the Biblical statements clearly imply. Using this tactic, they fit their theory to an altered Bible. This tactic I do not apply.)

(3.5) First part of day-four. During this creation-day, at the least, the Sun and Moon appear in R in mature or functional form and the day-three entities continue to develop in R relative to “rotation-time.” Within the Bible “water” is used as a transitional medium for certain significant physical and spiritual changes. It is possible but definitely not required that under one interpretation the “waters above” are transformed into these two and probably other local environment objects. This can correspond to the transformation concept relative to the formation of the Earth if that notion is accepted by the ancient Hebrews. A replacement notion is also possible if so accepted. By implication, day-four can also be when other solar system entities are formed. The DVD images neither indicate, in any manner, how the sunlight is generated nor any detailed aspects of the Sun or Moon or solar system entity construction.

(3.5-4 and additional relative information.) After the basic contents of the Earth, its local environment and the original exterior universe are produced, Adam and Eve are created. They and Eden appear, as described, in subsequent DVD images. The term Eden is not simply a place, but it is a basic concept as well. The arguments that there is no animal physical death are compelling. Due to this feature, it is necessary that physical entities such as the Sun, Moon and “stars” (the observed “dim twinkling lights”) be created as “everlasting” entities as represented by an unbounded \*developmental paradigm. (Under the rule for observation the dim twinkling lights is only what appears on the screen.) Perceived physical law processes do not produced any member of the sequentially displayed event sequence. It is rather trivial to display for an appropriate collection of event sequences,  $\mathbf{E}(i)$ , these entities as producing their necessary products without any deterioration in output. Indeed, as visually displayed, all other appropriate physical entities can appear within members of each event sequence. During the time of the pre-Fall period, any observed physical regulations that are verified by sequential members of an  $\mathbf{E}(i)$  are, obviously, distinct from those observed today.

Of great significance, for the GGU-model, is that what we conceive of as Natural laws, as causes and effects, is not how successive info-fields are produced. Successive members of an event sequence are designed so that we can predict via these ‘‘laws’’ some future events and subdue the earth and build our man made universe.

The firmament corresponds to an inactive portion of the properton info-field, which is only physical-like not physical. It is the object from which physical entities appear to emerge. From the physical-like viewpoint, it is infinitely dense. The formation of an info-field can be described as an ‘‘unfolded’’ like a curtain. This is mentioned in Isaiah 40:22, rather than being stretched out like an elastic body. As a curtain or tent unfolds it covers an increasingly larger and larger region. This is the ‘‘heaven,’’ the expanse, from which all other material aspects of the universe emerge. Various authors tend to call such an expanse ‘‘space’’ but fail to define ‘‘space’’ as produced by any physical-like entity although they claim that it may ‘‘expand.’’ This expanding space carries along with it material aspects of the universe. Or, the space itself need not expand but rather physical entities are simply separating one from another due to additional field properties. So, does the universe of today appear to our observations to expand as a whole or are material movements all caused by other physical processes?

There are differences in interpretations as to the meanings of the Biblical terms dealing with being ‘‘stretched out.’’ Does the Biblical notion mean an actual ‘‘stretching’’ like a piece of elastic material or does it mean to lay out or to unfold a fixed expanse? Some authors state that the phrase ‘‘like a curtain’’ or ‘‘like a tent’’ means that the expanse or universe does not stretch since a curtain or tent does not stretch.

The problem is with the use of the term ‘‘like’’ or phrase ‘‘as a’’ and the fact that for these notions, the term ‘‘curtain’’ and ‘‘tent,’’ are similes. Hence, the expanse must be different in the main from these material objects and, yet, have a few similar properties. Observationally, the drawing of a curtain can, indeed, appear as an elastic-like stretching. It is rather remarkable that after scheme (S) was highly refined it was noticed that method employed to produce each info-field can be a type of unfolding, a step-by-step process. Many years ago I showed how a universe-wide time-fracture can completely alter the development of a universe and we could not know via any physical means ‘‘what came before’’ this alteration. (See added references (A) and (B).) This enhances the Bible’s description as a guide.

**Relative to some creationary cosmologies, there is a contradiction in their basic construction.** As stated, relative to the created Earth, the strict Biblical interpretation used by most creationists requires a pre-Fall Eden to exist. In [4] relative to the created world prior to the Fall, there was ‘‘no hunger, no struggle for existence, no suffering, and certainly no death of animal or human life anywhere in God’s perfect creation (plant ‘‘life,’’ created as food for men and animals, does not ‘‘die’’ in the Biblical sense.)’’

Via trivial implication, as stated, this everlasting form of a perfect life as Biblically described could not rationally occur unless, at least, the created Sun, Moon and the stars are everlasting. This requires that the physical aspects of these entities as accepted by most creationists are incorrectly stated. The regulations that some creationists claim satisfy the original creationary scenario relative to the Sun, Moon and stars, do not satisfy the requirement that the original created entities exist in their described created state for an eternity.

However, the GGU-model is not dependent upon any form of humanly comprehensible physical regulations. Physical scientist are trained to conclude that the universe-wide frozen-frames that sequentially follow from a specific one are produced by application of physical laws. It is often difficult for them to understand that, for the GGU-model, this is NOT the case.

In order not to be considered as an unstated deception relative to the external universe, the Eden external cosmology is formed by rapid-formation over a miniscule period of Earth-time during day-four rather than assuming in-transit information (C). The DVD screen view is that region R appears in suspended animation and the Eden cosmology rapidly forms about it. When rapid-formation ceases, the R-region then develops in concert with the all that has been previously created.

Biblically, we can have no knowledge as to the original Eden cosmology that is rapidly formed so as to produce the exterior star-field. The Bible gives no actual information as to methodology.

In order to strongly interpret Rom. 1:20, I, at present, consider the original eternal universe to be a type-2 universe. That is, from the moment “NOW,” it has a physical beginning in the past but no physical ending in the future. If it is infinite both in “size” and “material,” then this certainly would indicate the vast “power” and divine character of God.

Biblically, we are allowed to do ordinary common forms of logical deduction. The attributes of God are described throughout the Bible, via various verses, and they compare God’s attributes with those of humanity. They indicate things the God can do that we cannot. In all cases, the appropriate comparable attributes are exceptionally “greater than” those of His created. Relative to mental processes much Scripture indicates this.

“For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways,” declares the LORD. “As the heavens are higher than the earth so are my ways higher than your ways, my thoughts than your thoughts” (Isaiah 55:8-9). (Also Job 33:12 and Psalm 147:5.) In Genesis 12:8 and 3:11-13, the way that the Garden of Eden is described and God’s reaction to Adam and Eve’s sin clearly imply the eternal nature of Eden, the pre-Fall Earth (LE) (LE = local environment) and, necessarily, that Adam and Even

would not physically die.

Thus, of great Biblical significant is that, as stated, prior to the Fall there is no human physical death and the Sun, Moon, the local environment as well as the “stars” are originally designed to be eternal. For the DVD view, only stars as visibly perceived are displayed in region S. **The information that we can glean from physical observation after the Fall does indicate that there needed to be distinctly different pre-Fall behavior for specific physical-systems.** Indeed, this can hold for the eternal cosmology and what may be a paradox, like the Obler paradox, probably has no meaning for the eternal pre-Fall cosmology.

We are told that “He counts the stars and calls them by name. How great he is! His power is absolute! His understanding unlimited” (Psalms 147:4-5 (LB)). As indicated for this to be an actual Divine attribute it must be a “greater” ability than that possessed by humanity. However, if Adam and Eve had not sinned, then they can conceptually count any finite number of stars. Technically, the GGU-model physical-system “numbers” He uses to count things can essentially differ from what we can use only if the material entities form an infinite set. Thus by simple Biblical implication His created original universe can be deductively considered as composed of infinity many physical entities. As will be discussed later, this does not mean that the universe that we perceive today needs satisfy this probable pre-Fall behavior.

To correspond to the “stamped-out” firmament requirement, there is a heat signature that matches this raqa notion. Under this scenario, this DVD view, as observed today, satisfies various regulations we can comprehend and that satisfy an “organizing” of the exterior universe. This also corresponds to a remarkable intelligent design. This is a basic reason why such a mode of formation is presented so, that, even today, we will be without an excuse. So that, even today, physical science cannot escape from His higher-intelligence attribute. Indeed, this is even more so after the Fall. Since The Eden cosmology rapid-formation process ends at a moment in its development that corresponds to 6,000 to 7,500 years ago and then pre-Fall Earth (LE) develop in a manner consistent with this cosmology, then the contrasting physical behavior of today clearly indicates the sustaining power of a higher-intelligence.

(5) All the remaining creation-day entities appear in mature or functional form in R. The Bible states in Genesis 2:2 that God ceased all His work after day-six. The notions of “ceases” and “work” must be included in this model. But, from what “work” does He cease? It is His creationary work. This model specifies that God’s creationary work includes the creation of all thoughts, the pre-designs, the constituents and all collections of event sequences necessary for His purposes. To sustain His creation, He does not do “creationary” work. Further, what has occurred and is continuing to occur can be described as “the transforming of thoughts into various reality.” I consider the “knowledge of” physical reality as equivalent to the actual physical reality in this higher-intelligence case and this corresponds to the final intelligently designed and,

hence, created process “St.” [[Recall that the GGU-model processes also model Heb. 1:3, where the notion of “sustained” means, at least, a mentally spoken word used to reproduce in a step-by-step manner the development of a physical universe.]]

The model satisfies the requirement that God has knowledge of all past, present and future events. In review, each alteration in the created universe that He allows is created in the form of covirtual event sequences. Under the strict verb form “to create,” it is by means of His created thoughts that various realities are produced. What is presented here is an analogue model “for behavior.” It may be the only way that we can otherwise comprehend God’s creationary activities.

“Cursed is the ground because of you” (Genesis 3:17). This is followed by an alteration in the physical existence of Adam and Eve. When the Fall of humanity occurs, it is then when physical entities acquire a “death” feature. It is the second application of the RFM that strongly yields the next steps in an event sequence. (For a general description, see [E].) What is observed is the DVD-image for event  $\mathbf{E}(i)$  immediately prior to the moment the “Curse” is announced. The DVD-image for the next universe-wide frozen-frame  $\mathbf{E}'(\alpha + 1)$  is essentially the same as  $\mathbf{E}(i)$ . (The value of  $\alpha$  depends upon the actual post-Fall external cosmology produced.) However, from the RFM, it is actually a frozen-frame from an entirely different pre-designed event sequence. *Significantly, this pre-designed rapid-formation occurs over an exceptionally small observer time interval and includes an earth that at first matches the earth in  $\mathbf{E}'(\alpha)$ .* (The actual identifier for the event producing universe-wide frozen-frame is  $(\alpha, \lambda)$  and the  $\alpha$  depends upon the cosmology being formed.) *However, it, of course, now rather quickly exhibits God’s description and slowly begins to correspond to the deteriorating features of the rapidly formed external universe.* The pre-designed universe-wide frozen-frame images for the continued development of these entities satisfy describable physical laws that we can comprehend. They continue to provide us with the knowledge that allows us to subdue the earth.

In accordance with Genesis 3:23, Eden-styled physical behavior subsides but this is not immediately observed. Many Bibles describe how God restricts Adam and Eve at the Fall by stating that “After he drove the man out, he placed on the east side of the Garden of Eden cherubim and a flaming sword flashing back and forth to guard the way to the tree of life.” (Genesis 3:24) However, the Literal states this in two disjoint sentences. The first sentence is, “And He is driving out the human, and is causing him to tabernacle at the east of the garden of Eden.” The second sentence reads “And He set the cherubim, and a flaming sword turning itself, to keep the way of the tree of the living.” The phrase “at the east side,” coupled with this separation, the “turning itself” and “tree of living,” a metaphor for eternal life, signify that all aspects of the eternal existence of the Eden portion of the Eden model are completely removed.

Our knowledge that such a place as pre-Fall Eden existed and that there is a corresponding Eden cosmology comes only from the Bible. No matter how our ability

to observe the behavior of the universe external to our local environment increases, there will be no indication from these observations that the Eden behavior existed. This does not mean that we cannot have knowledge nor evidence as to what physically existed after the Fall and prior to the Flood. The entire cosmology as we observe it today displays a remarkable rational consistency.

In summary, the information in the electromagnetic radiation and that is acquired from the particles we gather and analyze today does not indicate the actual events that occurred throughout the universe during the pre-Fall portion of the Eden Model. The Bible gives the necessary events that needed to occur cosmologically during that time period. The information in such a present day pre-designed event sequence does exist as a Divine mental construct. It is not a form of deception but rather serves a definite purpose. It displays the divinity and power of the mind of God. Further, the physical aspects of the present day cosmology and the Biblical described pre-Fall world strongly imply that originally humankind was created to inhabit a very special universe. *This and possible post-Fall through pre-Flood evidence yield strong reminders of what we have lost due to Adam and Eve's behavior and that we now exist in a historically very hostile and destructive environment.*

Our present universe is composed of degenerating physical entities via probabilistic behavior and, for biological entities, the additional feature of biological micro-mutation occurs. If evidence indicates, the cosmology which now governs our existence can have an expansion property that implies that our universe is headed towards "heat death." Thus, after the Fall, the pre-design that is a result of the Adam and Eve's behavior can certainly include a deteriorating universe that is satisfied by the statistical aspects of quantum theory.

