

## Ask Jeff – Creation Edition

By Dr. Jeff Meyers

sermonaudio.com

**Bible Text:** Genesis 1:1-3; Jeremiah 4:23-27

**Preached On:** Thursday, December 5, 2013

### **Greenwell Springs Baptist Church**

19421 Greenwell Springs Road

Greenwell Springs, LA. 70739

**Website:** <http://www.greenwellsprings.com>

**Online Sermons:** <http://www.sermonaudio.com/jeffmeyers>

Let me give you a little refresher and then we'll get into the concept. The idea was brought out or the ideas that were brought out were in relationship to creation, to the concept of Genesis 1 and reconciling a lot of what the Bible literally says with much of the concepts and philosophies and ideologies that we hear in the world and in the process of that discussion it led to this point where we had the opportunity to share the fact that there are various models of creationism. In other words, to have the idea that we are specially created by God, that what we know as the world at large was formed and established by God, there is not just one view of that from a creationism perspective. There are actually 5 main views or 5 main perspectives and we're going to deal with all 5 of those tonight so that you can see how believers, now, I'm going to rephrase it, how believers defend creationism in the world.

Now, before we get into the minutia tonight, let me say some very important things. Number 1 is this: that of the different views that you see tonight, most likely you will disagree with 4 of the 5 but please understand that those people who hold the other 4, just because they disagree with your particular perspective on creationism does not mean they are not true believers in Jesus Christ. This is not a litmus test for salvation, okay? Salvation is belief in Jesus Christ as the atonement for our sins and his resurrection as the satisfaction for eternity. Creationism is an important doctrine. It is a critical doctrine for our understanding of the Bible. Why? Because if you get off the train in the first chapter, you may not end up in the right place at the last chapter but please understand that one's view of creationism does not necessarily dictate their salvation aspect of their life.

Number 2 is this: please understand that you or someone you dearly love or your pastor, yes, truth be told, has held to varying views throughout their life. So do not believe that just because this is what you grew up with, that is what you currently fancy or whatever, is necessarily what you may always attribute to your life and please understand that as you grow in your walk with the Lord, there may be times where you switch boxes, so to speak, but you still believe that you came from God and you still believe in Jesus as Savior.

The last thing is this: tonight my goal is to share with you the 5 main views of creationism that Christianity uses to defend creationism. I'm going to share with you the basic premise of all 5. I'm going to share with you the pros and I'm going to share with

you the cons. In other words, what are the aspects that defend this position? What are the aspects that do not defend, in fact, maybe kind of contrary to? And please understand that every single one of these we could go an hour and a half, 2 hours each. This is not going to be exhaustive, it's going to be a summary of. That being said, as we're sharing, as we're talking, please feel free to raise your hand for points of clarification because it could be easy to confuse some concepts or ideas and my goal is not to share with you what I believe, my goal is to share with you what is out there and for you and the Lord and the word of God to struggle with what you believe so that you establish your own theology and your own belief and you can do what 1 Peter 3:15 says, you can go and defend the word of God out in the world.

So, that being said, I've already kind of preset our board here. The 5 main views of creationism and we're working from left to right not because it's conservative to liberal or liberal to conservative but as you'll see in a moment, it's really dealing with the expansion or the room for dating of creationism. On the left-hand side we have what is called theistic evolution. Then we have what's called the day age concept. Creation science or sometimes called scientific creationism. Young earth. In the gap. Now, I'm going to go through each of these individually and then we'll kind of compare them as a whole but please feel free if you need clarification or anything, well, go for it.

So, here's the first one: theistic evolution, the premise or the concept or the idea is that what the scientific community says, the belief currently, that the universe is 13.8 billion years old, that life, as far as life is concerned was about 4.5 billion years ago and that humanity was established at some level about 2.5 billion years ago. That that is the way in which everything came to be but that God established the process. Theistic, based on the word "theo" for God, that it is evolution. The basic way to say it is this: that yes, the bullet is evolution but God shot the gun. That is the concept of theistic evolution so the premise for this is that God initiated the evolutionary process. That's the concept known as theistic evolution. What this opens the door for is it allows for these age systems of the earth and all these fossils and such, that's not a problem to a theistic evolutionist because they say that is the way that God initiated it. And kind of the pro to this is not just the scientific evidence that supposedly is out there but their view of Genesis 1 through 3 where it says, "In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth and the earth was formless and void and darkness covered the face of the deep." Then you get into verse 3 and it says, "And God said let there be light." Their view is that God did not have an instantaneous creation moment but that it was a process and that actually the first 3 verses of the Bible actually can describe to us billions and billions and billions of years of time, energy, mass., etc. So what they see is the first 3 verses of the Bible not just as an event but as an elongated process. The advantage to being a theistic evolutionist is this: that no matter what they come up with, no matter what new idea comes out about the evolutionary process, it still does not mess up one's view of creationism because God still started it all. That's the pro.

