

## Why does the Doctrine of Creation Matter? Part 2

Dominion Covenant Church

Mike Elliott

February 24, 2008

Romans 8.19-23:

**19**The creation waits in eager expectation for the sons of God to be revealed.

**20**For the creation was subjected to frustration, not by its own choice, but by the will of the one who subjected it,

in hope **21**that the creation itself will be liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the glorious freedom of the children of God.

**22**We know that the whole creation has been groaning as in the pains of childbirth right up to the present time.

**23**Not only so, but we ourselves, who have the firstfruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly as we wait eagerly for our adoption as sons, the redemption of our bodies.

### I. Introduction

#### A. Question of belief.

Recall last week I shared with you my personal story. When I was an atheist I thought like an atheist—I attributed the entire material universe to naturalistic causes. When God renewed my life and I became a Christian I then thought like a Christian. Granted, there was much I did not understand about Scripture but I was able to grasp what was immediately apparent and as he has continued to sanctify my thinking I have continued to understand more and more of His truth.

My experience shows that it comes down to belief. Prior to my conversion I believed what my science teacher and the textbooks told me. After my conversion I accept what God and the Bible tell me. Prior to my conversion I scoffed at what those Bible-toting-evangelicals said. Since my conversion I pity those who still walk in darkness ignoring the plain statements of Scripture.

Note that evidence did not convince me, and I believe it is not evidence that convinces people. Evidence may make us question our pre-conceptions or it may harden us further. Ultimately, it is our belief that drives our decision. The core of the evolutionists' faith is there *is not* a transcendent God. From that belief follows naturalism and humanism. The core of the Christians' faith is that there *is* a transcendent God and he is revealed to us

in the Bible. From that belief follows acceptance of supernaturalism and all that goes along with it.

Unfortunately many Christians have compromised their faith in the transcendent God revealed in the Bible and hybridized it with the faith of the evolutionists. They think they have to do so because science and the evidence demand it. There is tons of research showing the evidence does *not* demand billions of years. Instead it actually demands a young earth wherein man has been around since the beginning. For example, we find human artifacts in coal beds (supposedly 59.9 million years before homo sapiens) and human footprints criss-crossing those of dinosaurs (supposedly 207.9 million years before homo sapiens). I'll avoid the rabbit trail that leads to all the fascinating physical evidence for a young earth. Suffice it to say evidence does not demand an old earth and many Christians have made concessions to evolution—unnecessary concessions.

### ***B. The Faith is at stake.***

The sad thing is that not only are they trying to synthesize the Bible with something that isn't even valid, but in so doing they lose the foundation of their faith and the tenets of the faith that are built upon that foundation. Last week I showed you that when we consider the entirety of Scripture, every detail, we see that the earth must be young. So the very truth of Scripture is at stake.

What I will demonstrate in our time together today is that when we remove the Scriptures as our authority, if we question their truth and substitute secular science for our authority *in the place* of the Scriptures, the whole building comes tumbling down. If God did not create the world in six consecutive contiguous distinct calendar days then we call God a liar and have no basis for the existence of sin, the extent of the fall, redemption, or future judgment. What is Christianity when you remove the doctrine of God, sin, judgment, and redemption? Zero. Actually it is less than zero, it is a negative. It is the doctrine of demons that leaves people without hope.

I am speaking to a broad audience here—don't think I am lumping everyone all together. The unbeliever, like me in high school, substitutes creation for the creator. I call on you to stop suppressing the truth in unrighteousness. Creation reveals the nature of God but the fallen mind perverts that. If God remakes your mind, you will see the truth. That day can be today. Please, on this day of rest, cease from your work denying God.

Second, I speak to Christians who believe in theories other than Calendar Day creation. I showed last week that those other theories do not give an

accurate statement of the testimony of Scripture. They may allow room for what the secular scientists tell us, but they do not allow enough room for everything God has told us in His Scriptures.

Third, I speak to Christians who do believe in Calendar Day creation. We need to know the reasons for this and be prepared to give a defense. We are stewards of the great truths of God and we should not hide it under a bushel. We should be bold as lions yet peaceful as doves. Our opposition doesn't compromise and neither should we.

## **II. Problems**

### ***A. Recap of last week's analysis. (top half of chart on the backside)***

Last week, based on the statement of creation in the Westminster Confession of Faith, we looked at the criteria necessary for a biblical view of creation. The Bible requires that God is the creator, he created everything, he did it to manifest the glory of his power and wisdom, he did it out of nothing, he did it all at the beginning, and he did it in the space of six days. I further established proper parameters for our understanding of "day" so there is no confusion about what it means when it says "in the space of six days."

