

6 Day Creation & The Presuppositions of Science:
How Important Is Creationism &
Belief In Six 24 Hour Days Of Creation?

sermonaudio.com

What is the Reformed Faith

By W. J. Mearow

Bible Text: Exodus 20:11; Genesis 1

Preached on: Sunday, June 22, 2008

Reformation Church

Boerne, TX (San Antonio area)

Website: www.WorldUnderChrist.com

Online Sermons: www.sermonaudio.com/reformation

The 20th chapter of Exodus, of course, contains the 10 Commandments, and I am going to focus on a portion of the Fourth Commandment.

In Verse 11, Exodus 20 says, “For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day.”¹ And to continue with that verse, “wherefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.”² That is the last portion of the Fourth Commandment.

The Fourth Commandment is possibly the most controversial commandment among Christians. Part of the reason, as you know, is the disagreement over how the sabbath day is to be kept holy.

But that is not what I am going to focus on today, the Lord willing. Another very controversial part is the statement that we just read, that the Lord created heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is in six days.

Now, as you know, almost all modern scientists say that that is the stuff of ignorant religious faith: that God created the universe in six 24 hour days. That is not science. That is religion. They say that is just a fairy tale of all fairy tales. If you want to believe it, that’s fine. Believe it in church, but no self respecting scientist is going to believe anything like that. The scientific evidence, they say, is that the earth was formed as part of a slow evolutionary process that has taken billions of years.

Now a lot of Christians today—or those who certainly think of themselves as Christians—agree with the scientists. I mean, this idea that creation in six literal 24 hour days is something a lot of people think only Fundamentalist hillbillies believe.

If you remember the play and the movie *Inherit the Wind* about the real-life Scopes Monkey Trial in the 1930s, that is a good illustration of society’s attitudes toward this subject. William Jennings Bryan was the most famous witness for the prosecution in the real trial, and in the play and film a character is based on him. Bryan was a very famous

¹ Exodus 20:11.

² Ibid.

man around the turn of the century, a two-time presidential candidate, very outspoken in his fundamentalism, unfortunately, not a very good defender of his biblical beliefs, but that didn't stop him from being outspoken about them. He was on the side of the anti-evolutionists. He was defending the biblical account of creation as best he could.

Inherit the Wind is a fictionalized account of the Scopes Monkey Trial. It actually bears little resemblance to the actual trial itself; certainly in terms of what was said and testified to. It is very interesting to read the actual transcript of the Scopes Monkey Trial if you ever have the opportunity to do that. William Jennings Bryan comes off much better than he did in the play and the movie.

At one point the Clarence Darrow character -- the famous lawyer and equally as famous Atheist and brilliant man -- was defending the teaching of evolution. He challenged Bryan's belief in six day creation by asking him if he is familiar with modern scientific methods of dating rocks.

Bryan replied, "Well, I don't think about such things."

Darrow asked him, "Why?"

Bryan said, "Because I don't think about things that I don't think about."

Darrow snidely replied, "Do you think about things you *do* think about?"

In other words, if you believe that God created the earth in six 24 hour days, you are a moron.

The film made Bible-believing Christians look ridiculous on the subject of creation. If you want to see the other side, by the way, a film that shows scientists themselves looking ridiculous when they discuss what they believe about evolution, see Ben Stein's movie *Expelled*.

As a result of the pro-evolution propaganda via the news and entertainment media, the government schools and many churches, even conservative ones, the average American thinks the idea of six day creation and a young earth that is not billions of years old is just ridiculous, on a par with believing that the earth is flat.

By the way, that is a charge made against Christians. "Oh, you people believe the earth is flat."

The Bible says the earth is round, Isaiah 40:22.

Even in supposedly conservative denominations, conservative reformed denominations, there is a large minority of pastors and elders and seminary professors who, of course, train the pastors of tomorrow, that deny that God created the earth in six 24 hour days. I am sorry to say that is a movement within many reformed denominations.