So what is the negative? What is the con? What is the pushback? Turn in your Bibles to the book of Isaiah 45:18 and I also want you to turn to the book of Mark 13:19. Now, we'll actually start with Mark 13 and Mark 13, by the way, just to give you a little

background as you're looking for it, Mark 13 is in line with Matthew 24, Luke 21. It's kind of what we call one of the great eschatological passages meaning studies of the end times. Jesus is disclosing the end of the world, what we know as second coming material. That fancy word "eschatology" means "the study of the end times." And in the course of this, he's talking about the great tribulation. He is talking about judgment. He is talking about the end of the world and in verse 19 of Mark 13 for those of you who have it open, it says that this tribulation will be greater than any other time, what does it say? "Since the creation of the world in which God created it." If I'm not mistaken, in verse 19 of Mark 13, is not the word "creation" used twice there? The word "create" means "to literally make out of nothing; to establish ex nihilo is the Latin phrase for literally out of the thin air." You and I as humanity, we've never created anything. Now, we've made a lot and usually it's a mess but to make something is to take something that currently exists and to form and to fashion it. To create something is to establish something already made without having to fashion it. It's just instantaneous. You snap your fingers, you speak the word and it is there. Why is this critical? Who is Jesus Christ? He is God in flesh. He is Immanuel. And Jesus Christ says twice in the same verse that what we know as our physical universe was created, that it came out of nothing. So one of the struggles with theistic evolution isn't the fact that science may back you up, it's the fact that the words of Jesus Christ speak to an out-of-nothing experience, not an elongated process experience.

But the other passage is in Isaiah 45:18 and Isaiah 45:18, here's what it says about creation, "For thus saith the LORD that created the heavens; God himself that formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, he created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited: I am the LORD; and there is none else." Now, we understand he formed it to be inhabited and even a theistic evolutionist would say, "Well, of course, he did billions and billions and billions of years after its conception or initiation." But the key phrase is right there in the middle "he created it not in vain." When you go back to Genesis 1:2 and it says "and the earth was formless and void and darkness was over the face of the deep," when the theistic evolutionist says that those 3 verses are a process, they are stating that for an elongated period of time there was nothingness, there was voidness, there was vanity, there was that concept and yet here in Isaiah 45 it says the Lord never created it in vain. You combine that with Mark 13:19 in which Jesus says he created it literally out of nothing. So the pro to theistic evolution is that it reconciles itself very well with the scientific community with the latest discoveries that they come up with. The negative of it is, even though it establishes that God created or started the process, there are some pretty specific verses in the Bible that push against the concept of a billion year process as which the means of which God established Genesis 1.

So any questions or clarification on what we know as theistic evolution? You've got that covered? You've got that idea down? Good deal. Sure. Sure. It's a little bit of sarcasm. Sure. Got it.

Alright, moving onward, what we know as the day age theory. The day age theory. You need to go to 2 Peter 3:8 and it's a very familiar passage when you turn there. The premise or the idea of the day age theory is that the days of creation, the 6 days in chapter

1 and, of course, there's a 7th day in chapter 2 of Genesis, that each day represents a time period. In other words, rather than stating that on day 1 when God said, "Let there be light," that that was 24 hours and that day 2 when he put a firmament in heaven to separate, you know, from the waters above from the waters below that that was the second 24 hour time period, the day age theory states that each one of these creative elements, each one of these days, is a time period. Now, there are some strict day age theorists who will say that it was a specific time period and there are others that will say this is much longer.

Now, if you turn to 2 Peter 3:8, a very well-known passage of Scripture that we like to use a lot not just in reference to this but it says in verse 8, "But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." So the day age theorist has this premise that when the Lord said on day 1 he did this and on day 2 he did this, well, a day to the Lord is as 1,000 years and 1,000 years is as a day, and so the premise is, well, maybe day one was 1,000 year time period and maybe day 2 was a 2,000 year time period and day 3, etc. There are some individuals who even take it a step further and say that because the number 7 is somewhat of a holy number and the number of completion in the Bible, they even believe it's possible that the first day was 7,000 years, the second day was an additional 7,000 years and you get a total time period of about 49,000 years to undergo what we know as the creation process.