Each universal-wide frozen-frame comes about via other pre-designed cosmologies that He mentally creates so as to correspond to what is necessary to correlate to human choice. This is an additional feature of the required participator universe. This is an important feature that, at present, only the GGU-model solves. *Today, one of the necessary human choices is atheism. The Eden Model allows for this choice.*

At each moment of observer-time when any aspect of human behavior occurs, an appropriate universe-wide frozen-frame from a pre-designed universe is realized. But, importantly, this universe-wide frozen-frame is a member of an event sequence that includes all of the post-Fall corresponding pre-design and realized events. This cumulative event sequence, in its original covirtual form, does not cease to exist simply because it is activated. I point out that the notion of a "spatial morphing border" as discussed (1, p. 178) is eliminated.

Throughout the continued DVD illustrations living organisms develop in what appears to be various forms. All aspects of these variations are pre-designed. As shown on this website, claimed “random” alterations are actually “mindom” alterations in that they satisfy probabilistic statements but no actual random behavior leads to these variations. I use a “three-world” approach to biological variation. Type-one biological “kinds” prior to the Fall are very narrow in scope. In general, they are those entities that are originally designed to physical procreate. The phrase “after its kind” is used ten times in Genesis 1. Some consider the somewhat vague notion that a “kind” is a category that indicates a “common ancestry.” There is no detailed Biblical definition for this term. Indeed, consistent with the original exhibited physical laws for the Earth, there are no “evolutionary” styled variations in the designs from their original formation until the Fall.

After the Fall and through the Flood, the type-one kinds are expanded to allow for additional variations within these kinds - the type-two kinds. These variations now allow for physical death. After the Flood, the kinds continue to correspond to the pairs that entered the Ark. Behavior within these kinds is again expanded - the type-three kinds - so as to correspond to “some” of the pre-designed variations that occur for other possible life-forms discussed in section IV. However, no kind category that was on the Ark will lose, via unaided physical processes, its identifying features.

Under no circumstances do I accept that entities are to be classified as members of a particular kind based only upon assumed non-biblical hypotheses. This is contrary to the scientific method. Hypotheses are indirectly verified if there is a preponderance of actual evidence that satisfies their predictions. Such a verification is not an absolute test that the hypotheses are fact. Further, adding evidence that does not actually exist because it conforms to a theory and stating that this verifies a theory is specifically forbidden not only by the scientific method but also by the rules of logic.

(6) After the Fall of man, as verified by Genesis 3:14-19, and as mentioned, physical laws that appear to govern region R and we can use for predictions are altered.

(7) Things continue in this fashion until the Flood.

For this creation scenario, the mathematical model states that there are many other unrealized universes that correspond to the realized external-universe. This is required by the alterations necessitated by human participator actions. Within these unrealized universes are various R-type regions, the R'-regions, that correspond in their entirety to the governing processes that yield the images in S. These R'-regions are termed “ancient earths with their local environment.” These R'-regions actually exist during rapid-formation. They no longer exist when rapid-formation ceases. Then in succeeding events, the R-region exists but now slowly displays finite life spans. (An ancient earth serves a specific purpose and it corresponds to a basic Biblical concept. This is discussed in other sections of this article.) Further, the event sequences can

include all other Biblical alterations in universe behavior. [[When the term “all” or “every” is used it is not related to physical “fact” unless it is qualified. To what collection does the word refer? Often the collection is supposed to be understood by the reader. The term as used in Genesis 1 - 8 relative to biological entities is, for me, clearly restricted to the original pre-Flood Earth (LE). Biological type entities that God may have designed for the external universe, and this is not prohibited, for consistency are confined to the third-type of kind category. But, the original kinds category is not altered. For example, the kinds category that started with Adam and Eve does not trace back to some other distinct kinds category.]]

After day-four, the external universe, with region R, are members of a library of universes as discussed in (1 p. 156). This is the “library” that models participator alterations. In this application of the GGU-model, this library includes *all* participator alterations, if any. Consistent with the physical laws we observe today and for comprehension, this library also includes universes with various physical-system combinations of entities within the R-region and entities within the other R'-regions

There are various Flood models that have been purposed. Many of these Flood models satisfy the physical laws, at least partially, that are associated with the selected external universe. They are all GGU-model possibilities. In Genesis 6:13, God states that He will not only destroy the life on the land but also ruin (destroy) the “earth.” One model states that, via the participator process, during the Flood itself the original Earth and its local environment are “replaced” with the images from a different DVD in the library with the following features. This is the applied “cast off” feature as the term is translated in Am 1:11. (I discuss, in section IV, Biblical implications that imply these features. Further, I discuss other methods used within creationary science to achieve the Flood altered earth of today.)

For my Flood model, an after-the-Flood event sequence yields material evidence that there is a mingling of evidence from the original (young) pre-Flood Earth with its local environment and that of an ancient earth with its local environment. This evidence verifies that the pre-Flood and the Flood itself existed. Rather obvious comparatively young evidence may be found mingled or even intertwined with “ancient” evidence at the same location. For this model, the Bible implies that our current earth was physically realized about 4500 years ago in terms of earth rotation time.

After the Flood and except for “miraculous events,” the current earth with its local environment continues to develop in concert with the development occurring in S. This DVD illustration satisfies Romans 1:20. It, at the least, indicates God’s exceptional creationary power, His higher-intelligence and His knowledge of the past, present and future. [[Recall that, theologically, the GGU-model processes can be defined as created processes that transform God’s “thoughts” into physical reality.]]

In summary, what is the Biblical purpose for the detailed information we

observe today in the starlight? Relative to the Eden Model, it is not to foster some scientific discipline. Although, it shows a remarkable rational consistency this is not its major purpose. The Eden Model completely satisfies Rom. 1:20. **What we are observing is the divinity and power of the mind of God and that He is truthful in what He states.** This is the true significance of the information we glean from starlight. This fact is independent from whether this information displays all of our previous modes of physical existence. The entire Eden Model corresponds to the absolute reality of being created, of being pre-designed, by the mind of God. All else pales when compared to this fact.

### References

(0) Concordant Version of the Old Testament - The Book of Genesis, Concordant Publishing Concern, Canyon Country, CA, 1957.

(1) Herrmann, Robert A., Science Declares Our Universe IS Intelligently Designed, Xulon Press, Fairfax, VA an other addresses, USA, 2002.

(2) Herrmann, Robert A., The Theory of Infinitesimal Light-Clocks, <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0312189>

(3) Herrmann, Robert A., The GGU-model and Generation of Developmental Paradigms, (Original paper <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0605120>)

(3a) Herrmann, Robert A., Nonstandard Ultra-logic-systems Applied to the GGU-model, <http://vixra.org/abs/1309.0125>

(3b) Herrmann, Robert A. GGU-model Ultra-logic-systems Applied to Developmental Paradigms, <http://vixra.org/abs/1309.0004>  
Also <http://vixra.org/abs/1308.0145>

(3c) Herrmann, Robert A. Genesis 1:1 - 2:1, <http://vixra.org/abs/1312.0122>

(3d) Herrmann, Robert A. The Theory of Ultralogics, <http://arxia.org/abs/math/9903081> and <http://arxia.org/abs/math/9903082>

(4) Morris, H. The Fall, the Curse, and Evolution. Back to Genesis, April 1998.

(5) Nelson's Expository Dictionary of the Old Testament, Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1980.

(6) On Romans 8:20-22. ". . . the whole of creation had been subjected to transience and longs for liberation." Dictionary of New Testament Theology, Vol 1, Zondervan (1979, p. 524).

### Added References

(A) Herrmann, Robert A., Developmental Paradigms, Creation Research Society Quarterly, 22(4)(1986):189-198, Section 4.

(B) Herrmann, Robert A., Fractals and Ultrasmooth microeffects, J. Math. Physics, 30(4), April 1989, 805-808. See <http://raherrmann.com/pub.htm> for important typographical corrections.

(C) DeYoung, Don, Mature creation and seeing distant starlight, Journal of Creation, 24(3)(2010):54-59.

(D) Weinberg, Steven, The First Three Minutes, Bantam Books, New York, 1977.

(E) Herrmann, R. A. The Eden Model, <http://vixra.org/abs/1409.0239>

(F) Herrmann, R. A. The GGU-model and GID-model Processes and Their Secular and Theological Interpretations <http://vixra.org/abs/1404.0421>

(G) Herrmann, R. A. Genesis 1:1- 2:1, 8, 10 . . . . <http://vixra.org/abs/1312.0122>

## II Strict Creation - A General Discussion.

If you have not already done so, you might find it instructive to consider what I actually do when I construct creationary models. [See (A)] Under no circumstances, do I wish any individual to be influenced in their choice of a cosmological model simply because I have discussed a specific model. Only 22 pages in “Science Declares Our Universe is Intelligently Designed” (Xulon Press April 2002) are used to describe how the GGU-model is applied to theology. There are many other rational possibilities. What I present in this article is a highly revised creationary model for Genesis 1 - 8. (Also, the phrase “rather sudden” is used in some cases, where entities may not appear instantaneous, but rather they might occur over an unknown period of Earth-time during a specific creation-day or they are produced over a comparatively “very small” earth-time interval. The term Earth (earth) means the third planet from the sun. )

As discussed for the DVD illustration, what follows is a continuation of a theological interpretation of the GGU-model and its relation to a Genesis 1 - 8 creationary scenario. This theological interpretation of the GGU-model should not affect, in any manner, the merits of the GGU-model, which has various secular and other theological interpretations. The brackets [[ . . .]] are used to indicate a somewhat more technical discussion.

The GGU-model as discussed in “Science Declares Our Universe Is Intelligently Design” never needs to be interpreted theologically. [[There are two different approaches. In this book, the reductionist approach is used. Today, I tend to consider only the “top-down” approach where, for a single universe, an ultimate ultraword is not needed.]] Although it’s shown that the notion called “in-transit” information and other known theological interpretations are viable scientific and rational possibilities, there’s an additional approach that I continue to detail. Each of these two approaches solves the problem of the apparent development of our universe over a vast number of years and, yet, rationally models the Genesis 1 - 8 account in the most literal sense possible. This

includes young-earth concepts. There is more the one young-earth concept. The one discussed in these four sections is highly Biblical in character but, relative to the Flood, considerably different than the approach that is most often reported on and discussed.

The creationary model here presented is distinct from those presently being popularized by Answers in Genesis (AiG), the Institute for Creation Research (ICR) and the Creation Research Society (CRS) and others.

As I point out in the above mentioned DVD illustration, no specific cosmology presented within the present creationary literature includes the requirement that it first includes an “eternity” feature that is withdrawn after the Fall. Such a GGU-model pre-design yields this requirement. Please do not categorize me as a “YEC” (a young earth creationists) based upon your knowledge of the models presented by such organizations and other individuals. Relative to their models, **I am not a YEC**. I am an SBC (Strict Biblical Creationist).

In all that follows, the phrase “local environment” means the Earth, sun and moon, and, depending upon evidence and personal choice, could include all of the other named constituents of our solar system.

Although, in what follows, I use some of the terminology found in the mentioned book and in others articles on this website, not knowing the exact meaning of these terms should not influence basic comprehension. For physical-systems, the term “development” refers to the notion that the formation of entities progresses in a step-by-step manner via pre-designed event sequences. And, for a universe, it means the step-by-step generation of an entire universe as it “appears” at each moment in a primitive sequence.

[1] The Bible teaches that God did not create the physical universe from nothing. The idea that God transforms His thoughts into physical reality is a Biblically sound creation scenario. **Pre-designed** portions of the Genesis sequence (i.e. library) appear rather suddenly in mature or fully functional form as the entities are described in Genesis 1:2 - 31. The originally realized biological Earth entities may have been rapidly formed from less complex entities but not via any form of biological random across-kinds evolutionary process. These biological objects came from a collection of specially designed objects each being termed as a “type-one kind\*.” (See \* below.)

As to the formation during day-four of the exterior universe, the “stars” - the dim twinkling lights - are formed by unknown means since they and the Sun and Moon are originally to be eternal entities. This behavior is completely rational in character since it can be pre-designed via general descriptions. These include mental images. All of the required GGU-model processes, ultranatural objects and the properton firmament comprise a portion of the “foundations” of the Earth (Job 38:4, Isa 51:13, 16) and are all created over a zero observer (or standard primitive) time interval and comprise

one of the two heavens implied by Genesis 1:1. An observer time value corresponds to a primitive sequence value but a primitive sequence value need not correspond to observer time.

[2] Although I developed the scientific model for the development of the exterior universe via “in-transit information” and this model remains viable when modified with an “eternity” feature, one needs to determine at what point in the development of the exterior universe realization occurs. The Hebrew word often translated as earth (’erets) is also often translated as a portion of the original solar-system object. In these four sections if not qualified, I use the capital “E” to indicate the entire pre-Flood earth object. Earth-time is time measured via any periodic and precise Earth-bound physical-system. Earth-time is a form of observer time.

[3] The Fall of Adam and Eve triggered a shift in a library or a branch in the Genesis sequence, a shift that altered the local environment to some extent as well as ending any “eternity” feature. This alteration comes about by application of the Rapid-Formation Model (RFM) (2). The local environment now adheres to some of the describable physical processes that govern an exterior universe as well as now allowing type-two biological alterations. Comparing the created entities prior to the Fall with those that existed after the Fall, indicates that the physical world is now transient. Evidence for this behavior is observed as various forms of physical deterioration.

What is the basic Biblical notion that constitutes evil? The physical aspects of this term correspond, in general, to that which objectively hurts ones existence. This can include defined sinful behavior. But, it need not be confined to this category. Humans suffer for other reasons not related to sinful activities. Today, just being present during many physical events often hurts ones existence. In certain Old Testament cases, such events are stated as a method God uses to physical punishment sinful behavior. (New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, Vol 1, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, (1967 (1975 version), p. 562.)) Thus, the original strict meaning of this term includes all of the physical events that hurt our existence. After the death and resurrection of Jesus, the notion that physical behavior exterior to an individual is a form of “evil” is no longer applicable. “Evil comes from a man’s heart in the form of evil thoughts which find expression in acts” (p. 563).