We saw that all of the non-calendar day theories failed on a number of points. Briefly, Naturalistic Evolution completely eliminates God. Theistic Evolution limits God's creation to acts of providence, says he worked with existing materials, and spreads creation out over billions of years. Day-Age Theory similarly spreads creation out over billions of years by adopting a view of the days that does not agree with the linguistic context. The Analogical Days Theory commits the same error of incorrectly understanding the days and allowing for vast time inserted into Genesis 1. Gap Theory inserts billions of years between vv 1 and 2 thereby violating Mark 10.6 by putting Adam and Eve a looong way from the beginning. The Framework Theory conveniently says Genesis 1 has no bearing on many of these six criteria so their answer actually gives no answers while creating other problems.

### ***B. Implications.***

I don't want you to think that my problems with the other theories are incidental. Are we being nitpicky by demanding special creation over providence? Is it such a big deal that the days of creation are just like our

days and that it all happened not too long ago? As I asked last week, Why does it matter?

The only reason it is a big deal to me that the days of Genesis be calendar days and the earth be young is because Scripture says so and other key parts of Scripture are linked to these details. Scripture tells us a number of things that go against the grain of secular science but we cannot just discard them. Scripture says, and science denies, Adam was a man created at the beginning, he sinned, he is the head of all humanity, all people and all creation is under the burden of his sin, and a second Adam has come to reconcile this. It may not seem like a big deal to insert time between Adam and the beginning but doing so is unscriptural and the repercussions are significant.

Because the theories we looked at last week contain various degrees of error, they have various degrees of dangerous implications. Again, I do not mean to lump all of them together. However, whether they violate one of the six criteria or all of them, serious damage is done to the Christian faith. In common they all violate the criteria about young earth. So today when I speak about the implications of their errors I will focus on the implications of the earth being old.

I should add that Evolution, Theistic Evolution, Day-Age, and Gap Theories explicitly say the universe is old whereas the Framework and Analogical Day Theories do not “require” the earth to be old. But the truth is that the Framework and Analogical Day theories at least allow the earth to be old, certainly suggest the earth is old, and I would say are actually articulated so as to be in accordance with the earth being old. So in reality all of these theories are old earth theories.

## **1. Doctrine of Sin.**

I’ve chosen to focus on one overarching error, old earth, and one overarching implication of that error, the topic of Sin. This is because it is so fundamental to the teaching and ministry of Jesus Christ and therefore fundamental to Christianity and the Bible. The presence of sin and how to deal with it is a critical thread running throughout Scripture.

### **i. Its existence: sin is the transgression of the law— Leviticus 5.17, 1John 3.4**

Evolutionists deny there is anything such as “sin”. They may speak of right and wrong but they have no concept of sin. They cannot accept the existence of sin because they do not acknowledge the existence of a God that

makes rules, a God whose laws men violate. Thankfully the other theories we have been discussing still acknowledge the existence of sin.

**ii. Its source: sin entered the world through Adam—  
Rom 5.12a**

They also believe death entered the world through one man, Adam, and death came from sin as Romans 5.12 states. Evolutionists flatly deny death is the result of the actions of an ancient human. They say death has been part of the system for millions of years, long before humans appeared on the landscape.

It is not surprising that atheists deny this basic truth of the source and result of sin, but altogether tragic when Christians do. Christians who defend the evolutionary timeframe by teaching the earth is old cannot believe the full value of Paul's words in Romans since they put origins and death hundreds of millions of years before Adam. Gap, Day-Age, Framework, and Analogical Days all require or allow for death in the hundreds of millions of years prior to man's existence. This runs up against Paul's words that death came from one man's sin.

**iii. Its result: sin subjects all creation to death—Gn  
3.17, 3.23, 5.5; Rom 5.12b, 8.18-22**

In order to pin this down we must clarify that the effect of sin is not just limited to one man named Adam, nor is it limited to spiritual death, nor is it limited to humans. It extends to all men and indeed to all of creation.

It affects man's spirit so that spiritual death is a result of the Fall.

It affects man's body so that human physical death is a result of the Fall.

It affects all of creation so that physical death among animals is a result of the Fall.<sup>1</sup>

We know Adam was separated from God as part of the curse (Gn 3.23), this is spiritual death. We also know that ultimately he physically died at age 930 (Gn 5.5). Paul says in Romans 5.12 that death came to all men. He repeats this in his letter to Corinth: "For in Adam all die" (1 Cor 15.22a). Thus, as a result of Adam's sin all men die both physically and spiritually.

Further, the creation also bears the brunt of Adam's sin. The first part of the Curse in Genesis 3 is against the ground (v17) and Paul says in Romans 8,

---

<sup>1</sup> Note, plants do not "live" in the biblical sense. They "wither" and "fade" (Isaiah 40.6-8; James 1.10). They die biologically but they do not die biblically.

**20** For the creation was subjected to futility... **22** For we know that the whole creation groans and labors with birth pangs together...