Now, please understand: every one of these ideas has shades of gray all throughout but the premise is that anywhere from 1,000 years to sometimes 7,000 or even a little more years per day mentioned in Genesis 1. Now, what is the pro for this? The pro or the idea that defends this or gives it credibility is the idea that God's perspective is not necessarily our perspective. Y'all remember a little verse in Isaiah 55, "His ways are not our ways. His thoughts are not our thoughts"? So the concept of our knowledge or our idea of time, who are we to restrict our definition of time upon God. When it says there in verse 3 that on day 1 he said let there be light, the pro to this is who are we to say that a day to him is not 1,000 years? Who are we to say that a day to him is not, you know, 49,000 years, whatever the idea may be. That's the pro to this. His perspective, God's perspective, versus our perspective, particularly when it comes to the aspects of time.

So what is the negative to this? I know y'all are going to be shocked, those of you that have gotten to know me over the last couple of months but there is this little word in verse 8 that is very important "but." I love that word in the Bible. If it weren't for the word "but" we'd all be in trouble. "The wages of sin is death but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Whenever you see the word "but" at the beginning of a verse, that verse cannot be taken in isolation. There is information that has been shared prior to it that it is comparing itself to. So in other words, you cannot just take verse 8 out of the picture and say, "This is a summary of creationism alone," you have to take it in the context of the whole passage.

So let's go back up in this passage and let's begin in verse 4. Let's get the whole idea here. "And saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation. For this they willingly

are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up."

Verse 8 of 2 Peter 3 has nothing at all to do with creation and has everything to do with the second coming. The whole passage is about the fact that Jesus is one day returning and don't panic at the length of time until he returns because, to us, 1,000 years is to him a day and it is but for a short time. You say, "Jeff, why is that a con or a negative toward the day age theory?" Because the verse that is predominately used to defend the idea that each day is representative of a time period isn't even a verse in regards to creation either on the frontside or the backside. The other negative and, by the way, I'm going to be really negative about all of these, don't panic, the other negative is the word for "day" in the Old Testament, originally in Hebrew, is the word "yom." That word, "yom," means "day." There are times in which the word is used for the day of the Lord but realize that in chapter 6 or in chapter 1 of the book of Genesis, we have 6 days of creation, right? Let's just presume, let's just presume that what we know as the creative elements of chapter 1 are in 1,000 year increments so it took 1,000 years for day one, 1,000 years for day 2 so by the time that Adam shows up we've had 5,000 years and he comes on day 6 and there is going to be 1,000 year time period. If you to the chronology of chapter 2, Eve doesn't show up for 6 more days so did he wait 6,000 more years? Because the Lord said, "It is not good that man be alone. I will create a helpmeet for him but you've got to wait 6,000 years." No, no, no, those were 24 hour days. Please understand that the same word is used on day 1 as is used in chapter 2 and one of the struggles that the day age theorist has is that it appears, at least on the surface, that you are choosing a time period when it is convenient and you're choosing 24 hours when it is convenient for the same word. But nonetheless, that is the day age concept wrapped up.

Any questions about the day age? Okay, we're either really confused or I am very clear about what I'm communicating. Yes ma'am. "Yom" means "day" in Hebrew. Yup, that's a yom. But you can say "boker tov" is "good day." It's another word for "day." Yom is the 24 hour time period. Remember the first day says "and there was darkness and there was light," so just a simple word. What I was trying to get across by that is the same word used in chapter 1 is used in chapter 2 and why is it 1,000 years in chapter 1 and only 24 hours in chapter 2 if it's the same word?

Anything else on the day age? As we move forward, we move to the middle position known as scientific creationism or creation science. If you go to a "Christian bookstore" or go online and buy a book that defends creationism, 95% of those books are written

from this perspective. This is the populist view. I didn't put it in the middle because it is the populist view, I put it in the middle because we are progressively going from longer time periods to shorter time periods. Theistic evolution, obviously could be billions and billions and billions of years. The day age theory could be 49,000 years or it could be 7,000 years. What we know as creation science, this is the idea or the concept that when you look at the biblical story of creation, we have to understand that the world of Genesis 1 looked very differently than the world of the 21st century and so we have to go back and look at it from an objective not just biblical perspective but we've got to look at it from a scientific perspective. And the main premise is the story of Noah and the idea that when what we know as the Noadic flood occurred, that it literally changed everything, not just in terms of humanity's relationship with the Lord and the promise of the rainbow but it also changed everything in the sense of the atmosphere and the way that things were established and the world in which we actually live, that this event was so dramatic that it changed everything.