But whether opponents of six day creation know it or not, the underlying basis for their faith—which is what it is— is known as uniformitarianism. One secular college textbook defines uniformitarianism as, quote:

One of the most important unifying concepts in the geo sciences. This concept developed in the late 1700s suggests that catastrophic processes were not responsible for the land forms that exist on the earth's surface. This idea was diametrically opposed to the ideas of that time period which were based on a biblical interpretation of the history of the earth. The prevailing view at that time was that the earth was created through supernatural means and had been affected by a series of catastrophic events such as the biblical flood.

This theory is called castastrophism. Instead, the theory of uniformitarianism said that the earth developed over long periods of time through a variety of slow, but uniform geological and geomorphic processes.

The ideas behind uniformitarianism originated with the work of a Scottish geologist named James Hutton. In 1785 Hutton presented a paper at the meetings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh advancing his theory that the earth has a long history, and that history could be interpreted in terms of processes that were *currently observed*.

For example, he suggested deep soil profiles were formed by the weathering of bedrock over thousands of years. He also suggested that supernatural theories were not necessary to explain the geologic history of the earth.

In 1785 these were revolutionary claims.

The work of Charles Darwin and Alfred Wallace on the origin of the earth's species extended the ideas of uniformitarianism into the biological sciences. **The theory of evolution is based on the principle that the diversity in the earth's species can be explained by the uniform modification of genetic traits over long periods of time.**

And that belief in uniformitarianism is really what is behind the rejection of the biblical account of creation. Now scientists look at the world and say, "Given the processes that we see it must have taken x number of years for the earth to form as we see it today."

In 1856 the earth was thought to be 22 million years old (by William Thompson, who later became Lord Kelvin, and other scientists). In 1862 the figure was between 24 and 100 million years old. In 1892 it was down to 18 million years, according to many scientists, but that same year Lord Kelvin recalculated and announced that the earth was 100 million years old. Shortly thereafter Charles Darwin's son, who was an astronomer, calculated the earth's age at 56 million years. In 1895 some scientists made the audacious

claim that, no, it was two to three billion years old. Kelvin stuck by his estimate of 100 million years, however, and later reduced his estimate to about 20 million years.

This went on and on, back and forth, and it still continues.

The latest consensus figure among scientists (as of 1956) for the age of the earth is four billion 54 to 55 million years, plus or minus one percent.

Our galaxy, by the way, is thought to be 11 to 13 billion years old, and that is based on the stage of evolution of globular cluster stars. And the universe itself is said to be 10 to 15 billion years old, and they base that on the recession of distant galaxies, how far they are moving away from each other.

The age of the earth itself is based on several radiometric dating techniques which measure the rate at which matter decays.

Here is the problem. Because they believe in the theory of uniformitarianism most scientists assume that the way things are today is the way they have always been. **They assume that the way things are today is the way they have always been.** They believe that we can date the age of the earth and the universe based on a process currently observed.

That is a fatal flaw in the method. It rejects the possibility of interruptions in the processes, such as the fact that matter did not decay or certainly did not decay in the way we know of it today before the sin of man brought death into the creation.

Look at Genesis chapter three, please. This is part of what happened after Adam and Eve sinned. In verse 17, "And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life."³ And it goes on to talk about how hard it will be for him to survive.

At the fall the ground was cursed as well as man. It is often said the Lord glanced the curse off of the ground before it hit man; the "ground" meaning the entire created physical universe.

So when scientists base their dating system on the rate of decay of observed matter, they are making the false assumption that matter has always decayed and decayed at the very same rate since it was created. But that is an untestable and unproven -- and unprovable -- assumption, the very kind of assumption that scientists deny that they ever make, yet they do it every time they try to date the age of the earth.

So how is the age of the earth and six day 24 hour a day creation linked?

³ Genesis 3:17.

Well, this way. What uniformitarianism ignores, in fact, rejects out of hand, and like that Clarence Darrow character in *Inherit the Wind* often contemptuously sneers at, is the biblical teaching there were six very special days in which God created the world.