Prior to the Flood, humankind chose to reject God’s guidance. So, it is obvious that God removed humankind from an environment in which they still had some protection from many physical events that were previously classified as “evil.” Then He stated that this method of destroying His previously created environment will not again occur.

After the Fall of Adam and Eve, the environment in which they were thrust changed from their previous experiences. Everlasting physical life is altered. Aging factors are now present in this newly realized environment. This is an environment in which Adam and Evil and humankind, in general, are not original designed to live.

Of course, such physical-system behavior exists in the covirtual or potential form by pre-design, which now becomes reality.

In particular, God states, “I will greatly increase your pains in childbearing” . . . . (Genesis 3:16) “Cursed is the ground because of you; through painful toil you will eat of it all the days of your life.” (Genesis 3:17) “I will produce thorns and thistles for you” . . . . (Genesis 3:18) “until you return to the ground, . . . for dust you are and dust you will return.” (Genesis 3:19) (NIV).

This last statement I take as meaning that human physical death occurs after this pronouncement. This reality is a direct result of human choice. However, the local environment still appears to satisfy various “physical” processes that are different from those we observe and describe today. Individuals live for rather long periods. Indeed, there is still no rain. (I examine the lack of rain-water more closely in section IV.)

[[[As discussed, the participator mechanism yields a continual shift to different Genesis library covirtual event sequences at corresponding moments in an appropriate primitive sequence. The following second approach is difficult to illustrate via a DVD illustration. The Genesis library contains pre-designed entities that are equivalent to ultrawords that generate event sequences. This maintains the notion of “God thinks” throughout the development of any physical universe. However, \*instruction-entities for a particular collection of universe-wide frozen-frames for each creation-day, or portion there of, are represented as an ultra-logic-system and as such is representable as an ultraword that rationally yields the entities that appear during each creation-day. This satisfies explicitly the “God thinks” phrase as it appears in Genesis1:1 - 2.]]]

[4] God states in Genesis 6: 13 “I will destroy them (together) with the earth.” Thus, He intends to destroy the original Earth as well. Yet another Divine intervention is made that shifts to another pre-designed branch in the Genesis sequence so as to completely destroy most of the original Earth’s biological entities and to ruin the special aspects of the Earth as well as aspects of the local environment. This satisfies the participator aspects of the GGU-model. (The meaning of the term ’erets (earth) is often ambiguous and it has different meanings when contextually required. This is discussed in greater depth in last portion of this section. This shift has removed all the “obvious” evidence that such a special pre-Flood local environment existed. (This notion is further described in section IV.)

It seems that this shift is made so that, after the Flood, the physical-system behavior within the local environment appears consistent with the processes that govern the development of the exterior universe. This includes type-three biological variations. (By disobeying God’s behavioral requirements, humankind has now placed itself in a physical environment that is highly dangerous to its physical well-being.) I note, however, that for the current earth, along with its local environment, the results of this process retain some of the rather unusual and rare aspects associated with the original

formation. These allow humankind to continue to exist while embedded in an exceptional hostile environment. Depending upon what constitutes its local environment these could include such aspects as a position relative to its home galaxy, planetary orbits, etc., and special protections accorded our present earthly home. This would be a signature indicating that our continued existence and the basic astronomical purposes are still operative. This type of alteration in our local environment is a one-time event as indicated in Genesis 8:22 and 9:11. The next such alteration will be not only affect the earth but the entire universe as indicated in Revelations 20:11 and 21:1.

Relative to the described mechanisms, a model such as the GGU-model should not be considered as presenting the exact mechanisms used to achieve the described behaviors. Such models should only be considered as mimicking behavior and it may be that we cannot comprehend the mechanisms in any other way.

The Flood exists within the Genesis sequence and, for many individuals, the results of this Flood as presented in this article form part of the “strong delusion” that God said He would “send.” There are certain anomalies within our local environment that cannot be convincingly reconciled with secular macroevolutionary mechanisms such as unguided mutations. This would be a signature, for those who can discern such anomalies, that God created our original local environment in a special form as indicated within the Scriptures and the development of certain entities within, at least, our local environment cannot be satisfactorily explained by means of any internally displayed or humanly described modern evolutionary mechanism. (There actually are no such unguided mutations.) Due to application of RFM and the participator mechanism, the exterior universe and our local environment is actually billions of years old. The “delusion” is actually a self-delusion especially today. Individuals have a choice as to how our universe came into being and develops. The strict Biblical choice or a choice strongly corresponding to a non-biblical world-view.

[5] Consequently, the universe **as it presents itself today** has developed via event sequences that include aging and this verifies the physical laws satisfied by the development. However, there are anomalies that cannot be “explained” by means of any secular theory of macroevolution. I speculate that these anomalies include the lack of any actual evidence for the macroevolutionary development, from less complex structures, of human beings, of certain animal and vegetable entities (the kinds) that, according to the Bible, were created rather suddenly in mature or functional form and were carried on the Ark. Further, geological features of our present environment may be better explained via a global Flood rather than any other presently known physical mechanism. As Biblically suggested, these features provide a reminder of what occurred previous to the inhabitants departing the Ark.

In section IV, I show how all present-day anomalies can be completely explained. To those that accept the literal Biblical account, it’s rational to assume that the present-

day observationally satisfied processes that lead to physical-system development need not be the original processes by which our local environment was formed and developed through the time of the Flood.

[6] There are other creationary models that solve the “starlight and time” problem. Some have required considerable effort to produce. But, thus far none, except for the general GGU-model, includes the necessary original “eternal” Eden feature. There is a notion in modeling termed “Occam’s Razor.” This philosophy of science concept is applied to various categories. The philosophy states that the “simplest” model within a category is the most likely to be correct. One category is relative to whether the terms used for a description are the least “complicated.” It appears that, in comparison and for the GGU-model, the rapid-formation model, which lends itself to a DVD demonstration and a computer-graphics illustration, is the least complicated. (This does not require one to give a deeper-meaning to the terms used to present such an illustration.)

\*Type-one biological “kinds” prior to the Fall are very narrow in scope. In general, they are those entities that are originally designed to physically procreate. The phrase “after its kind” is used ten times in Genesis 1. Some consider the somewhat vague notion that a “kind” is a category that indicates a “common ancestry.” There is no detailed Biblical definition for this term. Indeed, consistent with the original physical laws for the pre-Fall Earth, there are no slight “evolutionary” styled variations in the designs from their original formation until the Fall.

After the Fall and through the Flood, the type-one kinds were expanded to allow for additional variations within these kinds - the type-two kinds. These variations now allowed for physical death. After the Flood, the kinds continue to correspond to the pairs that entered the Ark. Under additional physical regulations, behavior within these kinds is again expanded - the type-three kinds - so as to correspond to “some” of the pre-designed variations that occur for other possible life-forms within the created and pre-designed rapidly-formed external universe.

Important additional details and other aspects of this solution appear in the next section of this article. Further, in the last section is where all of the post-Flood controversies are solved in the strictest Biblical manner.

### Reference

(1) Herrmann, Robert A., Science Declares Our Universe IS Intelligently Designed, Xulon Press, Fairfax, VA, USA, 2002.

(2) Herrmann, R. A., The Rapid-Formation Model <http://vixra.org/abs/1409.0240>

(A) Herrmann, R. A. What is Creationary Science?  
<http://raherrmann.com/creation.htm>

### III. The Detailed Genesis Creation Scenario

[0] In what follows, the term Earth means the third planet from the sun.

[1] (Note: The phrase “rather sudden” is used in some cases, where entities may not appear instantaneously, but rather they might appear over an unknown period of Earth-time during a specific creation-day or they are produced over a comparatively “very small” Earth-time interval.) In determining an appropriate theological cosmology, I adhere strictly to the follow requirement. A plain (strict) interpretation of the Scriptures must come first. A cosmology must then be chosen that most closely verifies the rationality of this interpretation. Under no circumstances do I first construct a cosmology and then re-interpret or even ignore portions of the Scriptures and then force the Scriptures to conform to this cosmology.

*At the present time*, it is likely that the general procedure used to realize (1. p. 196, 235) specific entities within our universe is the “functional form” scenario that follows the scheme as briefly described within the “general scenario” section on pages 193-210. But, the processes have been more clearly refined and the best approach appears in references [4] and the actual technical articles 1a,b,c.

Relative to the prediction of a higher-language, any scenario I discuss is strongly coupled to the lack of knowledge scenario, which I accept. Further, I accept as factual Isaiah 55:8-9. (Note: As indicated in the “First Revision Typographical Variations or Errors” for the book “Science Declares . . . .,” you should change the “creation day” for star creation from day-three to day-four.)

(In this article, the term “subparticle” was previously used. To prevent incorrect mental images as to models for subparticles, the term “properton” replaces the term “subparticle.” Without visualizing, a properton is an entity characterized only by a list of properties.) I mention, in the book, exactly what the notion of expanding, stretching or unfolding means might require new knowledge. However, the fact is that we do have knowledge that corresponds to a very strict original meaning for such terms. It is certainly likely that God would introduce the correct meanings for Scriptural terms well before they are used in the original transcriptions. For the firmament, how these terms relate to the info-field concept is discussed in section I.

Info-fields are composed of configurations of ultra-propertons, which are taken from the collection of all ultra-propertons and their verified predictions yield indirect evidence for their existence. Some of its properties are the following:

(1) Compared to our physical-world notion of “density,” this collection is infinitely dense. You can remove all of the ultra-propertons needed to form even infinitely many infinite universes from this collection and the remains remains infinitely dense.

(2) This collection and the info-fields as basic entities are NOT defined in any geometric manner. Geometric language only applies when

physical realization is being considered. But, for comprehension and as a mere mimicking model, an info-field and, in particular, any inactive portion, the firmament, can be considered as “unfolded” from a central position near to what would become the Earth and its local environment (R.)

(3) I emphasize that this activated portion of an info-field yields all realized physical entities AND event sequence alterations in physical-system behavior.

(4) In 2, various “physical metrics” are derived using only a light propagation theory. In applicable cases, these physical metrics also satisfy the Hilbert-Einstein gravitational field equations. Within each of these metrics is an additional parameter  $d$ . Depending upon the application, this  $d$  corresponds to the “speed” of expansion, if such an expansion notion is required. If our universe is not expanding, then  $d = 0$ . (Expansion does not mean “local” movement. And, depending upon the cosmology  $d$  need not be the “measured” expansion rate.) This  $d$  can also be used for an accelerated expansion if such should be the case. No “dark energy” is needed for this to occur. However, such added energy and material is apparently necessary for our universe to be infinite and to be composed of infinitely many constituents. In its complex form,  $d$  can represent a contraction rather than an expansion of the field if that should ever be the case. Of course, this expansion notion indicates the physical degeneration of our universe.

(5) There can be different modes for material expansion. For example, the expansion of all physical entities relative to the “center” can occur or it can occur relative to the entities themselves. Gravitationally bounded entities can appear to be “moving away” from the center as an entire entity or, again, merely separating one-from-another. There is a quantum field theory, “the quintessence model,” that allows many different modes of expansion to occur.

(6) Among other possibilities, the apparent expansion can occur in a modeled continuous manner or a discontinuous manner.

(7) As stated in Genesis 1:6, a geometric notion is now attached to the “firmament” description. The term is “midst” as there used. The phrase where midst is used only yields an approximate “center” from where the sequentially produced info-field “might” unfold, that is the formation of the physical-system properton configurations. As discussed in the note at the end of this article, this center can either be a single point from where this occurs or only an apparent point as viewed from the “waters below.”

(8) These properties indicate some of the designed features for this “firmament” and they are all obtained via mathematical reasoning. Hence, it is intelligently designed.

Since the formation of the info-fields is always substratum controlled and due to ultranatural laws and theories, I am convinced that any humanly constructed cosmology that purports to explain how our universe developed from some type of primitive material will either contain predictions that cannot be accounted for or there are physical events that are not predicted.

Does the operative phrase “And God Said (thought), Let there be lights in the firmament . . . .” refer to the starlight, as well as the stated “Sun” and “Moon”? It seems that two other Scriptural witnesses indicate this. First, Genesis 1:14 states that these “lights” are to “divide the day from the night.” What lights yield the “night” division? Two other witnesses yield “The moon and stars to rule by night:” (Psalms 136:9) and “. . . the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, . . .” The phrase in Genesis 1:16 “he made the stars (dim twinkling lights) also” is not as it appears in the LXX. This may be an interpreter’s attempt to make the phrase “parenthetical.” The actual rendering should simply be “and the stars” as it is coupled with the previous “made.” Thus, the “good (excellent, best),” in Genesis 1:18, refers to God being pleased with His creation of starlight as well. The GGU-model’s lack of knowledge prediction, as applied to the Eden Model, indicates that it is most likely that we cannot have any significant knowledge as to how the original Sun, Moon and starlight are created so as to exist for an eternity.

Although the external universe of today is hostile to life-forms, the term “good” often does not refer to any so-called “natural evil.” As mentioned, for the creation scenario, it most likely means that God is “pleased with the design.” All that is necessary, as described in Genesis 1:14-18 and elsewhere, is that an external universe, the stars, have certain useful properties. Thus, after the Fall and, especially, the Flood, the hostile environment both on the earth and exterior to it does have a direct affect upon human existence although mankind was not created originally to inhabit such an environment. Their environment was the Garden of Eden and the original Earth, where perceived physical regulations are very different from those one might perceive after the Fall or Flood. These original regulations include type-one variations in kinds. (See \* below for definitions.) A pre-designed hostile environment can be humanity’s abode if humans so chose it through their actions. This includes the type-three variations in kinds. Pre-designed hostile environments containing covirtual ancient earths, with their local environments, exist but are only realized via the participator aspects of the GGU-model. (Recall that “pre-design” corresponds to “thoughts” that are transformed into various realities.)