Now, I mentioned to you that I put these in order from time periods. Those who adapt a creation science or a scientific creationism perspective, many of these people will say that the earth as you and I know it is anywhere from about 6 to 15,000 years in age and, in fact, there is a young earth theory that we'll share in a moment but they usually tend to gravitate toward a very young view of the earth. So let's take it from a broad perspective, let's say that we're now dealing with the perspective that says that the earth right now is say 15,000 years old. That's on the far side of this view and the strict side would be about 6,000 years. Obviously we are going way far away from the other 2 perspectives, correct? Because now we're dealing with Genesis 1 dealing with literal 24-hour days. We're not dealing with time periods. We're not dealing with eons of time. We're dealing with 24 hour time periods that if you go back and you survey the time periods in the Bible strictly saying they was a guy by the name of Bishop Usher who hundreds of years ago said that Adam and Eve were in about 4,000 BC but if you've ever tried to do genealogies in the Old Testament, good luck. So-and-so who begat So-and-so who begat So-and-so and they forgot So-and-so and you don't know who So-and-so is and you can't pronounce half their names anyway.

So you go in that and so they say, "Well, it could be 6,000 but it could be a little bit longer. There's a little wiggle room there not because of the science but because of the genealogies of Scripture." Okay? So it's not bowing to science in that respective. So what is the pro? What is the advantage? What is the perspective that makes this view not necessarily right or wrong but so popular? Well, I mentioned Noah and the pro is Genesis 5 and Genesis 10. If you have a Bible, I want you to turn to chapter 5 and chapter 10. We're not going to read specific verses but I want you to call out to me some very specific numbers. Now, Genesis 5 and Genesis 10 are, for lack of better terms, not incredibly exciting passages of the Bible. These are genealogies. These are So-and-so begat So-and-so who begat So-and-so who begat So-and-so and then you nod off to sleep. I'm telling you, if you have trouble going to bed at night, read the genealogies by dim lights and you will not have trouble at all. I promise you. By the way, I struggle going to sleep at night. Do you know how I go to bed? I listen to sermons. I may be the only person in the room who has ever put himself to sleep. I'm just telling you it works.

So now, that being said, Genesis 5. This is before the Noah story. Remember Genesis 6:1 begins Noah, "In the days of Noah." Remember, he begins to build the ark. That process in chapter 6 alone is 120 years so when you're in chapter 5 you are at least 120 years from the first drop of rain falling, okay? Now, just for the sake of fun if you have Genesis 5 open, start calling out to me the length of years that some of these people lived. 969, good old Methuselah right there. 969. Anybody else? 815. 777, good old Lamech. 777. 912. 930. 895. 905. He died at 162 or is that when he had kids? He had kids at 162. That's frightening to everybody in the joy club right there. Wow. How long did he live? I think that killed him. That's great.

Okay, so do you get the idea that in chapter 5 life as we know it is lasting a very long time. I mean, we could go through and I've never actually averaged the dates together but just from what you've called out, you know, 850 years. Now, let me put that in perspective. If we lived in the same environment today, William Shakespeare would be writing for Broadway and still be young. He would only be 500 years old. What we know as the birth of the English language would have only occurred 100 years before some of these guys were born. What we know as the English language most people attribute to about 1066, okay, that was roughly 950 years ago. Methuselah would have been alive when English as a language was established if we put it on our world today. Think about this: you think some of you have to buy a lot of presents for grandkids at Christmas, can you imagine this world? You wouldn't just have great-great-grandkids, you'd have great-great-great-great-great-not so great-great-great-grandkids. You'd have them everywhere. The lifespan is phenomenal in Genesis 5.