Never have there been days like those in history. It is what is called special creation.

Uniformitarians say the world has always gone along exactly the same way without any interruptions, without any changes. They should be asked: How do you know? Why do you believe that? Were you there?

As God asked Job, so he asks modern scientists, “Where were you when I laid the foundations of the earth? Tell Me, if you have understanding.”⁴ Job 38.

They weren’t there at creation. They weren’t there before the fall or before the flood. I wish some of them had been around before the flood, but that is another story.

They claim they can only believe what they observe and, therefore, the way things appear to them today must be the way they have always been.

Proverbs 26:5 instructs the believer to, “Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit.”⁵

That means take the fool—in biblical language the fool is someone who denies --take his own assumptions and carry them out with him logically. Show him that they are folly, foolishness. If someone tells you they only believe what they observe—which is science, so called—whether they are talking about the earth being billions of years old or why they don’t believe in God or Jesus, say to them, “Oh, you only believe what you observe. So you don’t believe in anything you can’t observe with your own eyes.”

“That’s right.”

“And how did you come to believe that principle?”

“What do you mean?”

“Well, do you believe the principle that you can only believe what you can see with your own eyes because you have observed that principle with your own eyes?”

“Well, of course not. You can’t observe a principle. It just makes common sense.”

“So you believe in both things you can observe and you also believe in what you call common sense, even though you can’t observe it. So your statement that you can only believe what you observe is false, isn’t it? It is contradictory.”

⁴ Job 38:4.

⁵ Proverbs 26:5.

So when scientists or anyone else says they can't believe anything they don't observe, they are making a contradictory statement. It is self-refuting. Their fundamental starting point is contradictory, and that makes their conclusions invalid.

The statement, "I only believe what I can observe," is a proposition. Propositions cannot be observed.

In fact, everyone believes things they can't observe. We all do that.

Here is another objection to six days of creation. This one is often made by Christians: "What is the difference? What is the difference whether we believe the Lord created the earth in six days or six million days or six million years or six billion years as long as we believe He created the world? That is all that matters."

The difference is critical. The difference is believing what God says in the Bible and not believing it. That is the difference. The Bible says it was six 24 hour days.

Now we will get to the Hebrew that proves that in a minute. But you might as well ask, "What is the difference whether Jesus actually did miracles or not, whether he actually rose from the dead or not, whether... As long as you believe in him?"

If you don't believe God when he says he created the world in six days, why should you believe him about anything else he says in the Bible? That is why *belief in literal six day creation is fundamental to being a Christian*. If you get the first chapter of Genesis wrong you will get everything wrong. It is like starting to cut a board and if you are just a slight angle off when you start, how far off will you be at the end of that board?

The Bible says that God created the planets, the earth, the moons, the stars, solar systems, galaxies, the mountains, the oceans and all the living creatures from whales to microbes, all the atoms and their parts—even the quarks and things we don't know about—and man--in six 24 hour days.

To believe otherwise is basically to say that is impossible. It is to say, "Now I know Jesus said with God all things are possible, but I just don't believe him."

Every theory that rejects the biblical account tries to spiritualize it away by claiming the days aren't really days and God didn't really mean that and it had to take a lot longer than that and the Bible is not a book of science and there are gaps in the biblical account and a day to God is a thousand years...and on and on.

All of those objections are spurious cover-ups for unbelief. The Bible teaches special creation which is the opposite of uniformitarianism. What happened during that first week of creation is that God used processes he no longer uses, and those are processes we cannot observe today.

What is special creation? Genesis 1:2 tells us, beginning with verse one:

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.⁶

The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. That is special creation. The Lord created matter and he organized into oceans, mountains, plains and organized it teeming with life.

At the end of six days the Triune God rested. *Rested means ceased from his work. He stopped doing the work of special creation.* He has ceased ever since from using the processes he used during those six very special days. That is the reason science can never calculate the age of the earth. God today uses different processes -- processes we might call maintenance processes as opposed to creation processes.