[2] Sequentially presented Instruction paradigms produce event sequences that display physical entities and behavioral changes within physical-systems throughout

an entire universe as a physical-system. Such behavior can take any portion of the primitive sequence or period of observer time. If there is a portion of the primitive sequence or period of observer time history, then event sequences can repeat this history, or can even reverse the history.

The following adds slightly to my applications of the Rapid-Formation Model (RFM). First, I repeat the DVD-illustration description. Since this is a pre-designed universe, for consistency and possible later use, then after the Fall, at least, there is a location relative to all objects within the universe, where an ancient-type earth is formed. This ancient-type earth is formed in such a way that physical behavior satisfies the physical laws that also are satisfied by an external cosmology. This ancient-type earth includes its local environment - the R'-region. Of course, these entities are not of the special type God created originally for humankind.

Not all locations within a universe need to be realized at each moment in the primitive sequence. This happens here. With the exception of the in-transit or rapid-formation model, other creationary models solve the starlight and time problem by postulating specific cosmological mechanisms. For the rapid-formation portion, as the universe develops, the original Earth and its local environment in region R is not altered in any manner during the RFM process. After this and until Flood, behavior in region R is altered relative to its own set of physical laws. So as to not have two objects occupy the same space, those aspects of the developing universe that occur in region R' are simply not realized. Indeed, there are pre-designed developmental paradigms where the R'-region simply does not exist, while there are others where the R'-region continues to develop. Various pre-designed universes appear via the GGU-model's participator mechanisms.

It is significant that the RFM is independent from a choice of a universe external to the original region R. I consider viewing this process from a point exterior to the original Earth and its local environment for this simplified depiction. For the specific DVD illustration, the region R appears to be in suspended animation, while the eternal universe develops. This is accomplished by repeating those portions of this region's frozen-frames. (See "Science Declares . . ." p. 109.) Although region R is not altered, to enhance the special significance of R, the Genesis event sequence yields a universe that appears to be developing around R. The apparent suspended animation ceases at any chosen moment in the development of the surrounding universe. The RFM produces many distinct cosmologies exterior to R. With respect to today's accepted physical laws and the cosmology selected, such a development would appear to occur over vast periods of present day earth-time. Although it is not what I, at present, accept, in general after the Fall, secular "eternal" cosmologies are included.

Of Biblical significance for this participator form is that when a particular physical event  $E(t+1)$  is realized, the "previous" event  $E(t)$  is not lost. The event sequence that yields  $E(t+1)$  is a product of a specific \*developmental paradigm that details each of

the previously realized events. This yields a strict interpretation for various Biblical statements. For God's creationary activities, consider the rather poetic Psalm 148. Verse four states "Praise him, ye heavens of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens . . . ." Some have concluded that these are the original waters of Gen 1:7. The Living Bible implies that it represents the author's poetic attempt to describe a particular visual phenomenon. Obviously, neither the heavens nor waters can "Praise" anything except in a poetic sense. This sense can be somewhat re-interpreted.

It is mentioned at various times that Psalms are used for "remembrance." (38, 70, 97:12. . . . (KJV)). Clearly, "remembrance" is the motivation for Psalm 148. But, of significance, Psalm 148 also states that "for he commanded and they were created. He has also established them for ever and ever. . . ." Notice that the various entities as stated will not exist "for ever and ever" as they now physically appear. Relative to the "ever and ever," Matthew Henry states that the entities mentioned ". . . should last as long as there is occasion for them." Recently Spencer [7] makes, essentially, the same statement. The phrases such as "ever and ever" and "never" in relation to the physical universe mean that created beings cannot change what God has ordained for the physical universe, but of course, God can.

This indicates that God should be praised for all the entities that He created whether in realized and unrealized form. Hence, if applied, the outer place-holding waters being changed during day-four satisfies Henry's statement. Additionally, and as predicted, all the entities that are mentioned will exist "for ever and ever" in the final \*developmental paradigm. They will be "remembered." This file will remain for as long as such a sequence concept has any meaning. I point out the existence of such a \*developmental paradigm is consistent with Rev. 20:12-13.

How rapidly an external entity is formed is related to how region R is viewed via Earth-time, a restriction of observer time. For a developing universe, in order to make a comparison, an Earth-time measure is used to measure the external universe's time-development. Altering the period of suspended animation for the Eden external cosmology, this time development can occur over any day-four time-interval. The minimum suspended animation model corresponds to a zero-length interval of Earth-time. The notion of "formation" always refers to the formation of realized physical entities and, possibly, other preternatural physical-like entities that are realized but are not part of the defined material universe. For a specific cosmology, the physical entities that are rapidly formed need to be defined.

Recall that moments in observer time do correspond to moments in the primitive sequence. A developing unrealized external universe can "start" at any moment in this sequence. Starting entities can be at various levels of maturity or functionality. Thus, there are two significant realization possibilities. Realization can occur at the "starting" point of the sequence. Or, realization and development can "start" at some other sequential point. In this article, a miniscule Earth-time interval during day-four

is chosen during which the external portion of the Eden World, the Eden cosmology, is formed.

Theologically, one needs to accept a cosmology that does not contradict the Scriptures and that observationally satisfies Rom 1:20. My personal requirement for an observed external universe is that such an external universe indirectly reveals some of God's "invisible" attributes. It indirectly reveals His higher-intelligence via the GID-model interpretation. When for the Eden Model an exterior universe is rapidly formed, it might reveal, via the fine-tuning of various parameters, that our universe is especially created to yield our present earth and to harbor protected human life. It obviously reveals, via comparison with the exterior hostile environment, His great concern for various created entities. Although we no longer inhabit the original Earth, our present-day earth is still protected from much of the external universe's destructive influences. Further, our present cosmology is consistent with our specially selected location within our home galaxy, a location from which we can observe the wonders of His creation.

To include the fact that biological entities can participate in such a development after it reaches some moment, say 6,000-8,000 years ago, the participator mechanism, as illustrated in my book via the DVD notion, is needed. (Also see (1f)) Also, all such universes do exist in the "mind of God" so to speak. But, they are not physically realized until called forth. For this model, God knows the past, present, and future no matter what event sequence is activated. Does any other mathematically based creationary model include this necessary aspect for His creation?

For me, one intent of the Genesis 1 descriptions is to imply, for the Earth and its local environment as created prior to the Fall and Flood, that the physical development does satisfy various regulations that are very different from those we observe today. That is, the pre-Fall Earth with its local environment is very specially created to be different from a created and hostile exterior universe that would "appear" after the Fall. My application of the RFM to the Genesis scenario does not alter the Genesis creation-day numerical ordering, where different physical behaviors than observed today occur. Of course, the participator mechanism also applies prior to the Fall as well. (I use the term "satisfied" to indicate that alterations in physical behavior are not caused by physical law.) Moreover, using this ordering, the original R-region Genesis environment is created in the Biblically described functional form.

Using Earth-time, the Sun, Moon and starlight that originally appear are everlasting entities. After the Fall of Man, various physical laws external to region R, which we can comprehend, first emerged. Hence, in general, the universe exterior to region R, as produced by the second application of the RFM, satisfies the requirements for many different cosmologies that correspond to present-day observations. Thus, you have two type-R developments taking place during rapid-formation. The Biblically described R region and the external cosmologically produced region R'. The R region still appears but not at a moment when the R'-region appears in a universe-wide frozen-frame. I

term this as it being “out of phase.” This approach eliminates the argument that entities do not actually exist, at the least, in some form. It eliminates any claim that consistency is not maintained for the development of the exterior universe and that God does not present the truth relative to our present day modes of observation. Region R’ also exists as a pre-designed system.

Recall that I am an limited positivist within the philosophy of instrumentalism. For the GGU-model, a gleaned physical law does not relate to a “cause and effect.” The cause and effect notion is but an aid when we predict physical behavior. This philosophy of science means I do not find it necessary to accept unobserved hypothesized physical entities as existing in reality. Highly imaginative assumptions in such areas as quantum physics, quantum field theory or “strings,” are exactly that - imaginary primitive entities. As an example, excitations of quantum fields do not cause the fields to produce characteristics of “particles.” The observed behavior described by these imaginary constructs is simply satisfied by members of an event sequence that is pre-designed. Quantum field theory is an “instrument” used by us to predict behavior. God has gifted us with an extraordinary mental capacity to construct such theories for the sole purpose of predicting actual observed behavior. Such predictions are necessary so that we can follow His requirements that we “subdue” the animals and most likely the earth as well. They allow us to build a human made “universe.”

Relative to the Earth-time, much of the external universe can also appear in various degrees of functional form. Such an “appearance” depends upon the cosmology chosen and how the realization operator is applied. Summarizing, at the end of day-four, through the Fall the earth and its local environment satisfy the same physical regulations as those of the exterior universe. From the Fall through the Flood, as partially indicated in Genesis 3:15-19, the Earth with its local environment develops in such a way that it satisfies physical laws that are slightly different from those satisfied by the hostile external universe observed today. This concludes my basic description. Below I give a few more details.

No universe-specific physical laws are used for the RFM. This is why the RFM process applies to proposed secular and theological models. All of this certainly shows how “creation” reveals God’s “power.” He is not constrained. Now I always state that these are models in the analogue sense since God is a higher-intelligence. These descriptions need not correspond to the exact methods God employs. This means that these descriptions are a way to comprehend a mode of creation that probably, in the physical-world, cannot otherwise be fully comprehend by His created. The Biblically mentioned solar system entities are produced by sudden realization or rapid formation in functional form under the day-four scenario. The rapid-formation suspended animation does not require a “morphing” boundary employed in some of my writings.

There is Scriptural evidence that the notion of “sudden” need not be instantaneous

but rather it can mean a longer period during a specific creation-day. This is seen in the wording of some of the day-three events. For the original Earth scenario, the “water” was separated into two branches. As indicated by Genesis 1:9, no other water is realized. There is water “above” and the water world from which the original Earth emerges is the remaining portion of the original water. There is a rather sudden change in this water world where the water below now appears to be gathered together into seas and DRY land appears. There is also a “bringing forth” or “production” (i.e. shall become) mentioned. This indicates that an event can take place over a time interval within day-three. This model preserves the exact ordering of events as described in Genesis 1. It preserves the exact realization of the material objects and processes that yield these realized objects as modeled by a type of “mental speaking” or “commanding.” The terms correspond, in meaning, to that which is comprehensible by most individuals at the time first presented (about 1450 BC) and their meanings have not changed.

As with all such theoretical discussions, present-day observations yield indirect evidence for the acceptance of the mentioned creationary scenario. Relative to specific Scripture, a portion of the info-field “construction” can display a type of encircling or encompassing of the Earth. Such an encompassing appears in Proverbs 8:27. Matthew Henry comments on this passage. “He was not less active when, on the second day, he stretched out the firmament, the vast expanse, and ‘set’ that as a ‘compass’ upon the face of the depth,’ surrounding it on all sides with that canopy, that curtain.”

This idea that there is a surrounding or a “circle” about the Earth and its local environment is also stated in many other “translations.” KJV “When He drew a circle on the face of the deep.” NASB “When He inscribed a circle on the face of the deep.” Young’s “In His decreeing a circle on the face of the deep, . . . .” ASV “When he set a circle on the surface of the deep, . . . .” This can refer to the forming of the Eden cosmology. The star field producing portion of an info-field is formed “around” the pre-Fall Earth and its local environment. This can also be continued as a reminder relative to today’s observational evidence for our present external universe. Further, this concept can satisfy the Scriptural notion that the Earth and probably its local environment is surrounded by the star-field portion of the info-fields. They might display this property via a “surrounding” notion while radially appearing to be “spreading out” from a spatial point.

The simplest spatial evidence for the notion that our universe surrounds the local region R would be that various galaxies at approximately the same distance from the Earth would generally form spherical-like shells about the local Earth environment. However, since the galaxies are in relative motion, I do not contend that any observed effects need to be continuous effects throughout the cosmos. All that is needed is that enough galaxies satisfy this “shell effect” so that this configuration yields a signature relative to the local environment that implies that this info-field configuration (the “firmament”) originally satisfied this “circular surrounding” notion.

[[As derived in [2] on p. 68, the Robinson-Walker line-element is totally based upon light propagation properties, the chronotopic interval, alterations in infinitesimal light-clock counts and the selection of a potential velocity. The potential velocity statement used is a combined substratum expression that relates substratum motion to physical world behavior. The metric is not derived using hypersphere notions. Of course, the metric can be interpreted in terms of a spacetime metric as yielding a redshift but it need not to be so interpreted. The potential velocity used in this derivation allows the metric to be directly related to Riemannian geometry. But, it need not be so related. The actual derivation of the redshift express is not dependent upon a theory of gravity. A basic redshift expression such as (63.3) in D. F. Lawden, *An Introduction to Tensor Calculus, Relativity and Cosmology*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1982, p. 182, is obtained directly from the infinitesimal light-clock form of the Robinson-Walker metric and infinitesimal light-clock measurements. No gravitational field notions are required.]]

It is totally false that a modern cosmology based upon the Hilbert-Einstein gravitational field equations requires that there by no privileged position within our universe. This is especially so since the expansion Robinson-Walker metric is derivable without considering any gravitational dynamics. Further, since vast motions were introduced after the Fall and measurement of such motions are but relative measures, there appears to no instrumentation, at present, that can reliably produce evidence from within our local environment that can determine whether our universe is a geocentric or heliocentric or a Milky Way centered model.