Now, flip over to Genesis 10. Genesis 10 is the first chapter after the Noadic story. Now remember, the whole story of Noah is chapters 6-9. In chapter 6, the wickedness of man is everywhere on the earth. God says, "Build an ark, rain is coming." Noah gets on the boat, it rains, it pours, they stay on the boat, they get off the boat. In chapter 10, we have a list of the genealogies after Noah. Now, I want you to start at the top of chapter 10 and start naming some of the lengths of their years. Anybody? Hello? Genesis 10, how long are they living? Go to where there are genealogies. 500, we've got 500. Now, y'all have to admit 500 is a long time, right? 403. Keep going. 430. Y'all don't have any genealogies in Genesis 10? Are they in chapter 11? Well, golly, I ate too much dinner tonight. I apologize. Forgive me for that. I apologize. Please forgive me. Now, you have to give me a little credit, there are a lot of names in chapter 10. There are just no ages given.

Alright, in chapter 11, please forgive me, beginning in verse 11, "And Shem lived after he begat," a kid whose name I can't pronounce, "five hundred years." That's a pretty long time, right? But it's no 969. Keep on going. Verse 15, he lived 403 years. Look at verse 20, 230. They are having children but then it says then after he begat he lived 207 years and it keeps going and it keeps going and it keeps going. By the time you get to the end, look at verse 26, "And Terah lived seventy years." Verse 25, 119 years. Verse 24, 29 years. What you see in chapter 11 specifically, forgive my mistake there, is you see the age of humanity progressively lessen. When they get off the boat, they're living 500, 400+ years. By the time you get 7, 8, 9 generations down the road, how long are they

living? The same lifespans as you and I. And what is so critical to this view, why the Noadic story is so important is the concept of creation science or scientific creationism is this: that the Noadic flood was such a critical event not just in God's relationship to man and our relationship to him but that the universe was so dramatically changed that it changed everything about our world such as that when you began to study, this is what's critical, when you began to study the world on the other side of the flood because the environment, because the atmosphere and because the world was so different, we cannot use dating and/or scientific principles today and overlay them on then because it's a different world. It's a whole different focus.

Some of the examples that have been given to validate this is people go out to get a rock, y'all know about carbon-14 dating, right? You take a specimen of a rock, you give it to a scientist, they do the half-life of carbon-14 and it comes back and it says this rock is X number of years of age. There have been rocks that have been taken that people know predate what we know as Noah's time frame. Take the rock, break it into 12 pieces, give it to 12 different labs, guess what you get? 12 different dates. Why? Because the premise is that the world then is not the world of today so therefore carbon-14 dating, that may be accurate for up back to Noah's flood is not accurate on the other side of Noah's flood so that when they pick up a rock and say this person is 14 million years old, the scientific creationist comes back and goes, "You can't use that type of dating system to date that because it's on the other side of the flood." Everything changed. The ages of humanity changed. Life changed. Everything changed. In fact, when you start looking at the way the animals reacted, the humans reacted, the whole world changed with this whole Noah experience.

So the pro of this is this idea of Genesis 5 and Genesis 10 and, by the way, one of the words that comes out if you study this kind of from a scientific perspective is the word they call the canopy theory, the idea that the earth was shielded and protected by God and it says in Noah's flood that the heavens were opened and the waters came out from below, etc. This idea that this canopy, for lack of better terms, was no longer as effective or effective as it used to be in those days. So the advantage or the pro of this position is that the Noadic flood was so significant that it significantly alters how we can scientifically date things on the other side of the flood as opposed to this side of the flood. That's the pro.

You say, "Well, what is the negative? What is the disadvantage to this?" The disadvantage or the negative of this position is: we really don't know outside of the dates that we have in Genesis 5 what the world on the other side of the flood really looked like. We are not able to re-create it. We are not able to go into a lab and say, "Oh yeah, this is what it looked like. We know for a fact this is what it was." We don't have absolute solid information that says, "Well of course, in Genesis 5 they lived 969 years because they had this protective element and we have proof and evidence to show thereof." So the scientific proof, for lack of better terms, and I'm putting that in quotes, is just not there. That doesn't mean it's necessarily false, it's just stating that the idea that something was dramatically different before the flood than after the flood, it makes a lot of sense and it works and particularly when you've got rocks that are being miss-dated, but there is not a



real way to go back and definitively define how that works. For example, if you've read a lot of the books in this position, one of the things they share is that the animals on the other side of the flood would have acted dramatically different than on this side of the flood. If humans don't live as long now as they did then, then maybe animals, i.e. dinosaurs and such, didn't get as big as they used to way back when. There are a lot of speculative concepts based on these ages being so different.