Science looks at these maintenance processes and says, "Well, using the decay rate of these processes that we see today we calculate the earth is 4.54 billion years old."

But that is a false calculation. They work on presuppositions, assumptions which they cannot prove. They take it on *faith* that the processes that we see today have always been the processes.

The scientific method itself is based on unprovable assumptions; a false faith in the uniformity of processes.

But aren't I also operating on faith? Isn't it also faith to believe that God used other processes to create in six days, processes He no longer uses?

Yes, I am. My point is that one's starting point HAS to be faith. Science is not ultimately based upon reason as opposed to faith. **The presuppositions of the scientific method are based on faith just as much as the presuppositions of the Christian "method."**

The Atheist believes that his reason should determine what he believes. That is part of the problem -- many scientists are Atheists—not all by any means, but many are. They believe that the reason should determine what they believe, but they cannot prove why it should. Why should your reason determine what you believe?

The Christian believes the Bible should determine what he believes even when it contradicts his reason, because we know our reason is fallen. And the Christian can prove why the Bible should determine what he believes from the impossibility of the contrary, which I am not going to get into.

While a Christian may not be able to demonstrate that to the Atheist's satisfaction, well, not to worry. God will do that job. Every person, including every Atheist eventually

⁶ Genesis 1:1-2.

discovers that every word of the Bible is true. The critical question is: When do you discover that? Before you die or when it is too late, instantly after you die?

Jesus said in John 17, “Thy word is truth.”⁷ Every word in the Bible is true including a little Hebrew word and that word is **Mwy** (yome). You may not think you know Hebrew, but you know that word **Mwy** (yome). You know it when it is coupled with another Hebrew word **rpk** (kip-poor’), **rpk Mwy** (yome kip-poor’), the Day of Atonement, the most holy day in Judaism.

Mwy (yome) is the Hebrew word for day. It is a little word, but God uses it over 700 times in the Old Testament. And almost every time it means a literal 24 hour day.

It is my understanding that there is no Hebrew scholar in any seminary, Jewish or Christian, who believes that **Mwy** (yome) in the first chapter of Genesis means anything other than a literal 24 hour day. I read that. I am not sure of the accuracy of that. I know Orthodox Jews certainly believe that.

And the very same word **Mwy** (yome) is used in our text in Exodus 20:11. “For in six days,” six **Mwy** (yome), “the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is.”⁸

If **Mwy** (yome) doesn’t mean a literal 24 hour day, what does this passage mean?

Please turn to Exodus 16 beginning in verse 26.

The Lord through Moses is giving instructions to the Israelites on the gathering of manna in the desert. Exodus 16 beginning in verse 26:

Six [**Mwy** (yome)] days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the sabbath, in it there shall be none [no manna]. And it came to pass, that there went out some of the people on the seventh [**Mwy** (yome)] day for to gather, and they found none. And the LORD said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the LORD hath given you the sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth [**Mwy** (yome)] the bread of two [**Mwy** (yome)]; abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh [**Mwy** (yome)]. So the people rested on the seventh [**Mwy** (yome)] day.

God here is saying, he is proving that **Mwy** (yome) is a 24 hour day. Nobody, including those who claim that **Mwy** (yome) means something else in Genesis claims that it means anything other than 24 hour day in this text. It is the same word, the very same word in Genesis 1, Exodus 16, Exodus 20.

⁷ John 17:17.

⁸ Genesis 20:11.

Those Christians who deny six day creation and believe the earth was created through evolutionary processes that took millions if not billions of years say that **Mwy** (yome) in Genesis 1 means a much longer period of time than 24 hours.

It is simply arbitrary to say, “Well, it means a literal 24 hour day on this page, but over here it means billions of years.”

What fools men make of themselves when they deny God’s Word to make it fit the changing theories of Atheistic science.

Now what I just described to you is called theistic evolution. The proponents of theistic evolution think they are defending the Bible. I believe many of them have very good intentions. They believe they are defending God’s Word, making it acceptable to the modern world and to science.