Because of the curse the creation is groaning and laboring. It is not operating as it was originally designed to operate. Similarly, Adam's descendents are not operating as they were originally created to operate. But the creation's bondage is solved in a parallel way that man's bondage is solved, and since this will mean the elimination of death for men, it will mean the elimination of death for the creation.

This is a vitally important point. We must not downplay the full reality of the curse stemming from Adam's sin.<sup>2</sup> To say the earth is old and the fossils were laid down long before Adam is to say physical death existed before Adam. Scripture says otherwise. It says the malfunctioning of the creation we see today is linked to the malfunctioning of man, "the whole creation groans and labors with birth pangs ... we also ... groan within ourselves" (Rom 8.22-23). Both were caused by the first Adam's sin and both are solved by the second Adam's perfection.

#### **iv. Its consequences: sin is judged in the past and future.**

Skeptics realize that if God was not involved in the beginning, physical death is unconnected to sin, and there is no penalty for breaking his rules, then he is not to be feared in the future. When they remove the flood they remove a past example of his judgment and make it easy to deny the future final judgment. I am not suggesting that Day-Age, Gap, Framework, and Analogical adherents have gone so far as to deny hell; but many of them excuse the universal nature of the flood because, like creation, it is just too much to believe. Besides, the scientists tell us the fossils were deposited over billions of years, not in a single relatively recent catastrophic flood.

##### ***a. In Noah's day it was universal, by water, and never to be repeated—Gn 7***

Science says the universal flood didn't happen, the Bible says it does, so they re-interpret the Bible to say something that they think preserves their system of thought. One common scheme is to say the flood was local. Unfortunately this attempt to save their scheme is illogical and ends up calling God a liar.

---

<sup>2</sup> It is amusing to see how those who deny Calendar Day Creation work themselves into a corner and create problems they expect Calendar Day adherents to solve. They say the earth is billions of years old so it is impossible for animals to have *not* died during that extended timeframe. They expect us to tell them how there was no death. Well, if they would just accept that the days were calendar days, Adam was created at the beginning, and the Fall occurred not too long after day 7, there is no difficulty with the lack of death prior to Adam's transgression.

If it was a local flood Noah could have walked over the mountains to safety; he did not need to spend a year building an ark. Also, the Bible describes the water as rising many feet over the tops of the mountains—Why wouldn't it have spilled over the mountain ridge to fill the next valley? The Bible says all human and land animal life that was not on the ark was killed—Why would a local flood have affected life in other regions of the world? Finally, God promised Noah that a similar destruction by floodwater would never happen again—If this was a local flood how are we to account for the numerous local floods throughout history? (i.e. on the Mississippi, hurricane Katrina, and this winter in the Northeast.)

When a Christian compromises and says Noah's flood was local he gives ammunition to the skeptic who can turn around and say, "FEMA can deal with your god's local floods. I don't have anything to fear!" The attempt to harmonize the Bible with evolutionary theory makes nonsense of Scripture, calls God a liar, and leaves people in their rebellion.

***b. In the future it will be universal and by fire—  
2Peter 3.7, 12***

God has told us how he judged sin in the past and how it will happen in the future. This description runs up against evolutionary theory at every point including the end point. The current idea among evolutionists is that eventually, perhaps after many intermediate periods of global warming and cooling, the sun will burn out and the Earth will become a frozen wasteland. This is very different from the Bible's description of fire that burns up the unrighteousness on the Earth and purifies it anew. Fire or freezing? The two do not mesh.

***v. Its cure: sin is washed away by Christ—1Cor  
15.22; Rom 8.22-23***

The last aspect of the doctrine of sin that falls away as a consequence of evolution compromisers is the hope of Redemption. If they deny the unity of fallen humanity under Adam they lose the unity of redeemed humanity under Christ. Scripture links the two: "For in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." (1Cor 15.22; cf Rom 5.14-19, 1Cor 15.45-49) Also, if they deny the linking of the creation's groaning to humanity's groaning they lose the creation's rebirth that is linked to humanity's rebirth. "the whole creation groans and labors with birth pangs together until now.

... we also groan within ourselves, eagerly waiting for the ... redemption of our body.” (Rom 8.22-23)<sup>3</sup>

Thus we see the implications of adopting the evolutionary theory in total—this leads to denial of sin, judgment, and redemption. Adopting it in part this leads to denial of the full scope of the curse from Adam’s sin, denial of past judgment of sin, and limiting the full scope of future redemption. Ultimately they have denied the very Bible they were attempting to keep plausible in the eyes of modern man. A Bible full of billions of years is empty of the full truth of God and lacks the full hope he promises.

### ***C. Underpinnings.***

There are other doctrines affected by mistakes in Genesis but that is enough for today. We clearly see the faulty structure that follows from their faulty foundation.

Now I want to take it back two steps and look at the philosophical underpinnings that led to that faulty foundation in the first place. I want to explore how they approach knowledge and reality. This is necessary because what is really at stake is the Knowledge of God.