Today, the standard Big Bang (BB) model employs a “stretching or expansion” that, in general, produces the average recessional motion of galactic matter. From the event sequence viewpoint, such an expansion can be comprehended as discussed in the last note to this section.

I have no doubt that my Eden model and its application to the model I have selected for external universe creation will be criticized. Some who claim to be Christians, even Christians who are scientists, will reject my selection. Such scientists continue to present cosmologies that are completely developmental in structure or cosmologies that have little Scriptural support. Further, usually they do not include the original “everlasting” feature. And, indeed, they contradict this concept. The cosmologies they invent may be yet another example where God has allowed a great delusion to occur. Although the RFM can produce them, the unnecessary creationary cosmologies that tend to solve, in different ways, the “starlight and time” problem, are no longer of significance. But, for “some reason” individuals continue to present them. I can find no acceptable reason for this. Let the secular world popularize its cosmologies. It cannot escape from the Eden model and its creationary consequences.

[3] As previously defined, the term “development” can refer to the notion that formation of entities progresses from definable simple stages to definable complex stages

via event sequences. When restricted to biological entities, one might term such a development as “evolution.” Again I mention that the behavior within the Earth’s vicinity, prior to the Flood (type-two variations), and especially prior to the Fall (type-one variations), satisfied physical laws that were considerable different from those that exist today (the type-three variations). One basic creationary stance is that all of the Scripturally stated specifically named local objects were, with one possible exception, realized suddenly at the level of maturity or functionality that is in accordance with the Biblical description. Certain day-three entities might have been produced over a longer day-three observer time period. For “sudden” and mature realization or rapid-formation examples, consider dry land, biological entities, the Sun and the Moon and starlight. However, what we observe today is very different from what occurred during creation week.

Until the Fall, most of the physical laws applicable to our local environment did not include those that, today, we associated with, at least, “human physical death.” The process we call the conservation of energy was probably not applicable to all objects. The entities were everlasting. On pages 198 - 199 of the above book, I discuss what I accepted relative to the creation statements made in Genesis 1:1. I have recently revised my stance on Genesis 1 and my findings are stated in [1d]. The pre-designed water is to be separated into two portions. The portion “under” the “firmament” is the portion that is used for the earthly seas and possibly a portion is transformed into dry land. It is used for no other purpose. The Hebrew terms used prior to this separation indicate that, in observer time (which is a restricted form of primitive time), before the “dry land” appeared, the “land” was in an “unreal” form. This is exactly the unrealized and pre-designed requirement associated with the Genesis sequence interpretation for the GGU-model.

To be realized in the physical-world, God would need to activate the properton combinations, an info-field, and apply a process modeled by the standard part operator. These processes are included as a necessary step, for specific physical-systems, with the application of the “God said (thinks)” ultralogic-type operator for days 2 - 6. This is the conjoining of each “universe-wide-frozen frame” and allows a physical-system to appear to develop in primitive and, hence, observer time. For example, such a frozen-frame would exhibit a portion of the realized water at one moment in the event sequence, and immediately this portion is replaced by dry land and the realized dry land takes its place. On the other hand, the dry land could suddenly appear as if it had been originally composed of water and came from the water. As the Greek states “cohering out of water” where cohering means to stand together. There is no need whatsoever for God to have transformed some water into the dry land using additional physical processes.

All original Earth physical events are obtained in the same manner as the “dry ground, the land” and the “seas” are obtained via rapid-formation or sudden appear-

ance. There need be no humanly comprehensible regularities that guide any of the original developments. For example, the objects that appear during day-three do not require the Sun to have been realized during any previous creation-day. As a single term and not as generalized to the Eden cosmology, the Garden of Eden (Pleasantness) (i.e. Pleasantville) can identify a region or a concept. Further, as mentioned, since the Sun would need to be everlasting and, via rational generalization for consistency, locations not in the Garden Eden, if any, prior to the Fall, would need to display physical-system behavior different from that which we observe today. This is even true between the Fall and Flood. As discussed in section IV, I postulate that Scripture implies there is no rain throughout the Earth until the Flood occurred. However, it is my view that relative to notions not mentioned in Genesis 1-8, speculation should be greatly constrained.

Prior to the Fall, there appears to be a much greater interplay between the ultranatural world and the material world. Any differences in physical-system behavior in the Garden of Eden and elsewhere all occurred through realized pre-designed event sequences. When God cursed the ground (Genesis 3:17), the allowed physical behavior that excluded physical “death” was altered so that “aging” occurred at an unknown but definite rate via event sequences. Clearly other aspects of Pleasantville no longer applied.

The notion of “natural evil” (disease, earthquake, tsunami etc.) is not actually relative to “aging” and “death.” Humankind has chosen, via its behavior, to exist in an environment for which they were not originally created. Of course, covirtual libraries and events sequences were pre-designed with these possibilities, where humankind is either included within or excluded from the event sequences. Recall again that, for this theological interpretation, pre-design can be conceived of as being within the “mind of God” and “creation” is a two step process.

Attempting to give a “reason” why such pre-designed libraries should have been created in the first place is highly problematic. One should learn to simply accept various Biblical notions and statements as those offered by a true higher-intelligence. The Bible states that it is Adam and Eve’s disobedience that directly caused them to be included within this first level of destructive physical-system behavior. (For comparison purposes only, the event sequences that yield this new local environment may be considered as formed by coalescing of other event sequences. Of course, the event sequences are in realized form.)

As mentioned in the book, during the Flood and due to the selection of a different collection of pre-designed event sequences, previously satisfied physical laws would appear to be altered so that they correspond to those we perceive today. A major variation is that, relative to biological development, type-three alterations in the “kinds” appear. (See \* below for the definitions.)

Such alterations simply broaden each “kind” so that kinds correspond to similar categories for the external universe. However, such allowed variations do not satisfy the notions of “random” evolutionary processes. The “kind” category for the pairs that were on the Ark still applies. They do not lose their identifying features via any unaided physical process as the universe develops. From the pure physical viewpoint, they remain the pairs needed for procreation or that are identified as having a common ancestry.

It is contrary to the scientific method to accept a physical theory with non-observable hypothesized features as fact and then claim that predicted missing evidence supports the theory. Only “actual” physical evidence can support an indirectly verifiable theory and such theories cannot be considered as fact in any absolute sense. This is especially so since there are GGU-model interpretations that are valid alternatives. After the Flood, these perceived but altered laws, at the very least, are consistent with our present aging concepts. My previous approach to the after-Flood environment is altered in the next section.

Various physical entities that we examine today are indeed of great age, but they are mingled with other evidence that does not display such age. God’s curse has removed much of the physical-system evidence for the existence of this previous Earth and its local environment. The local environment does not “remember,” in major cases, that it was, in the beginning, accorded a special type of non-corrupt existence. However, as specifically described in Genesis 1, there are specific animal, including humans, and vegetable entities that display, today, secular behavior which is best explained by assuming that they appeared suddenly in Biblically described functional form rather than through macro-evolutionary processes. The existence of such mingled evidence does not contradict the Eden cosmology.

The Eden notion and its alteration refers specifically to *physical-system behavior*. When such Eden behavior is altered this does not alter post-Fall physical material that has been purposely mingled with other material evidence. No unguided materialistic macro-evolutionary mechanism will satisfactorily explain all of the actual physical evidence present today.

The Flood is a significant solution to a problem fostered by humanity itself. Obviously, humankind, knowing the difference between what God considers as “good” and “evil” behavior chose “evil” and this “forced” God, in physical-system terms, to give humanity what it sought - a more destructive and violent environment. This is the type of environment that exists throughout our universe today. Consequently, it is not the actual physical environment that has any relationship to “evil.” But, it is human behavior that has led to humanity being placed in this hostile environment, which corresponds to the previously unrealized ancient-type earth. God, of course, allows humankind a way out of this dilemma, a way to remove the actual “sting” of death, a way to attain “eternal” life in His presence within a new type of Garden of Eden.

Once again, due to the existence of ultranatural theories and laws as well as ultranatural events, the descriptions and predictions for this Genesis Flood scenario must be considered only suggestive in character. Further, for these same reasons, this scenario description must be considered as incomplete. As with all such theoretical discussions, present-day observations yield **indirect** evidence for the acceptance of this creationary scenario and no evidence will ever contradict this scenario description. As suggested, pre-Flood unaltered evidence should exist that will reveal the existence of specific antediluvian physical processes distinct from those gleaned from present-day observations.

My SBC stance is based upon the necessity for “great age” as exhibited today by many, **but not all**, material objects and, in general, is based upon standard earth-time. In general, earth-time is time measured via any highly periodic and precise earth-bound physical-system. Earth-time is a restricted form of observer time. Prior to the Flood, earth rotation time is the proper earth-time measure. Hence, the earth of today was physically realized about 4,500 years ago as such a measure is directly related to earth rotation time.

[4] Mathematically, the coalescing of all “frozen-frames” can be rationally assumed to be controlled by intelligent actions. As discussed in the book [1], research described in the paper [1e] implies that statistical models coupled with an allowable perturbation scheme are the most likely bases for the fundamental (particle physics realm) and other physical-system behavior for entities within the universe as it is observed today; the after Flood behavior. These models, as presented in this research, do not imply any lack of complete Divine control via intelligent agency.

Within creationary science, the Biblically based assumption is that the statistical behavior within the universe corresponds to the notion that the universe is “cursed” due to human sin. As a proof text, consider Paul’s statement in Rom. 8:22 “For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.” (KJV) This implies, according to [6], that physical behavior, as compared to behavior prior to the Fall, is transitory. There is a slight controversy relative to the Greek translated here as “creation.” In various places it is translated “creature.” However, as stated by God in Genesis, rational deduction implies that alterations in physical-system behavior should be considered as extending throughout the observable universe so as to be consistent with humanities future pre-designed observational capacities.

The introduction of statistical behavior at any moment in the development of a cosmology is a viable GGU-model rational possibility and leads to an alteration in the necessary everlasting cosmology present during the time of Eden. Probabilistic behavior, expansion and the removing of other features that yielded the everlasting cosmos and, hence, the ensuring heat death satisfy the transitory behavior for our universe. It has been predicted that God controls the design and His control can satisfy statistical processes that strongly verify that He has, indeed, designed this behavior [1e]. It is because of the Fall of man, that the eternal character of physical behavior is lost.

[5] What “evolutionary” processes I might accept, I discuss below. Any apparent evolutionary behavior is intelligently pre-designed variations in kinds and the coalescing of frozen-frames is controlled by intelligent agency. All such kinds categories are created via the same procedures. They appear in a mature or functional form. However, for today’s observable cosmology, we have no Biblical knowledge as to their level of maturity or functionality when first created. As pointed out, the interpretation that any such behavior is not controlled by a higher-intelligence and that such processes were the original processes by which our local environment as well as the exterior universe came into being yields a strong delusion.

[6] At present, I tend to reject so-called “common sense” geometric styled models for the fundamental realm of particle physics in that they appear to be anti-scriptural. The Scriptures state specifically (Romans 1:20 and elsewhere) that through investigation of physical-system behavior one should be able to glean some of the invisible **attributes** of God. The term “common sense” seems to correspond only to naive geometric imaginary. This is a very limited form of our mental capacities. Under this definition, the teachings of Jesus (Matthew 5 and elsewhere) are far from being what would pass for “common sense,” especially today. Further, throughout the Scriptures, we are told how very different are God’s “thoughts” from those of His created. These facts illustrate that the Divine mind need not follow the concept of this limited form of “common sense.” The concepts of quantum physics directly imply a strong comparative form of physical-system deterioration in behavior. Statistical behavior is a demonstrated aspect of our observed behavior and is used to predicted such behavior. This makes such behavior “commonly” understood.

[7] Please note, I tend to limit my prideful tendency to explain in humanly comprehensible terms what I might imagine are the exact details as to “how” God created something. The reason for this is the GID-model prediction that we are dealing with a God that is not only infinitely powerful in comparable attributes but also infinitely more intelligent than any created entity. The processes that have produced and continue to alter our entire universe, through this very moment, are consistent with the exact ordered sequence of events as described in Genesis 1 - 8 as they are literally interpreted in the strictest sense.

[8] It is mention in “Science Declares Our Universe Is Intelligently Designed” that the length of a creation-day most be determined from Scriptural analysis. However, it is clear that there are, at least, six primitive sequence intervals that can be identified as corresponding to active realizations of event sequences. It is self-evident that there is neither a Scriptural nor physical reason why each of these primitive sequence intervals cannot be related directly to Earth-time as measured by one complete Earth-rotation. Such a rotation is viewed from our local environment and may be represented by any equivalent highly periodic Earth-bound physical-system behavior. It appears that such a “day” notion is employed to indicate that the events described, especially those during

days two - six, occurred over a “short time period” as we comprehend such a “time” notion. (No actual physical realization took place during “day-one.”) Hence, it is rationally acceptable to allow the time interval for each creation-day to be that which is considered to be one complete Earth-rotation relative to the inactive info-field and the forth-coming star-field.

\*Type-one biological “kinds” prior to the Fall are very narrow in scope. In general, they are those entities that are originally designed to physical procreate. The phrase “after its kind” is used ten times in Genesis 1. Some consider the somewhat vague notion that a “kind” is a category that indicates a “common ancestry.” There is no detailed Biblical definition for this term. Indeed, consistent with the original physical laws for the Earth, there are no “evolutionary” styled variations in the designs from their original formation until the Fall.

After the Fall and through the Flood, the type-one kinds were expanded to allow for additional variations within these kinds - the type-two kinds. These variations now allow for physical death. After the Flood, the kinds continue to correspond to the pairs that entered the Ark. Under additional physical regulations, behavior within these kinds is again expanded - the type-three kinds - so as to correspond to “some” of the pre-designed variations that occur for other possible life-forms within the created and pre-designed rapidly-formed external universe.