Many also think that those who believe that the Bible clearly teaches God created the universe in six 24 hour days...well, they think they are basically rubes that make all Christians look backwards in the eyes of the world and, of course, it's very important that we look good in the eyes of the world, isn't it?

Those who believe in so called theistic evolution—trying to make the Bible fit the latest scientific discovery which, of course, often contradicts last year’s scientific discovery—are trying to make God’s Word pleasing to men instead of bringing the Bible to men to make them pleasing to God. They can’t tolerate being viewed as ignorant and unsophisticated by the world which is what will happen if they defend biblical creation, so they are trying to gain the world’s approval, again, many with very good intentions.

But that is simply a compromise between God’s Word and its enemies.

You know, if the Bible *did* fit in with modern science what would it look like in 100 years? If it fit in with the modern science of the 1700s what would it look like today?

By doing this they are wise in their own eyes. "If we can just show unbelievers that the Bible agrees with the latest issue of *Scientific American*, maybe they will become Christians. Maybe they will read the Bible and become Christians."

Proverbs 26:12 says, “Do you see a man wise in his own eyes? There is more hope for a fool than for him.”⁹

The theistic part of theistic evolution is that God is involved, He operates through the natural processes of evolution or that God created evolution as his way of creation. It is an attempt to reconcile the Bible with evolution. One version of this is called the day-age theory. **The day-age theory essentially says that when God said he made the universe in six days He was kidding.**

⁹ Proverbs 26:12.

He didn't really mean six literal days, but that "day" means an age of indeterminate length. That is why it is called day-age. It could be thousands, millions even billions of years.

If you don't remember anything else from this sermon, I hope you remember this. If a day in Genesis 1 means anything other than a literal 24 hour day, even if it means two days, much less a thousand years or a billion or whatever, then the Fourth Commandment makes no sense.

The Fourth Commandment says we are to follow God's pattern.

Exodus 20:11, "For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day."¹⁰ And we are to do the same.

Now if "day" means a billion years, then the Lord created the universe in six billion years and rested for one billion years. We are therefore to work for six billion years and rest for a billion years!

If "day" means anything other than a 24 hour day we don't know how to obey the Fourth Commandment. Any theory that rejects creation in six 24 hour days nullifies the Fourth Commandment by reducing it to gibberish.

Think about it. If you used the word "day" in speaking to someone who didn't have much knowledge of English, how would you describe what you meant? I imagine you would use very much the same terms that the Lord did in Genesis 1. We don't have to theorize about what God meant when he said "day" in Genesis 1. He defines it very clearly.

Genesis chapter one, verse five, "And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day."¹¹

Verse eight. "And God called the firmament Heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day."¹²

Verse 13. "And the evening and the morning were the third day."¹³

And so on, verses 19, 23 and 31.

How else would you describe to someone what day is? No, "day" means "day" and not a million years or any other period of time other than 24 hours.

God used the word "day" knowing that people would try to twist it and spin it into something completely foreign, completely wrong. So He defined the word for us:

¹⁰ Exodus 20:11.

¹¹ Genesis 1:5.

¹² Genesis 1:8.

¹³ Genesis 1:13.

evening, that is, night, and morning, that is, daytime. He didn't have to put that in there, but he did so we would know we are talking about a regular 24-hour day.

Remember, He was there. The theistic evolutionists were not.

“Where were you when I laid the foundations of the earth?”¹⁴

Do we want to believe them or do we believe God's Word?

Now there is another anti-biblical theory I want to touch on because you probably have been confronted with it or certainly will be. It is called the gap theory. It maintains that between verse one of Genesis chapter 1 and verse two there is a gap of time of indeterminable length. It could be billions of years in which God created everything, even whole nations in verse one, and then there was a great worldwide catastrophe in which the world of Gen. 1:1 was destroyed, made without form and void, and Gen. 1:2 picks up from there.

Gen. 1:1 says, “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.”¹⁵

Gen. 1:2 says, “And the earth was without form, and void,”¹⁶

The gap theory claims that between those two verses there was a whole world created and then it was destroyed.