#### **1. How to know God.**

##### **i. Naturalism or Scripturalism.**

In order to know God we must look where he has revealed himself. God has told us how he reveals himself and it is there that we must come to know him. To seek an alternative approach is to commit the same sin as the original sin of Adam and Eve who wanted a shortcut to knowledge.

##### **a. Role of Reason.**

Scripture tells us man’s reason is corrupt. As part of the Fall our thinking is misguided and we come to wrong conclusions. Yet, unsaved people still think as humans. Unbelieving scientists are not stupid. They may lack wisdom but they are very smart. They are still aided by God to some degree because they still have the image of God in them. They can think logically

---

<sup>3</sup> I admit that as far as I know Scripture does not explicitly say animal death came from Adam’s sin. I am concluding this to be the case because of Paul’s parallel between our groaning and the creation’s groaning. His parallel says that that our death is akin to the creation’s death (except, of course, that the creation does not have spiritual life and thus cannot suffer spiritual death) as also is our rebirth akin to the creation’s rebirth (in the resurrection we will have physical bodies and animal death will be eliminated).



(at least sometimes), drive their cars, communicate via language, etc. As *unsaved/unrenewed* individuals their reason is not completely *unaided*.

Saved individuals fare better since our minds are being renewed, but we are not infallible. We can and do still make mistakes. David was a man after God's own heart yet he thought he could get away with adultery and murder. He was very wrong about that!

A man can only keep his way pure by keeping it according to God's word. (Ps 119.9) So reason is useful and necessary, but it operates within the constraints of sin and must conform to God's revelation.

### ***b. General Revelation vs. Special Revelation***

How then does God reveal himself to us? What body of information are we to apply our reason to in order to understand him? The answer is "Revelation" and we speak of General & Special Revelation where General Revelation is apparent through the creation, per Romans 1.20, Psalm 19, etc. and Special Revelation is his Scriptures.

While they both qualify as revelation, we must only expect from each what is promised. We are told Special Revelation, that is the Bible, "*is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, thoroughly equipped for every good work.*" (2 Tim 3.16-17) We are told General Revelation, that is the creation, "*declares the glory of God ...shows his handiwork*" (Ps 19.1-2) and shows his attributes of power and God-ness (Rom 1.20) Thus, Special Revelation is much broader, expansive and inclusive teaching us everything we need while General Revelation only teaches us a few things.

We must also remember that either means of Revelation, when seen with fallen minds, makes no promise of being rightly interpreted. Even when Revelation is seen with renewed minds it can be wrongly interpreted. Hence we see Christians disagreeing among themselves about what the Bible says and we see scientists disagreeing among themselves about what nature tells them. This does not mean that the Revealer or the Revelation is faulty, only that we, the interpreters, are faulty.

One modern day Day-Age proponent says that Nature is the 67<sup>th</sup> book of the Bible. As such, he says it is inerrant and cannot lie. He further says that since Nature is inerrant the discoveries and conclusions of scientists are truthful. His last point relies on faulty logic. It is incorrect to say that just because General Revelation is true that the observations and conclusions of scientists are all true. They most certainly are not. If they were always right

they wouldn't be continually revising their theories! Revelation is true, whether general or special revelation, but our interpretation of it is certainly not free of error. The creation does not lie, but we are prone to misread the creation.

*c. The physical evidence. Old or Young earth?*

One prominent Analogical Days proponent makes a similar claim as the Day-Age defender I referred to a moment ago. He says the created realm speaks truly so appearances cannot be deceiving. Then he says the universe appears to be old so if the earth is actually young then General Revelation is lying. Well, if in fact the creation did testify to its own ancientness and then it turned out it was young there would be a lie. But in fact we are told by Special Revelation it is young! Psalm 19 and Romans 1.20 do not promise that General Revelation tells us how long ago Adam lived and how close he was to the beginning, only the Bible claims to do that. Psalm 19 and Romans 1.20 do not claim that General Revelation teaches us how far away the stars are or how long the fossils have been in the ground. These verses say the heavens declare God's glory, the firmament shows his handiwork and God's invisible attributes are clearly seen in what has been made. The fact human beings conclude based on their observations that the stars and the fossils are thousands of millions of years old is not the fault of General or Special Revelation. It is the fault of man, the interpreter of the Revelation. Because of the Fall and the corruption of our minds, the true message declared by the heavens and his handiwork is misinterpreted by Fallen Man.

While I will not discuss the evidence in archeology, geology, or paleontology, suffice it to say there is no physical evidence that proves an Old Earth and disproves a Young Earth. I refer you to various creation science ministries<sup>4</sup>. The evidence does not point to an old earth; the evidence is being misread based upon naturalistic presuppositions.