Any questions, concepts, clarifications? Yes sir. Noah's flood, basically, roughly 2,500 BC. Where? The oceans. No, I mean seriously, well, you have, understand, okay, that's a valid question, where did the waters recede to? Do you know what the one aspect that we did not have on earth prior to the flood, it had never what? Rained. How do we get rain? Water evaporates, formulates and comes back down and so the idea is that the recession of the water not only went into what we know as the oceans but it also, the evaporation process because as they would say, things are different now, that water evaporated up, comes back down and that cycle is there. Does that communicate? Does that help out?

Right. What Brother George is saying is that in this theory that there is no more water in our universe now than there was then, it's just not all on the earth, it's in the clouds, atmosphere. The atmosphere is different than it was then. Hopefully that clarifies.

Yes sir. Yes sir. Absolutely. Sir, are you having a Junior moment? Okay. What he's referring to is there's a book called "The Genesis Flood." One of the predominant authors is a man by the name of Henry Morris who is kind of a forefather in Genesis theology, for lack of better terms, in which he goes through chapter after chapter basically diagnosing this kind of difference between then and now with rocks and formations. As you said, you read it, it was interesting but you've forgotten a lot of it because it's very scientific but yet it's very good.

Yes sir. Right. Great question because the question is: a year because we're talking about years back, were they 365 days as we now know it? In the Jewish world, they were actually 360 days. Five days does make up some difference but not millions of years worth of a difference. By the way, just so you'll know and I know I'm chasing a rabbit here, what we know as our months of the year, do you know they are actually based on the Jewish calendar. I don't know if y'all knew that. But let's take the month of October, okay? October, "oct" means what? 8 but it's the 10th month of the year. Have you ever thought about that? December, what does "deci" mean? But it's the 12 month of the year. Our months of the year are actually based on the Jewish calendar, not on what we call the Gregorian or the Roman calendar. Once again it just proves God knew what he was doing and, well, he really did it right because even our calendar system is based on their calendar system, we just don't even realize it. I think that's kind of interesting how that all works out. September, 7 but it's the 9th month. So when you're reading the Bible and it says, "In the first day of the first month of the year," it's March, not January. So when you read those you have to understand that that calendar, it's twisted a little bit but the years don't dramatically change. Does that help out a little bit? Because, once again, you're dealing with lunar cycles is what you're doing.

Any others on this? Yes. Whoa, wow, lots. We've still got 2 more to go. Okay. The question is, Noah's flood. What she's bringing up is major land changes, formations, the continents that, you know, you remember in school they put them all together and then they divide them all up and they kind of fit like a jigsaw puzzle but now they are separated. It says in the Noadic account in those 3 chapters, it says, the water from above and the deep from below and you get the idea and, one of the great questions is was Noah's flood, was it localized or was it globalized? Well, the Bible says over the whole earth and people say, "Well, you mean it literally covered everything?" Well, it says whole earth and it covered everything. So you take the huge mountains and, by the way, one of the discussions is, "Well, how did it recede so fast?" Noah did not land at the Dead Sea. He landed on a mountain so please understand, he didn't come all the way back to sea level, okay? He came back down some way but you take that out and if you were to take any type of element, let's just take the earth and you've got water coming from above and water coming from below, it's natural in this position particularly to postulate that even large landmasses would easily float and divide and separate and move. As water recedes at that much regression, large landmasses that we would presume would take millions of years could be carved like a hot knife through butter because the force of water is so great. So to that question, yes. That opens up the idea that the Noadic flood produced elements that may appear to be older than they actually are.

Now that you mention fossils and the whole idea is would it have brought fossils up? And if you're not, for lack of better terms, if you're not familiar with kind of the scientific study of all this, one of the struggles that anybody has, forgive me for saying this, on this side of the board when you get into longer time frames but even in particular what I call the non-believing scientific community is what we call the spontaneous fossil record. You would think that if we evolved over millions and billions of years that you could dig down and find a few fossils, come up, find a little bit more, come up, a little bit more and it would just get more saturated but what you find is nothing, nothing nothing, boom, fossils everywhere. It's called the spontaneous fossil record and so that is one of the elements that defines the fact that the creation of humanity and animals in particular was a very quick process, not an elongated one.

Does that help? Would it have moved them around? I guess, I don't know. I'm not a geologist but I think you've got evidence, particularly from this perspective that the world of today is dramatically different than the world of then.