Why would anyone think that? Because it is supposed to explain why testing rocks tells us the universe is billions of years old. It supposedly tells us why there are fossils.

There is a rather major problem with the gap theory: There is nothing in Scripture that supports it.

If you are going to claim there is a gap between verses one and two with no biblical reason to believe it, nothing in the text to indicate it, no basis to even infer it, why not claim that there is a gap between verses two and three, or three and four, or any other verses in the Bible? That would be ridiculous; just as ridiculous as claiming there is a gap between verses one and two of Genesis 1.

The Hebrew word “created” in verse one is **arb** (baw-raw') which means created out of nothing. In the beginning God created out of nothing the heavens and the earth. Nothing existed before verse one except God.

Despite the gap fantasy, there is no evidence in the Bible that there was anything material in existence before the account beginning in verse two. In verse one God created matter and in verses two and following He organizes it.

¹⁴ Job 38:4.

¹⁵ Genesis 1:1.

¹⁶ Genesis 1:2.

The Hebrew syntax in Genesis 1 actually puts the whole lie to the gap theory. This is written under the consecutive rule of Hebrew grammar which means that verse one is the heading. Verse two and what follows are lists under that heading.

If the English Bible followed the Hebrew grammar verse one would end with a colon and some of the verses following would be subsets of that verse, like bullet points. That is the way to read it.

The gap theory, like theistic evolution, is an invention. It has no foundation whatever in Scripture. It is just another way for people to deny what the Bible says in a man-centered attempt to make the biblical account of creation relevant and compatible to an unbelieving world.

Now I want to touch on a couple of other things before we wrap up. To review, we said there were six 24 hour days of special creation. There has never been anything like them in the history of the world. The seventh day the Lord ceased from creating new things. And he is now using maintenance processes.

The first law of thermodynamics is that energy can be changed from one form to another, but it cannot be created or destroyed. The total amount of energy and matter in the universe remains constant, merely changing from one form to another.

Actually, that is one statement of science that is true, because it agrees with the Bible. It describes God resting, ceasing from special creation. He continues to change matter and energy from one form to another. New stars are formed. Old stars burn out. Earthquakes and floods change topography. People are born, people die, dust to dust, ashes to ashes.

In the first chapter of Genesis God calls his creation "good" five times. And when He was finished with creation he called it "very good."

What do we have today? Disease. Corruption. Destruction. Death. Do you think God would have called all of creation very good if it was filled with pain and corruption and disease and death? No.

Those things are in the world because of sin. Before sin entered the world through our first parents Adam and Eve, none of that existed. Man and woman were created in perfect harmony with each other and with God. Marriage was perfect. The world was very good. Then sin entered the world. God cursed man in the ground, that is, all of nature.

What happened? The second law of thermodynamics went into effect. The second law of thermodynamics—entropy—disproves evolution. **The most fundamental laws of science say the universe is not evolving, it is *devolving*.** It is falling apart, corrupting.

Our bodies eventually dissolve. The universe eventually dissolves. The world is running down. Entropy is a consequence of the fall when God cursed the ground.

So the second law of thermodynamics is distinctly opposite to evolution which says man is being perfected. That is a fundamental New Age belief, and it is demonic.

Belief in literal six day creation is fundamental to believing the rest of the Bible. It is fundamental to believing what the prophets wrote, what the apostles wrote, what Jesus said. It upholds the meaning of keeping one day out of seven, the Lord's Day, as a day of holy rest.

If you believe the Lord didn't create everything in six 24 hour days and rested on another 24 hour day, the Fourth Commandment has no meaning whatever. The Fourth Commandment is intimately tied to the origin of man in the universe. That is known only to God and to whom God has revealed this knowledge, that is, those who trust his written revelation, the Bible.

No matter how many rocks they study, scientists cannot disprove special creation. They can't disprove the fact that God used processes we know nothing about to create the universe in six 24 hour days.

They should spend less time with the age of rocks and more time with the rock of ages.

Let us pray.