*d. Embarrassing result: order of events don't mesh.*

**Genesis has earth then sun/moon/stars, sea then land, light then sun, land plants before sea life, birds before reptiles, mammals then insects.**

One particularly obvious discrepancy between the biblical record and the evolutionary model is the order of events. We must wonder, why dismiss the Bible? Why not dismiss evolutionary theory and its old earth timeframe?

---

<sup>4</sup> See [www.answersingenesis.org](http://www.answersingenesis.org), [www.drdino.com](http://www.drdino.com), [www.icr.org](http://www.icr.org). I have found the writings of Dr Henry Morris especially helpful.

**Evolution has all these reversed.**

On the back of your outline is a table that compares the two orders of events. They are irreconcilable. They cannot both be true as Theistic Evolutionists and Day-Age Theorists have hoped. They have attempted to insert God into evolution or the evolutionary timeframe into the Bible but neither will work. The Framework Hypothesis and Analogical Days realize this. So the Framework theory allegorizes the Genesis 1 order while the Analogical Days theory introduces a new concept of time. By persisting in their allegiance to evolutionary timeframes they make these demands of Scripture.

**ii. What is your authority? The Bible or secular scientists?**

Thus, a key error these theories make is that they have mistaken priorities. They accept a *particular interpretation* of physical evidence ahead of Scripture and then look for an interpretation of Scripture to fit their taken-for-granted interpretation of physical evidence.

They believe Scripture is true and they believe the museums are filled with fossils dating back millions of years. So they need to find a way for the Bible to be in harmony with that belief. The fact that they try to push the facts of Scripture into the mold of the facts of nature shows they really hold nature higher than Scripture. They should be trying to interpret the facts of nature in the light of Scripture.

**2. How to read the Bible.**

**i. Perspicuity = “clearly expressed and easily understood”.**

We need Scripture and we need it to be our primary guide. Properly seen, the creation will never contradict the Scriptures. Since the Scriptures give us a fuller picture, we should start there.

One of the key principles of the Doctrine of Scripture is its perspicuity: that’s a five-dollar word meaning “clearly expressed and easily understood”. The perspicuity of Scripture was a key tenet of the Reformation. The Reformers wanted to take the Bible out of the cloister of the experts and put it into the hands of everyman. Hence they translated it into vernacular languages and sold it in the streets.

The papacy feared this. They did not think the common man was intelligent or worthy enough to be trusted with such an august task as

interpreting Scripture. That must be reserved for the experts. This is the very same principle that Day-Agers, Framework Hypothesizers, and Analogical Day-ers are acting out. They think the average man is a simpleton when he sees “evening and morning were the 2<sup>nd</sup> day” (Gen 1.8) and understands it as an actual day.

The papists of the 1500’s wanted the people to depend on the authorized interpreters. After all, those men had studied at the best universities and had the best degrees. They could be trusted. The non Calendar Day creationists of our day do the same thing... only worse. In the 1500’s you had to trust the Doctors of Divinity. Now you are told to trust the doctors of physics, molecular biology, and geology. Meanwhile many of today’s Doctors of Divinity claim to have special training and insight into the Scriptures that enables them to see eons of time in a day, a special poetic framework, and a different concept of time. Where does that leave the common man? All too often it leaves him with his Bible on the shelf and his head in his hands. It also leaves the unbelieving world laughing at us.

At the same time as the perspicuity of Scripture is vital, there are indeed subtleties in Scripture that take investigation. I don’t want to underestimate the value of inquiring thoughtfully and really digging into the text to compare Scripture with Scripture to get the full picture. Many able laymen and theologians have wrestled with what seem to be contradictions. Last week I explained to you a completely reasonable way to resolve the supposed conflicts between Genesis 1 and 2<sup>5</sup>. Having done this, we do not need to resort to making Genesis 1 allegory or analogy.

I firmly believe there are no errors in Scripture and if we approach it with a humble heart, asking God to open our eyes & give us illumination, He is faithful to grant our request and we will see the truth. It is not necessary to dismiss what is clear (the days, special creation, and compact timeframe of all 31 verses of Genesis 1) just because some details take careful discernment. Unfortunately many Christians do, to varying degrees, dismiss the Bible in favor of the unbiblical system of evolution, even if it is only the timeframe of evolution that they hold onto.

**ii. Hermeneutics = “a method of interpretation, esp. of the Bible”.**

Once we have established that Scripture is the pre-eminent form of revelation, that it is free of error (there are no contradictions), and that its

---

<sup>5</sup> I mentioned two plausible ways to reconcile the two. There is also a third: Genesis 2 may be “through Adam’s eyes”.

basic teachings can be clearly understood, that is still not enough to keep us out of danger. How do we go about interpreting the Scriptures we agree are first priority and inerrant?

I've mentioned that the Framework Hypothesis takes Genesis 1 to be allegorical poetry because it involves symmetry. They say Scripture is true, but that it is true allegory not true history. Analogical Day-ers say the time of Genesis 1 is analogous God-time not exactly the same as human-time so God is using human language to give us an analogous glimpse of God's reality. These are both treading very dangerous ground.