**Important:** In the following section, I give a complete, both scientific and Scriptural, solution to all the post-Flood controversies. All of the present day scientific evidence and strictly interpreted Biblical statements are consistent with this solution.

## References

1. Herrmann, Robert A., Science Declares Our Universe is Intelligently Designed, Xulon Press, Fairfax, VA, USA, 2002.

1a. Herrmann, Robert A., The GGU-model and Generation of Developmental Paradigms, <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0605120> and most recent version <http://vixra.org/abs/1309.0004>

1b. Herrmann, Robert A., Nonstandard Ultra-logic-systems Applied to the GGU-model, <http://vixra.org/abs/1308.0125>

1c. Herrmann, Robert A., The GGU-model processes and Their Secular and Theological Applications, <http://vixra.org/abs/1404.0421>

1d. Herrmann, Robert A., Genesis 1:1 - 2:1, 8, 10, . . .  
<http://vixra.org/abs/1312.0122>

1e. Herrmann, Robert A., Probability Models and Ultra-logics  
<http://arXiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0112037>

1f. Herrmann, Robert A., The Participator Model  
<http://vixra.org/abs/1410.0181>

2. Herrmann, Robert A., The Theory of Infinitesimal Light-Clocks, <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0312189>
3. Herrmann, Robert A., The Theory of Ultralogics, Part 2, <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/9903082>
4. Herrmann, Robert A. Simplified GGU-Model Processes <http://raherrmann.com/simprocesses.htm>
5. Herrmann, Robert A. Same as 1c.
6. On Romans 8:22. See Dictionary of New Testament Theology, Vol 1, page 524. Zondervan, 1979.
7. Spencer, Wayne, The Fate of the Universe and Psalm 148, CRSQ 50(3)(2014):195.

#### IV. The Genesis Flood and its Aftereffects

There is a common and very deceptive linguistic process employed by the physical science community. Although what they describe is but one of two or more models that predict observed physical behavior, they write and speak using a **positive language**. They remove adverbs such as “maybe” and, especially, its meaning “possibly” from the sentence structure. One is trained to do so. It is tedious to modify all the appropriate terms with this proper nuance. However, supposedly, individuals making these “scientific statements” are aware of this. But, I doubt that many actually believe that a theory, a model, they have worked on most of their lives and for which they have even won such things as a Nobel Prize may be false. I demonstrate below the use of a positive language. However, this is only a linguistic technique and, in actuality, what I present below only yields an indirectly verifiable choice. One needs other means, not classified as “scientific,” in order to determine which choice is fact.

[0] Below you will find an addition to my general book [1] statements (beginning on page 210) relative to apparent age. What appears in this section is a more in-depth explanation as to how the Genesis Flood rationally leads to our present universe. “In the beginning God created the heavens . . . ” (Gen 1:1). The Scriptures indicate by implication that there exists a created object in which the “foundations of the Earth” are contained (Job 38:4, Ps 104:3, Isa 57:13, 16, Heb 1:10) and in which the physical world is embedded. The GGU-model predicts such a “foundational world” that is contained in the technical “ultranatural world” (a portion of the nonstandard physical world.) There are also indications in Rev 21 that such an ultranatural world Biblically exists.

The Scriptures when plainly (strictly) interpreted imply that all entities “made in God’s image” that have existed on our present planet from about 2348 BC, or maybe

as far back as 4000 BC, are descendants of Noah. (For further information about such claims, please see the URLs at the end of this article. However, some of this AiG information needs to be modified based upon the following discussion.)

[1] As a review, recall that the fundamental primitive entity used for this GGU-model interpretation is specific information. I now consider the notion of instruction-information, now termed as instruction-entities, as the most significant aspect of specific information. Specific information is mentioned on page 106 of “Science Declares Our Universe Is intelligently Designed” and elsewhere. Its properties are determined by investigating the production of perceived physical world entities.

The refinements to the GGU-model mathematically model real human physical behavior. This includes how we generalize this behavior to machines. Previously, motion picture film or VHS tape was employed. Today, a major aspect of the modern construction of a DVD is modeled. In particular, the notion of a changing universe-wide frozen-frame (or slice) is utilized, where such “frames” exhibit all necessary levels of complexity. The mathematical model then predicts substratum processes and entities that yield the event sequences.

[2] Entities defined as “immaterial” are used within scientific theories and have been accepted by many (physical) science-communities. As an example, consider the follow that appears on page 154 of the text “Elementary Quantum Field Theory” by Henley and Thirring.

The most fascinating application of our rules is, however, not to any material substance but to immaterial fields, the excitation of which appears to us as elementary particles.

Such “fields” can be considered as pure imaginary objects that have physical properties imposed upon them. For example, energy. If one simply takes “Plank’s” constant  $h$  and multiplies it by a frequency  $\nu$  of so many cycles per second, the result is energy in terms of the unit “joule.” And this is suppose to be a great revelation. Such fields can represent behavior we may not be able to otherwise comprehend. I point out that, although defined as immaterial, these “fields” are still assumed to be part of our physical universe by most quantum physicists. This quotation can be altered for the GGU-model.

The most fascinating application of our rules is, however, not to any material substance but to immaterial info-fields, the realization of which appears to us as physical entities.

In this case, the term “immaterial” refers to something in the ultranatural world that is not part of our presently defined universe.

As defined on page 59 of “Science Declares . . .,” images comprise all digitizable forms of meaningful human sensory and mental information. Specific information is meaningful information restricted to physical-systems. In general and prior to real-

ization, an info-field is also termed as covirtual. All aspects of a physical universe, independent from how they are categorized by physical-science, are generated from primitive \*instruction-entities. Each aspect of such specific information is immaterial in a much more general sense than the sense being expressed by the above quotation. Thus, if there actually exist “quantum fields,” then these are not immaterial from the viewpoint of \*instruction-entities and info-fields.

[3] Using various methods to obtain a Biblical chronology, the actual Flood is assumed to have occurred on the Earth at a point about 4,500 years ago. (For this article, the capital “E” signifies that this is the pre-Flood original earth.) Prior to the Flood, the Bible indicates that the inhabitants of the Earth were the descendants of Adam and Eve. After Noah built the Ark, God directed representatives of animal “kinds” (type-two) to the Ark so they would survive the coming deluge. There have been attempts to determine relative to our modern categorizing of biological entities what the term “kinds” signifies. In this interpretation, such a determination is unnecessary. Many accept that it is but a collection of entities that have been designed to procreate. (See [6] below for my definitions of the three types of kinds.)

God directed that representatives from groups of animals that are type-two kinds migrate to Noah’s Ark. Based upon the animal population of today and exhibited by the sparse fossil record, there are studies that attempt to determine the actual number of animals that were carried by the Noah’s Ark. As this interpretation develops, it will be obvious why such a determination is unnecessary.

Consider the following translations of Genesis 6:16.

- (1) “A window shalt thou make to the ark, and in a cubic shalt thou finish it above” (KJV)
- (2) “Put an eighteen-inch opening all around just above the upper deck” (Modern Language Version)
- (3) “Construct a skylight all the way around the ship, eighteen inches below the roof” (Living Bible)
- (4) “Make a roof for the ark and finish it to a cubic above” (RSV)
- (5) “Make a roof for it and finish the ark to within 18 inches of the top.” (NIV)
- (6) “Narrowing you should make it from the middle, and to a cubit shall you finish it from above.” (Concordant Literal) Some of these versions also give secondary readings for Genesis 6:16.

The various translations for Genesis 6:16 indicate that there is no knowledge as to the exact meaning of this particular aspect of the Ark construction, expect that it is probably an opening near the top of the Ark. Except for the door in the side of the Ark (6:16), there are no other mentioned openings that lead into the Ark. Further,

6:16 states that there are to be three decks. Pre-Flood physical methods used to obtain light, especially sunlight, are needed in order to maintain animal-life in a healthy condition. Hence, such an opening would not suffice since the Ark has three decks. *Many creationists do all they can to minimize God's direct input into aspects of their creationary models. I do just the opposite. I do all I can that is consistent with a very strict, common knowledge, Biblical interpretation and the scientific method to enhance our view of God's power over His creation and how He is involved in the continual development of our universe.*

Recall, "Then the LORD shut him in" (Gen. 7:16). The lack of the necessary physical ingredients indicates that what transpired within the Ark during the time it "floated" on the flood waters is being controlled supernaturally. The Bible gives no other indication as to what type of "world" comprises the interior of the Ark. I reject attempts to explain how the Ark's inhabitants survived without God's designed intervention. As mentioned, many attempt to minimize God's input. Gen. 7:16 implies that "supernatural events," events that do not correspond to today's list of physical events, occur throughout the interior of the Ark. (Recall, I am using a positive language.)

There tends to be logical error made by some creationists and others when the animal inhabitants of the Ark are discussed. In 1:20 - 21, God states that He creates all of the Earth's sea and bird-life. The realization statement "And coming it is so" immediately follows. What specific animals are carried by the Ark? There is slight ambiguity as to names given the categories. What follows are examples taken from the KJV, NIV and the Literal.

Genesis 1:25. "And God made the beast of the earth after its kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepth upon the earth after its kind . . . ." )KJV)

"God made the wild animals according to their kinds, the livestock according to their kinds, and all the creatures that move along the ground according to their kinds." (NIV)

"And making is Alueim the land-life for its from-kind and the beast for its from-kind and every moving animal of the ground for its from-kind." (Literal)

Genesis 6:19 "And every living thing of all flesh, two of very sort shall thou bring into the ark, . . ." (KJV)

"You are to bring into the ark two of all living creatures, male and female . . . ." (NIV)

"And of every beast and of every moving animal and of every living animal of all flesh, a pair from all . . ." (Literal)

Genesis 7:8 "Of clean beasts, and of beasts that are not clean, and of fowls and every thing that creepth to the ark, . . ." (KJV)

“Pairs of clean and unclean animals, of birds and of all creatures that move along the ground, male and female, came to Noah and entered the ark, . . .” (NIV)

“Of the clean beast, and of the beast which is not clean, and of the flyer, and of every animal that is moving on the ground, pair by pair they come to Noah into the ark, . . .” (Literal)

The NIV and the Literal additionally use two major Old Testament Greek manuscripts not employed by the KJV. These were copied from previous ones in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> century A.D. The common logical understanding of a connective such as “and” is that, for the statement to be “true,” each conjunct must be “true.” This is also the case, when the Hebrew word signifies a sequence notion. A notion that is equivalent to application of an “if” and “then” implication. These logical requirements should be applied to these quoted verses. The words such as “all” and “every” yield no logical truth unless the relative statement is true for each member of a list that identifies its “scope” of application.

The one sure animal population that is not on the Ark are sea-creatures. It turns out that, for this Flood model, it is not significant that the Ark animals be more clearly identified since it is easily shown that not only were there no sea creatures on the Ark but a major category presented by today’s evidence is also missing. Notice that the term “kinds” (portions) is used. There is no further Biblical indication as to how one differentiates one “kind” from another “kind.” Of course, there is the size of the Ark to consider and that the number of different kinds is also unknown.

If among all the entities God created, not including human beings or sea-life that populated the Earth, God created the many categories of dinosaurs, then either they too are among the animals on the Ark or, for some totally unexplained reason, each entire category dies out prior to the Flood. There are creationists who claim that this latter method solves this problem. They accept that all such animal kinds simply died-out before the Flood. There is no Biblical mention of such a major event. Were there dinosaur kinds on the Ark? If there were, as seems reasonable, dinosaur kinds that correspond to many of the different species that have been discovered and they were on the Ark, then they should either exist today or there should be ample evidence that they existed, alive, a mere 4500 years ago. In general, no such ample evidence exists.

God does give a hint as to what he has done so the earth of today exhibits actual age and clearly indicates that dinosaurs kinds actually existed in the forms we have discovered. His creation is pre-designed. God does not, in general, delude humankind. But, certain members of humankind deceive themselves. One delusion is the assumption that we are intelligent enough to rationally and adequately explain all features of the universe about us. Such theoretical explanations are entirely of no Biblical significance unless they aid us in subduing the animals and the earth. This is the original Biblical

instruction give humankind.

Not accepting the commonly understood Biblical statements as our primary source of necessary information but inventing imaginary scenarios using an extra-Biblical language can lead to logical inconsistencies. As soon to be more fully discussed, *interpretations* made by some individuals for observed evidence will lead to inconsistent theory related statements. These theory inconsistencies are the result of using the same name for the evidence in statements generated by two different theories. The problem is which if any of the theories is the correct one. But, rather than accept that this evidence and theory inconsistencies establishes the GGU-model's predicted "lack of knowledge" feature, they reject the Biblical statements. Such inconsistencies yield direct evidence that we are not an higher-intelligence.

Presently, there has been found 1047 dinosaur entities that differ in some feature so that modern science feels its necessary to give them different names. A few members of this group can certainly be misidentified. There could be a few entities on the Ark identified as dinosaurs. These would be the ones that were categorized as extinct but later found to exist. Of course, to the ancients, some Ark animals and especially sea creatures are considered as "monsters." Consider the term translated "dragon" in the KJV. Other well known Bibles, translate this word as "jackal" and even "wild dog." When is it a water-serpent or a water-snake? As a water-serpent or snake it need not have been on the Ark, I suppose. As a jackal or wild dog, it probably would be on the Ark. Which is it? In general, does it matter? No, since this term can only correspond to a few of the kinds. Removing these from the dinosaur list, if they are there, has little logical effect.