Sir? On purpose? Not on purpose. Oh no. Are you trying to go back to sleep listening to my sermons? Yes sir. Okay, I'm sorry. It doesn't work for you? I apologize. Well, I put myself to sleep very well, it's easy. No, thank you very much. Any other questions on this position?

Okay, moving onward and I know, please understand, lots of information, fire hydrant theology, okay? Let me recap the very beginning. One's position does not necessitate their relationship with Jesus Christ. It assists their explanation to a lost, dying, non-believing world of how we could be created by God and not established by accident.

The next one is what we call the young earth theory. The young earth theory is, no pun intended, very young in conception. If the idea is that the premise is a very strict 6,000, 6K years of creation and they believe that when it says, if you go back to the genealogies, back to Adam and Eve of about 4,000 BC, that everything from a time perspective is absolutely positively literal, just as it says, no questions asked, okay? Now, the pro and the con to this are kind of wrapped up in one big, I guess, project. Obviously the pro and please understand, the pro on this position isn't necessarily a negative on the other, it's you've got a strict attention to literalness. In other words, there is none of this, "Well, the word really means this or if you look at it this way the word really means this." It's 24 hours a day. Boom, bam, here we are. We've got to deal with it. It's not our job to necessarily say what it really means but just let it mean what it really says.

So the pro of that and the con, the young earth theory, what they have done is they believe, yes they believe that Noah's flood was significant and impactful, don't get me wrong but what they say and what is so critical to this perspective is that when God said, "In the beginning," he created the heaven and the earth, that that was a sinless society and a sinless world and therefore what would appear in a sinful world to take a million years, in a perfect world could take one second. So kind of the pro and the con is looking at science if I can get this to write, in a perfect world. Some of the individuals who advocate this position, is they will take special ovens, for lack of better terms, and machinery and they will take rocks and they will put it at the perfect humidity, at the perfect time and at the perfect pressure and in a matter of, you know, just a few hours, create coal and they'll say that in a perfect environment, it would not take millions of years, it would take but a few seconds and the environment in which God created what you and I know was a perfect, sinless environment. What the young earth theory is and I know we're kind of short on time and I'm not trying to evade it, it really is creation science on steroids. It's taking those premises and going the next step and saying, "Let's not even say that the world before Noah and after was different, let's go back even a little bit further and say before sin ever entered the world the world was different." You can't measure it the same, yes, but they look at it from a perfect world. If the humidity was perfect, the pressure was perfect, everything was perfect, the time period to create or make something would not be as long as it is now because our world is messed up.

Now, one of their great examples, by the way, and this is the part of this theory that's both the pro and the con because it's so speculative but it's so interesting. You know that the sun as we know it, the sun is losing mass every day. Now, if you listen to the scientists, we're going to burn up in a billion years so don't panic yet, we've got a billion left. But it's losing mass. It's been losing mass at a certain rate for a very steady amount of time. Well, if you go back in time and you start adding that mass on every day and you go back a million years, then Mercury would be engulfed by the sun but Mercury is here. If you go back and you look at Niagara Falls, Niagara Falls is actually receding at like 12 to whatever it is inches per year, I don't know what it is, but it's receding at a certain level and it has been ever since we've noticed Niagara Falls. If you go back 100,000 years, Niagara Falls would have had to start in Western Canada to get where we are and so the ideas and, ma'am, this kind of goes onto your question, the things that appear to have taken so long would not have taken near as long in a perfect environment of which the

Lord obviously had to work with in Genesis 1:1. So it's called the young earth theory. So the pro of it is, hey, perfect world, perfect conditions, yes. The con of it is: perfect world, perfect conditions and you're kind of making science formulate, it's kind of a rolled up ball, if that makes sense.

Anybody on the young earth theory concepts, ideas, questions, concerns? It's pretty simple. Yes sir. Any place in the Bible that backs up that theory? What backs it up is the idea that if you go back and take the years as literal years, take the days as literal days and you back all the way up into the Old Testament, you get to what we know as Genesis 1 in roughly 4,000 BC and so from that time period to here you've got about 6,000 years and they take that time period as that's what God gave us, it was perfect when he started it, we can't understand it now. So that's kind of the pro. It's a strict attention to the little interpretation of those time periods that, you know, when it says a generation, they don't read 40 years, they don't read 70, they don't read 100, it just says So-and-so begat So-and-so those many years, that's how many years it was. Keep on trucking on.