**Not a reason to assume its not human history.**

Regarding the interpretive technique of the Framework hypothesis: beware, since if symmetry necessitates allegory with no historical basis behind it, then an easy next step is to say the story of redemption is merely allegory.<sup>6</sup> After all, there is striking symmetry between the events of the creation week and the events of the redemption week.<sup>7</sup> But if the events of the redemption week are allegorical and the only history is that some day some where a man names Jesus died and was seen again three days later, critical historical details are missing and the resurrection has lost its true historical power. Paul and others affirm the resurrection was a detailed historical event and Moses (Along with the Prophets, Psalmists, Jesus, and the Apostles) affirms the creation account is a detailed historical event. The mere presence of symmetry does not necessitate allegory and biblical allegory is grounded in history.

Regarding the interpretive technique of the Analogical Day-ers: is there such a thing as God-time that is different from human-time? Is there such a thing as human language that communicates God's truth by analogy? No to both. If God has his own time and we have our own time how are we to ever know where or when they ever intersect. If God has his language and he uses human words to communicate by analogy how are we ever to know which is straightforward language and which is analogous language? Thankfully, with a proper understanding of God we do not have this confusion. God does not exist in time, he is eternal! There is no such thing as God-time. The whole purpose of time is for us humans to live in so the

---

<sup>6</sup> Frameworkers still say there is a historical reality behind the allegorical creation story (i.e. God really did create the land, sea, fruit trees, etc. at some unknown point in time and in some unknown order). But they do not see any historical details in Genesis 1, which is what is so dangerous. There are other instances of allegory in Scripture but they are based on historical realities. Thus, Frameworkers' allegorical method is more extreme and thus more dangerous (and thus unbiblical).

<sup>7</sup> See *Creation and the Cross* by Henry Morris, Ph.D., available at [www.icr.org](http://www.icr.org). This article disuses the parallel framework of the Redemption Week.

only time that exists is human-time. Further, the whole purpose of language is for God to communicate with us and each of us to each other. If he has analogous but not identical language then the purpose is defeated. With their definition of language, language becomes so flexible and vague that it become meaningless.

**Conclusion of “Revelation” section.**

I don’t think B.B. Warfield or modern defenders of these other theories set out to purposely undermine the Bible. B.B. Warfield was a strident defender of biblical inerrancy. Today there are countless seminary professors and seminary graduates who defend the Bible as the infallible, inerrant, Word of God yet at the same time defend the evolutionary timeframe via these compromise theories. They can’t have it both ways.

The preceding discussion makes it clear that pure Evolution is unbiblical, Theistic Evolution is unbiblical, the Gap Theory is unbiblical, the Day-Age Theory is unbiblical, the Framework Hypothesis is unbiblical, and the Analogical Days theory is unbiblical. They are unbiblical because they have a mistaken way of approaching Scripture: they place the fallible conclusions of science above the infallible word of God and then look for ways to interpret Scripture so as to agree with those fallible naturalistic conclusions.

The end result—this is the ultimate implication—is that they make it impossible for us to know God and to understand his Bible. They say God time is different from human time. They say God’s language is different from our language. They say the conclusions of scientists are true above and beyond the truth of Scripture. They are questioning the nature of time and language and the truth of Scripture in order to avoid having to ditch the claims of science. In so doing they make it impossible understand the Bible and impossible to know God.

**3. Gnosticism = “emphasis on spiritual to the exclusion of the material”.**

There is one more Big Issue I cannot fail to mention. It concerns the nature of God and reality. Let me ask you, Is God concerned about the physical world? Or is he just interested in spiritual things? The Gnostics in the time of the early church had adopted the Greek philosophy of dualism—they thought material things were dirty and corrupt whereas spiritual things were pure and admirable. These Greek pagan ideas made inroads into the church and the apostles had to respond.

John wrote in his second epistle, “For many deceivers have gone out into the world who do not confess Jesus Christ *as* coming in the flesh. This is a

deceiver and an antichrist.” (2Jn 7) Jesus really did have a physical body, he was not a phantasm as the Gnostics argued. Even his resurrected body was physical, as we see from his interaction with Doubting Thomas. Earlier I mentioned that as part of Christ’s defeat of Satan on the cross the whole creation is being released from its groaning and will be remade anew. God cares deeply about the physical world.

When the Frameworkers make Genesis 1 a set of spiritual ideas instead of a set of spiritual *and* physical realities they are starting down a very dangerous path. Was Jesus’ resurrection a spiritual idea or a physical reality? After all, no one ever comes back from the dead just like we never have light without the sun or moon, right?

### **III. Conclusion.**

#### ***A. Willingly ignorant—2Peter 3.5-7***

We should not be surprised that the extraordinary claims of Scripture come under attack. Peter told us this would happen.