Then we have, very approximately, 850,000 insect species on this earth. We have physical indications as to the existence of insects in the far past. To how many different Ark kinds would these correspond? If we needed only a relatively few such kinds and, hence, only a few pairs of Ark representatives, then only allowing non-evolutionary alterations within kinds is there enough time for a mere Flood modified earth to produce the many different insect species?

So, at this point, the present-day dinosaur category and the insect population of today remain a problem for a some creationary science scenarios. However, later in this article, a reasonable solution is presented.

[4] The Scriptures indicate that the Flood "rains" did not actually come from "clouds" but had different sources. Indeed, Biblically, there is no cloud-initiated rain prior to the Flood (see \* at the end of this section) and the long life-spans are a product of a different set of perceived physical processes than those that exist today. (This includes type-two variations in kinds.) Since event sequences are used, the "rain"

simply appears as though it is being poured from the sky, from heaven. The Biblical statement is “the windows (floodgates, crevices) of the heavens are opened” Genesis 7:11, where the plural “heavens” is correct.

For my GGU-model interpretation, this re-enforces the relation that exists between the first heaven and second heaven in producing alterations in physical behavior. This additional strengthening of this notion implies that what occurs is not the result of something previously realized. That is, the event sequence produced rain did not relate to any past or even future physical-system regulations that might be humanly comprehensible. As discussed below, this is rather startling to the Earth inhabitants. Further, there is the “water” that suddenly emerges from the “great deep.” [In what follows, the symbol (LE) means “with its local environment.”] This Flood scenario is produced via event sequences, where the Earth (LE) prior to the Flood is *not* what we generally observe today.

An examination of the term “earth” (’erets) as used in Genesis 1:1, 1:9, 1:10, as is done above with the “window” notion, also yields ambiguous results. The Genesis 1:2 description in various Bible versions indicates that the earth is other than the created water. But to what type of “land” is it referring? The Hebrew used has various distinct contextual meanings. Some appear to consider the term as it appears in Genesis 1:1 to mean just the “dry” land since in 1:10 it states that “God called the dry land ’earth’ ” (RSV). The NIV uses three distinct terms for the exact same Hebrew term “’erets;” in 1.1 “earth;” in 1:9 “ground;” and in 1:10 the dry ground is called “land.” But then the Concordant Literal also states for 1:10, “. . . the dry part ’land.’ ” But they suggest that it might be called “earth” as well. Thus, comparing various scholars, when ’erets is used, it leads to a rather ambiguous notion.

So, what does ’erets mean? As stated in Nelson’s Expository Dictionary of the Old Testament, Thomas Nelson, Nashville, 1980, p. 108, “’*Erets* does not only denote the entire terrestrial planet, but is also used of some of the earth’s component parts. English words like *land*, *country*, *ground*, and *soil* transfer its meaning into our language.” This reference indicates that “terrestrial” means the “material world,” “including the ‘mountains,’ ‘the seas,’ ‘the dry land,’ ‘the depths of the earth’ (Ps. 2:8, 95:4,5; Amos 4:13; Jonah 1:9).” Thus, the meaning of ’erets appears to be very contextually controlled. It requires both a general linguistic and a logical analysis whenever it is used if one wants to know what it means when originally transcribed.

Certainly, prior to the Flood, humankind would noticed that there is something solid below the water-line. I briefly discuss in section I, the word ’erets in 1:1 to mean the Earth, the unrealized water and non-water aspects of a physical entity that is soon to be inhabited and observed by humankind. The idea as stated in Matthew Henry’s commentary and upheld by the NIV and Concordant Literal is that the Genesis 1:1 ’erets means a portion of the total water. That is, in this context the water below becomes or is transformed into the Earth, both the water portion and the non-water

portion. But this Earth has not taken its proper form as yet. It would appear, as compared to what is formed, to be chaotic, formless and would not yet display any of the non-water features. (The LXX states this as “unsightly and unfinished.”)

I take the “land” as the dry portion. (The basic LXX translation uses the term “land” for the non-water part of Earth.) As done in the NIV, I take the “ground” as the non-water portion of the Earth. Then one may need, if possible, to differentiate contextually between these distinct meanings. A basic reason for this analysis is to reasonably establish what the term ’erets means in Genesis 6:13. and the phrase “destroy them with the ’erets.”

For the Living Bible, the Genesis 6:13 ’erets implies that only land life is destroyed. The NIV indicates that its meaning here may be ambiguous since they do not note that “land” can be substituted for Earth at this point. Other versions simply state that ’erets will be destroyed by the Flood. From the LXX, this verse has “gê,” which is understood there as the solid portion in contrast to the sea, but is translated there as “earth.” Thus, one needs to make choices. In 6:13, does the term ’erets mean the ground, the land or the entire earth? And, what does “destroy” mean? The meaning must be the same as that commonly understood in 1450 BC. My choice, as well as a few others with whom I have discussed it, is that, **relative to its actual purpose, in Genesis 6:13, ’erets means the entire non-water part of the world.** (Due to the ambiguous nature of this term, individuals tend to select the meaning that corresponds to a particular Flood model.)

When one has competing models that predict the same results, is there an analytical way to state that “one is preferable”? Of course, this does not mean that this way is absolutely sufficient. There can be many philosophic reasons why one selects a specific behavioral model. In physical modeling, there is the important “Occam’s Razor” concept. *A “good” model is one that is “minimal” in some defined sense.* Occam’s Razor can, certainly, be applied if it also satisfies other philosophic requirements. One such application of Occam’s Razor is relative to the number of or the “simplicity” of a stated hypothesis. As presented later in this article, such an Occam’s Razor simple hypothesis is presented, an hypothesis that today’s evidence verifies. It is the “mingled” evidence hypothesis.

There is an indication from our knowledge of today’s earth that when God destroys something the result, from a direct viewpoint, is a complete form of destruction. This is the result of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah in Genies 19. (Some claim that a site has been found. Others state that this is not the case and I also doubt it.) Thus far, no convincing physical evidence has been found that indicates that these cities existed. But, such destructions can also yield evidence that requires Holy Spirit discernment. That is, the evidence can be interpreted in more than one way and only through a process as stated in 1 John 2:27 can the correct interpretation be known. At the least, the entire non-surface water world has been altered from what it was prior

to the Flood. My Flood model does not preclude remnants of Sodom and Gomorrah from being found as a reminder of what occurred.

At the curse, the Fall, human choice leads immediately to an entirely distinct rapidly formed external cosmology. Relative to the participation mechanism, for consistency, ancient-type earths and their developments take place in covirtual form. [[During rapid-formation, the universe-wide frozen-frames that contain a developing ancient-type earth are termed as being “out of standard sequence-phase” with respect to the standard moments in observer-time. In the actual mathematical model, these are denoted by Greek alphabet symbols as identifiers.]]

From the time of the Fall through the Flood, various ancient-type earths (LE) are represented by universe-wide frozen-frames at nonstandard moments in the primitive sequence and the Earth (LE) is perceived as contained in the universe-wide frozen-frames realized at the standard moments in observer-time. The term “ancient” can mean an earth-type object that can be adjudged by means of **direct observation** as being, at least, 15,000-20,000 observational years old. *By the GGU-model participator mechanism, the earth of today can merely be a Flood modified pre-Flood Earth.* However, relative to the concept of “mingled” evidence, comprehensible physical processes that satisfy accepted physical laws for the earth (LE) of today will neither adequately “explain” all of the present earth features nor the now known fossil material. This is evidence for mingled evidence that is participator produced via pre-designed event sequences.

For this model, when the Rapid-Formation Model (RFM) is applied at various moments, there are two “time” periods being displayed. When rapid-formation takes place at the two pre-Flood moments, time periods as deduced or measured from the young Earth for events in the exterior universe and those relative to the age of the original Earth are not the same. Necessarily, by comparison, exterior universe time periods, with respect to the same measuring devices employed on the Earth and, at the least, for the second RFM application, appear, for consistency, to be vastly greater than the age of the original Earth. If this had even been deduced by the inhabitants of the pre-Flood Earth, then this would imply that although they are not living in Eden that they still hold a special place in God’s plan. Technically, this is not an inconsistency even if the Biblical account is not accepted. It simply requires one to reject the Biblical account as to the formation of the original Earth and accept that the actual pre-Flood earth was formed by a local form of rapid-formation close to the end of the rapid-forming exterior universe. This is a rather simple GGU-model formation.

The construction of primitive sequences has the nonstandard primitive moments as members of the minuscule intervals used during the development of a universe. From the moment when the universe-wide frozen-frames are comparatively highly altered, so to speak, both of the “worlds,” the ancient-type earth (LE) and Earth (LE), continue to development so as to satisfy the different collections of physical laws. Pre-designed

\*developmental paradigms yield these physical realities.

For comprehension, from the appropriate moment when God curses the ground through the end of the Flood there is an informational transmission from the Earth (LE) and this alters covirtual entities in the still developing ancient-type earth (LE). Is this a purely fantastic process? No, not even for modern quantum physics.

The quantum physics EWG interpretation, which is accepted by many, states that ANY physical event that takes place within our universe will cause events to take place in each of many other “worlds,” none of which we can perceive by any of our human or machine sensors. These other worlds can have physical events occur that are exceeding different from those that occur within our world. Indeed, it has been proposed that it is in one of these “other worlds” where Jesus resides and everlasting life is fact. This is an “alternate reality.” The existence of this collection of “worlds” is based upon a cosmological model that results from pure mindless behavior.

Obviously, this theological interpretation of the GGU-model is relative to the concept of what constitutes a “reality.” The actual reality is as far as one can get from “mindless reality.”

What God ‘‘thinks’’ yields the highest form of reality. In comparison, what physically realized biological entities perceive is an extremely low form of knowable reality. The technical term “pre-design” refers to the first step in creation, creation via the “mind of God.”

Today, various humanly described physical laws for this current earth (LE) are the same as those that govern the external universe. However, such described physical regulations yield Biblical anomalies when the predictions are made as to past events. These anomalies are associated with the pre-designed prior physical-behavior of the descendents of Noah’s Ark. Also, the current earth (LE) is mostly composed of portions of an ancient-type earth (LE) as pre-designed. There are, of course, pre-designed \*developmental paradigms that in a general way “describe” the moment when the mingled “worlds” are realized. This is, however, the general primitive sequence process and is not an alteration in method. Such a pre-design that describes entire replacements is mentioned in Isa. 66:22, and is repeated in 2 Peter 3:13 and Rev. 21:1.

In Genesis 6:13, the word translated “destroy” signifies to “cast off,” that is, the non-surface water portion of the world is “discarded, thrown away.” In 2 Pet. 3:6, the general Greek word “appollumi” is used, where it is often translated in the Active Voice as “completely lost, completely destroyed.” In the Middle Voice, as used here, it means “physi-

cal things are lost, persons are lost, spiritual or eternal life is lost” and other types of loss. In Matt. 8:25, life can be lost but there remains a physical entity. Then one can simply “loss sight of” an object. Relative to the Flood, it tends to mean that *the previous purposes are destroyed or lost, but that, as an entity, there remains a physical existence of some type*. For the GGU-model primitive sequence process, this corresponds to the continued sequential existence of a pre-designed and realized physical entity, an entity that has vastly different features than the previous sequential entity.

In general summary, the current earth (LE) upon which we reside, being a realized combined earth (LE), contains evidence for the existence of both an ancient-type earth and the Earth. (I won’t speculate as to the percentages.) It is sufficient that the ancient-type earth (LE) (observationally, at the least, adjudged to be 15,000-20,000 years old and the usual theoretical extension to vast periods), the Earth (LE) and the present combined earth (LE) all exist via God’s mode of creation.

There was no global Flood on the ancient-type earth (LE) but sea-creatures are transferred to an environment that does not immediately match the new environment using the second method that applies in the referenced Eden model. The ancient-type earth (LE) artifacts and methods that imply their age represent a higher form of reality, a reality that continues to present God’s higher intelligence, a form of reality that clearly expresses one of His powerful yet invisible attributes. God combined portions of the Earth (LE) with these ancient-type artifacts for a specific purpose. For those with the proper discernment, they give an indication of the existence of this pre-Flood environment, verify the Biblical account, and, by implication, indicate that the pre-Fall Biblically described Earth existed. However, there will remain modern physical theory inconsistencies. **These inconsistencies are evidence for the predicted lack of knowledge model.**

As to dinosaurs and the like, the fossil record and earth age, the current earth gives evidence that animal kinds, distinct from those in the Ark, existed on the ancient-type earth and remain a major part of the current earth. I point out that, originally, life-forms on the ancient-type earth are mentally created as they are for the Earth. They appear in a specific functional form. These forms are much less complex when first created. These life-forms further develop and such developments may satisfy generally stated regulations. The very concept that discovered objects were fossil evidence for life-forms was suggested by Aristotle 2400 years ago. The age of various, but not all, fossils as determined by general or modern modes of observation and deduction indicate that they form ancient evidence.

Today’s current earth requires interpretative discernment in order to differentiate between the purposes for physical laws and the technical methods used. Originally, as mentioned, they are given so that human beings can subdue various aspects of the

Earth (LE) and, to various degrees, our current earth (LE). The facts are that the Bible gives very little information as to any technical methods used prior to the Flood. Indeed, there is no indication as to whether Noah and his family possessed **all** the technical knowledge developed prior to the Flood. They knew how to build boats and, probably, possessed knowledge of how to operate a farm and how to care for animals. But, the Bible does not indicate whether any member of Noah's immediate family could work with iron or brass (Gen. 4:22).

Having great technical information prior to the Flood is rather unnecessary since Noah, his family and many of his descendants trusted God to supply the necessary information whenever it is necessary. The refined GGU-model processes can eliminate a general "morphing" boundary I use in my original writings. However, a type of boundary can be used to accommodate those individuals that require macroscopic physical-systems to interact in a realized continuously "smooth" manner.