2Peter 3.5: For this they willfully forget: that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of water and in the water, **6** by which the world *that* then existed perished, being flooded with water. **7** But the heavens and the earth *which* are now preserved by the same word, are reserved for fire until the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.

They willfully forget numerous things—that the heavens came about by the word of God, the earth was a watery planet, the world was judged by a flood, the world is preserved by the same word that created it, and this world will be judged by fire. Those who willfully forget these things are called “scoffers” who walk according to their own lusts (v 3). Today’s atheists who defend evolution are lustful scoffers. God has revealed these facts of history to us so we would not be ignorant and misled by their lies. Christians should do everything they can to distance themselves from these lustful scoffers and not accept their conclusions which stem from ignorance.

#### ***B. Exchanged the truth of God for a lie—Rom 1.25, 2Cor 6.14-18***

Rather than distancing themselves they have jumped into bed. Christians who have adopted old earth, local flood, deistic, scientific materialism are following those who have exchanged the truth of God for a lie (Rom 1.25). In response I quote the Apostle Paul,

“what communion has light with darkness? **15** And what accord has Christ with Belial? Or what part has a believer with an unbeliever? **16** And what agreement has the temple of God with idols? For you are the temple of the living God. As God has said: ‘ I will dwell

in them, And walk among them. I will be their God, And they shall be My people.” 17 Therefore “ Come out from among them And be separate, says the Lord. Do not touch what is unclean, And I will receive you.” 18 “ I will be a Father to you, And you shall be My sons and daughters, Says the LORD Almighty.” (2Cor 6.14-18).

Light should be overcoming darkness not incorporating darkness into it.

Christ and Belial are in conflict.

The believer and unbeliever have different masters.

The temple of God needs to be purged of idols.

He is our father and we are his children.

### ***C. Failure to believe—John 5.46-47, Luke 16.29, Acts 28.23-24***

The failure to heed the plain words of Genesis is not a failure of young earth physical evidence or a failure of Calendar Day exegetical scholarship. It is the same as the people’s failure to believe Jesus’ basic claims. In his day people clamored for proof, especially miracles, as evidence to back up his message. He responded, “For if you believed Moses, you would believe Me; for he wrote about Me. But if you do not believe his writings, how will you believe My words?” (John 5.46-47; cf Luke 16.29, Acts 28.23-24). No amount of physical evidence and no amount of Scriptural evidence (either in the words of Moses or the words of Jesus) will convince those who are willingly ignorant. The Holy Spirit is the only one who can do this.

### ***D. Uncompromisingly Affirm the Whole Truth.***

Facing a world of unbelief, we must hold fast to the doctrines handed down to us (2Thes 2.15). The Scriptures are a beautiful cohesive whole; we cannot be cafeteria Christians and choose a bit of this and a bit of that to suit our liking or the shifting norms of the world. One family in our church has a family motto that has significant theological implications: “We eat everything on our plate with a smile on our face, and we chew it thoroughly!”

The wisdom of this world denies the supernatural. It looks for a material cause behind everything. As a result they don’t even consider the supernatural since it is by definition outside their worldview. We must not compromise any aspect of biblical supernaturalism. This includes all aspects of creation, the flood, the tower at Babel, Sodom and Gomorrah, the incarnation, Jesus turning water to wine (wine, not grape juice), raising Lazarus from the dead, the vicarious atonement, the Second Advent, and everything in-between.



Pietism denies the earthly and physical. It looks for an exclusively spiritualized meaning in everything. They deny the real physical impacts of disobedience (curse of the Lord's Supper eaten wrongfully, 1Cor 10); they deny real physical fruits of obedience; and they deny the future physical results of the spread of the gospel as nations bow to the throne of Christ.

Our forefathers in various generations have labored to hold the line against these twin enemies. We must stand with them. Actually, we must not be satisfied with merely holding the line. We must press forward. Just because the State of Nebraska permits homeschooling today doesn't mean it won't be outlawed tomorrow. Just because the PCA permits Calendar Day creation now doesn't mean we are guaranteed that freedom in the future. The best defense is a good offense.

We learn from the past and we fight for the future. May untold multitudes be able to say with Jeremiah,

'Ah, Lord GOD! Behold, You have made the heavens and the earth by Your great power and outstretched arm. There is nothing too hard for You. (Jer 32.17)

# Why does the Doctrine of Creation Matter? Part 2

Dominion Covenant Church

Mike Elliott

February 24, 2008

## I. Introduction

- A. Question of belief.
- B. The Faith is at stake.

## II. Problems

- A. Recap of last week's analysis. (top half of chart on the backside)
- B. Implications.
  - 1. Doctrine of Sin.
    - i. Its existence: sin is the transgression of the law—Leviticus 5.17, 1John 3.4
    - ii. Its source: sin entered the world through Adam—Rom 5.12a
    - iii. Its result: sin subjects all creation to death—Gn 3.17, 3.23, 5.5; Rom 5.12b, 8.18-22
    - iv. Its consequences: sin is judged in the past and future.
      - a. In Noah's day it was universal, by water, and never to be repeated—Gn 7
      - b. In the future it will be universal and by fire—2Peter 3.7, 12
    - v. Its cure: sin is washed away by Christ—1Cor 15.22; Rom 8.22-23
- C. Underpinnings.
  - 1. How to know God.
    - i. Naturalism or Scripturalism.
      - a. Role of Reason.
      - b. General Revelation vs. Special Revelation
      - c. The physical evidence. Old or Young earth?
      - d. Embarrassing result: order of events don't mesh.
    - ii. What is your authority? The Bible or secular scientists?
  - 2. How to read the Bible.
    - i. Perspicuity = "clearly expressed and easily understood".
    - ii. Hermeneutics = "a method of interpretation, esp. of the Bible".
  - 3. Gnosticism = "emphasis on spiritual to the exclusion of the material".

## III. Conclusion.

- A. Willingly ignorant—2Peter 3.5-7
- B. Exchanged the truth of God for a lie—Rom 1.25, 2Cor 6.14-18
- C. Failure to believe—John 5.46-47, Luke 16.29, Acts 28.23-24
- D. Uncompromisingly Affirm the Whole Truth.

Summary Comparison			Naturalistic Evolution	Theistic Evolution	Day-Age	Gap	Framework	Analogical Day	Calendar Day	
			Ignores the Bible	<i>Based on their interpretation of Genesis 1 and 2...</i>						
	<b>God is the creator.</b>	Dt 4.32, Ps 8, Isa 40.26, Mark 13.10, Rev 4.11, etc.	No God	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	<b>He created everything.</b>	Ps 89.11, Eph 3.9, Col 1.16, Acts 17.24.	All by processes	Naturalistic Providence	✓	✓	NA	NA	✓	
	<b>He did it to exhibit his attributes.</b>	Jer 10.12, Ps 104.24	Chance	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	<b>He did it out of nothing.</b>	Heb 11.3	Pre-existing	Pre-existing	✓	✓	NA	✓	✓	
	<b>He did all of it in the beginning.</b>	Mark 10.6	Spread out	Spread out	Spread out	Spread out	NA	Spread out	✓	
	<b>He did it in the space of six days.</b>	Gn 1.31-2.1 Ex 20.11	Long time	Long time	“✓”	Long time	NA	“✓”	✓	
	<b>Acknowledges the existence of sin</b>	Leviticus 5.17, 1John 3.4	✗	“✓”	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	<b>Acknowledges sin's source</b>	Rom 5.12a	✗	“✓”	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	<b>Acknowledges sin's result</b>	Gn 3.17, 3.23, 5.5; Rom 5.12b, 8.18-22	✗	“✓”	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	
	<b>Acknowledges sin's consequences</b>	Gen 7; 2Peter 3.7, 12	✗	“✓”	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	
	<b>Acknowledges sin's cure</b>	1Cor 15.22; Rom 8.22-23	✗	“✓”	✗	“✓”	“✓”	“✓”	✓	
	<b>Exalts Special Rev. over General Rev.</b>	2Tim 3.16-17	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	
	<b>Upholds the perspicuity of Scripture</b>	Ps 119 vv105, 130; See WCF 1.7	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	
<b>Accurate Hermeneutic</b>	2Pt 1:20-21; Acts 15:15; see WCF 1.9	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓		
<b>Avoids Gnostic tendencies</b>	2John, see also the Apostles Creed	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓		
✗ = fails this criteria.      “✓” = attempts/claims to meet this criteria but doesn't really do so. ✓ = meets this criteria      NA = says Genesis 1-2 doesn't address this issue.										

Order of Events	Genesis Creation Account	Evolutionary Theory*	Differences: <i>Biblical Creation has...</i>
	Day one—Light. Day and Night. Day two—Firmament. Day three—Seas. Grass, herbs, fruit trees. Day four—Lights (Sun and Moon) in the firmament. Day five—Sea and winged creatures; each its own kind. Day six—Cattle, creeping things, and beasts (=domesticated animals, insects, and wild animals); man and woman; each its own kind.	Solar system. Light. Earth. Water and atmosphere. Seas. Plants progress to fruit trees. Animals progress to Man.  <small>*Assumed to be true by Theistic Evol. &amp; Day Age. Assumed but not required by Framework &amp; Analogical Days.</small>	Light <u>before</u> the solar system. Earth <u>before</u> the solar system. <u>Watery</u> , not dry, planet. Land plants <u>before</u> sea creatures. Winged creatures <u>before</u> land creatures. Man <u>distinct from</u> animals.