In further detail and for the Ark, after the indicated Biblical time, the Bible states that the "waters" abated (Gen 8:11). Then Noah waited seven more days and indications are that the "waters" had "dried up off the earth" (Gen 8:13), where the term translated here as "earth" can just as well be translated as "ground." For this interpretation, the Flood "waters" on the Earth are not the reason for any mingling of Earth evidence with the ancient-type earth evidence. Recall that within the Bible "water" is used as a transitional medium for certain significant physical and spiritual changes. The Flood waters also serve as a type of "interface" between the Earth (LE) and the current earth (LE) that was realized, with combined evidence as here understood, from its covirtual state.

Our current earth (LE) exhibits features that comprise portions of the Flood destroyed or ruined (Gen. 6:13) Earth (LE) that, depending upon interpretative evidence, can appear to be superimposed over an ancient-type earth (LE), where most physical-system behavior is consistent with that displayed by the external universe. *However, I continue to emphasize that there are interpreted anomalies relative to modern physical theory and the existence of the Biblically described Earth (LE). This is evidence for creation by an higher-intelligence and the prediction that complete pre-designed descriptions require a higher-language.* Although the Earth (LE) is destroyed, for those that have the proper discernment, such Earth (LE) evidence constitutes a signature that the Earth (LE) existed. The strongest evidence appears to be biological.

We are told God sent a "wind over the earth and the waters receded" (Genesis 8:1). (The term "wind" is the same one used for "spirit.") This is yet another indicated event associated with God's preternatural world of physical-like events. The Bible does not given a specific indication as to "when" our present day mingled evidence earth first appeared. First, by Genesis 8:9, Noah knew that the water had not yet receded. But, one week later he know that it had receded (Genesis 8:10).

However, by implication, during that week the water had receded prior to the Genesis 8:11 event and this left drying land that could not immediately sustain land-life. But, at the end of that week, the dove returned with a “olive leaf plucked off.” Genesis 8:11 clearly indicates that the land, where the Ark stood at that time, was now developed so as to sustain human and some animal life. This indicates the very special aspects of the conjoining of these two earths. It is the existence of such a plucked off olive leaf that implies that the land where the Ark now rests is rather immediately inhabitable. However, cautiously, Noah waited and found out other facts one week later, when the dove did not return. In particular, to support the Ark’s animal life, as symbolized by the dove, the necessary specialized foods also exist. Due to Genesis 8:11, I choose a moment during the week stated in Genesis 8:10 when the land aspects of the Earth are appropriately modified relative to each succeeding primitive sequence event. This yields the mingled evidence earth as it is observed today.

In Isa 46:9-13, God states to “Remember (zaw-kar (Strong)) the former things, those of long ago; . . . (NIV)” He then mentions some of them. According to Strong, the basic meaning of this term is “to mark (so as to be recognized).” Hence, there is a mark in the “mind” or a mark by other means that enhances memory. Any marked physical entities, probably, will produce confusion for others that have no Biblical knowledge. This need not preclude them from eventually attaining such knowledge.

There is interpreted evidence that implies that a global Flood occurred on the Earth. But, “other” evidence implies that just a significant local flood or no noteworthy flood occurred. Such seemingly contrary evidence points to the mingled evidence model with its reminders that a global Flood did occur on the Earth.

Such anomalies within a specific theory imply certain possibilities. (1) If an accepted scientific theory and corresponding observations imply a young current earth (LE) (about 6,000 - 7500 post-Fall years ago), then there are apparent anomalies that seem to be best explained by an ancient-type earth (LE) theory. (2) If an accepted scientific theory and corresponding observations imply an ancient-type earth (LE) (say billions of years old), then there are apparent anomalies that seem to be best explained by a young earth (LE) theory.

Relative to modern scientific theories, the anomalies will not be eliminated by the conjoining of the Earth (LE) evidence in various ways with ancient-type earth (LE) evidence. Such anomalies are explained as follows: (i) mingled material evidence, (ii) mingled physical-system behavior or characteristics and (iii) method-signatures such as “relative sudden appearance” in functional form. Also relative to methods, it is appropriate to assume that all of the physical objects that comprise the ancient-type earth (LE) are the products of rather sudden realization, in functional form,

at various levels of complexity.

There have been great efforts put forth that are intended to explain many of the geological features exhibited by our current earth as those produced by a global Flood. That is, that the present earth is merely a Flood modified Earth. Then these features are extrapolated to other features that do not, at present, support such an interpretation. This is explained as evidence that corresponds to mingled physical-system behavior. Indeed, some evidence indicates that there was a global Flood on the Earth (LE) exactly as stated in the Scriptures. In the model presented here, prior to Noah leaving the Ark, various Flood features are exhibited by the ancient-type earth (LE). To those with discernment, the current earth (LE) has strong reminders of the Earth (LE) and the global Flood and, hence, the reasons for it. How much of the Earth and the ancient-type earth is mingled can only be determined by those who can discern the differences. Recall that there is a Genesis sequence that yields these results.

There are specific Scriptural concepts that appear to enhance this mingling notion. As the Living Bible states it “Instead, God has deliberately chosen to use ideas the world considers foolish and of little worth in order to shame those people considered by the world as wise and great” (1 Cor 1:27). (Also 1 Cor 1:20-21, 3:19-20.)

It is very clear to me that the Flood mechanisms or driving processes as described in Genesis 7:11 and that yield the Flood do not correspond to any form of present-day perceivable physical laws. I reject attempts to interpret Genesis 7:11 in order to force these descriptions to conform to any known present-day processes. It is the pure event sequence approach that preserves remnants of the Earth (LE).

I repeat that the results, here described, definitely display God’s exceptional “power” while other Flood models tend to diminish His influence. The mingled evidence gives to those that have the proper discernment the necessary reminders of the Biblical facts and of “what could have been.”

If there should be a concern as to where the “water” went, there are pre-designed event sequences that produce a disappearance as well as an appearance of physical entities. One can ask many questions relative to the mingling of evidence. Since no biological entity within the universe is a higher-intelligence, then answers to such questions can exist but, as established by the GID-model, the answers can also be beyond human comprehension. As noted above relative to the “new” earth, although the processes can now be stated in scientific terms, drastic alterations in a physical-type of existence is not mere Scriptural speculation.

On the current earth (LE), there is evidence for biological entities from an ancient-type earth, entities that were not brought on the Ark. Among others, these are various dinosaurs. But, as mentioned, the creation of such entities is rather sudden in a func-

tional form at some unknown level of complexity. They also are confined to the kinds I call type-three. These kinds allow for certain variations within the kind that are somewhat broader than type-two in order to satisfy the universe's physical laws. The behavior of these entities can satisfy appropriately restricted physical-laws. God reminded Noah, in Gen 9:6, that "humanity" is created in God's image. This signifies that all Biblical references to humanity, humankind, man etc. refer only to biological entities that are "made in God's image." This refers must strongly to the "spirit" aspect of His created. Further, all such humans are descendants of the Ark inhabitants. If the Hebrew and Greek words often translated as the Earth, or after the Flood, the entire current earth are associated in any manner with humankind, then necessarily these words only refer to entities that are related to the descendants of the Ark inhabitants.

Compared to the everlasting Eden (LE), the current earth (LE) and physical entities throughout a universe are obviously "cursed" relative to physical-system behavior and the transient nature of physical reality. In Gen 9:2-5, some of the actual changed behavior for animate objects is described. In Gen 9:13, we find that the current earth has different physical-system behavior. For the current earth, verifiable biological change within kinds for each biological entity throughout a universe, including descendants of the original Ark inhabitants, are not produced by random mutilations. As shown in [2], all such alterations attributed to mindless random mutations actually satisfy patterns designed by a higher-intelligence. For the modern theory of evolution (common descent etc.) there will be found, especially relative to the animal kinds present on the Ark and the human descendants of the Ark inhabitants, anomalies relative to the most commonly held modern physical-laws that are best reconciled by applying the ideas - the model - presented in this article.

There should be method-signatures that indicate that some of the methods used to produce the pre-Fall Earth (LE), such as relative sudden appearance, are also utilized to establish an ancient-type earth (LE) and, by restriction, a current earth (LE). In particular, for the ancient-type earth what may appear as an addition of information that yields a distinctly different biological entity is actually a signature for relative sudden appearance as it is exhibited by pre-designed event sequences. The theological interpretation for pre-design validates the Scriptural concept of "foreknowledge." What I have presented here is a "model." Hence, it mirrors behavior. Since we are dealing with an higher-intelligence, my descriptions must remain incomplete. The lack of knowledge aspects and the predicted existence of a higher-language need to be considered. I do not contend that this model is precise. This means that the described mechanisms need not be the actual ones that lead to the described behavior.

This model yields of all of today's predicted human and machine sensed evidence. Relative to why there are strong secular interpretations for the formation of our universe that also predict the same evidence, 2 Thess. 2:11 may be of great significance.

\*The Bible first mentions “to rain” (matar(maw-tar’)) in Genesis 2:5. This is done in the negative sense. “. . . had not caused it to rain upon the earth.” This is coupled with the 2:6 “mist” statement. Such statements are placed in the Bible for definite purposes. They are germane. Hence, an obvious question would be “When did it start to rain water?” I note that matar denotes an “operative” statement that is used for other purposes not related to “water.”

An actual beginning moment when the rain would occur in the form of water (rain-water) should be present in the Bible in order to properly complement this Genesis 2.5 statement. The Bible might be silent on the matter. But, in that case, the “no rain” and “mist” statements are rather unnecessary. Indeed, removing these statements from the Bible would seem to have no significant affect upon “there was not a man to till the ground” and the creation of man. The Genesis 2:5 environment is pre-designed to be highly distinct from other environments in which God could have placed humanity. This is counter to the notions of evolutionary-creation and progressive-creation.

In general, there are reasons why God does not give explicit reasons for His behavior or for His commands. As shown in the “Theory of Ultralogics,” it is predicted that there is a type of “Divine” language. This “language” has linguistic rules similar to many ordinary humanly written and spoken languages. However, this language cannot be communicated directly to humanity. This implies that when God sets out rules or commands that humanity is to obey, then He need not give reasons for His rules or commands. However, an answer to this “rain” question does not appear to fall in this category.

There is the notion of Biblical speculation as used by many cults. Such conjectures often follow from the belief that “the Bible is silent on the matter.” I follow the rule that Biblical speculation must be greatly restrained and should be consistent with all other strictly interpreted Biblical statements. Relative to a various questions that one might ask about this Flood model, speculation should be applied only when one can demonstrate that there are no Biblical statements that answer the question in a reasonable manner. All such speculation must be consistent with any previously interpreted Biblical statements.

Does God demonstrate such a supernatural control over a long-time-period of this type for the rain-water operation? In James 5:17, James tells us how God further demonstrates His control over this operation.

Since there is no mention of the rain-water operation after Genesis 2:5 through 7:4, can the rain-water operation occur during some unknown period between Genesis 2:5 and 7:4? If it did, then this does not follow the rule for proper speculation since Genesis 7:4 does mention a rain-water operation. Thus, I accept that the moment described in Gen. 7:12 is the first actual application of the rain-water operation. I cannot say whether Noah knew the complete meaning of the term as used by Moses - matar. That

is, the 1450 BC understood meaning that describes this event. He certainly became aware of it during the deluge and why the boat God instructed him to build would not sink due to the rain-water. The Ark was built like a “room” and thus had a top and sides. However, as indicated, the Bible gives but a rather vague description as to how the top of the Ark was constructed. Then certainly other inhabitants of Earth are startled by such an event. They have no means to avoid drowning since they have no experience with such a physical event.

[5] Based upon my creationary model, the following articles would need to be altered. When done, many questions relative to all of humankind being descendants of Noah and post-Flood aspects of this planet on which we dwell are answered at the following URLs.

Where are all the human fossils?

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v14/i1/humanfossils.asp>

The human fossils still speak!

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v15/i2/fossils.asp>

How did the different ‘races’ arise (from Noah’s family)?

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/Home/Area/AnswersBook/races18.asp>

Where are all the people?

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v23/i3/people.asp>

The mystery of ancient man.

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v20/i2/ancient.asp>

The following is a small amount of “evidence” for a “young” earth. Rather than the exact explanations giving in this article, the “mingling” notions stated above can be applied more effectively.

Evidence for a Young World.

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/4005.asp?vPrint=1 | /a/|>

[6] Type-one biological “kinds” prior to the Fall are very narrow in scope. In general, they are those entities that are originally designed to physically procreate. The phrase “after its kind” is used ten times in Genesis 1. Some consider the somewhat vague notion that a “kind” is a category that indicates a “common ancestry.” There is no detailed Biblical definition for this term. Indeed, consistent with the original physical laws for the Earth, there are no “evolutionary” styled variations in the designs from their original formation until the Fall.

After the Fall and through the Flood, the type-one kinds were expanded to allow for additional variations within these kinds - the type-two kinds. These variations allow for physical death. After the Flood, the kinds continue to correspond to the pairs that entered the Ark. Under additional physical regulations, behavior within these kinds is again expanded - the type-three kinds - so as to correspond to “some” of the

pre-designed variations that occur for other possible life-forms within the created and pre-designed rapidly-formed external universe.

### **Reference**

(1) Herrmann, Robert A., Science Declares Our Universe IS Intelligently Designed, Xulon Press, Fairfax, VA, USA, 2002.

(2) Herrmann, Robert A., Probability Models and Ultra-logics  
<http://arXiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0112037>

(3) Herrmann, Robert A., The Theory of Ultralogics  
<http://vixra/abs/math/9903081> and <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/9903082>