Does that help out? That perspective? Oh, a particular verse? No. Sorry. Forgive me. So, as you'll notice they all have pros and they all have cons. Anything else on the young earth?

The last but not least is the one that we actually were addressing somewhat the last time we were together which kind of spawned this whole conversation, is this idea of what is known to many as the gap idea or the gap theory. Now, the premise here and please understand that to explain this properly, would really take about 3 or 4 of these nights, okay? I've got 10 to 15 minutes so here we go. The idea of the gap theory is that in Genesis 1:1 through 3 that there is a gap, for lack of a better term, between verses 1 and 3 and that is verse 2. The premise is, "In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth." That everything was perfect. Everything was wonderful. Everything was great. In verse 2 when it says "and the earth was formless and void and darkness was over the face of the deep," the idea is that even though God created it perfect in verse 1, something tragic happened in verse 2. In fact, the overwhelming majority of people who believe in this particular system state that that is when the fall of Satan occurred, that that time period was a time or a gap, for lack of better terms, and that in verse 3 that when God said "Let there be light, it was not the initial creation of light but it was the turning of the lights on that had "been turned off" at this tragic event in verse 2. Hence, having a gap of time between verses 1 and 3 which would be verse 2.

One of the passages that we looked at the last time we were together was that passage in Jeremiah 4:23 through 27. Remember, it talked about there was a time period of the judgment of God where it said all the cities were destroyed? It says that all the birds, everything was gone and a lot of people have applied that to Noah, the problem is not everything was destroyed with Noah. There was some life left. Though it may be few, there was some left. Obviously that passage says that everything was obliterated and so what this statement or what this premise is is that Genesis 1:1, we don't have any idea when that actually happened. We don't have a time frame but what they do say is this: that in verse 3 when it says God said, "Let there be light," that was 6,000 years ago. So

do you see the premise there? That Genesis 1:1 could have been billions of years ago but Genesis 1:3 was 6,000 years ago because there is no idea of how long that "gap" was between it. And this may be a concept you may or may not be familiar with so the premise goes a little bit something like this: God created everything and he established it in verse 1. Satan falls, he turns off the lights. At some point in the future, he turns them back on. It's been 6,000 years since he has turned them back on. That is the premise.

You say, "What is the pro to this?" The pro to this position is Genesis 1. You say, "Well, how is that the pro to this position?" Because in Genesis 1 and we discussed this a little bit last time we met, it says that God told Adam and Eve to replenish the earth. How do you replenish something that was not plenished? It says, "And let there be light and let there be this and let there be that," and not until you get to day 6 does the word "create" show up again and that word "create" is only used in reference to humanity which would have not been a part of Genesis 1:1. So what you have is the pro to this is that the word "create" is critical to that which is being completely brand new. In Genesis 1:1, everything was brand new. In verses 3 until day 6, that which had been "in darkness" for who knows how long is brought back to speed and this new entity known as humanity is created as in verse 1 out of nothing, that which had never been before, humanity.

So the language of Genesis 1 allows for you to take a step back and say, "Wow, the words that are used are very interesting. Why would we be told to replenish if there was not an original plenish? Why to this position's advocacy, why would God give the garden of Eden and not just the whole world of Eden? Why would Cain fear others out there? Why would the garden be selective and everything else? Why would Adam say everything out there is bad, everything in here is good?" So the language of Genesis 1 is a language of which a lot of people that hold this position will say is a language of restoration, simply meaning that the majority of what you see in the creation account does not describe an initial event but a restoration of a former event.

So, someone who at one point in my life, really, alongside my wife, it was her idea in the sense of the creativity, we restored an older home. What we did was take something that was old and dilapidated and brought it back to life. That whole idea of taking that which is in a position of "not good" and making it good. Do you realize that everything that God did beginning on day 1, he said, "Let there be light," and what did he say? "It is good." By the way, if you look at that passage of Scripture, interesting that the light comes out of the darkness. You know darkness is the absence of light? It's kind of interesting because 1 John says that God is light and in him is no darkness at all. So once again, it's the language of this passage that works alongside with that passage in Jeremiah 4.

The other pro if you would allow me to put 2 pros here, is it kind of allows the best of both worlds. You have the literalness of the 24 hour days in Genesis 1 and that verse 2 "gap" also allows for these large time frames of scientific quandary. Does that make sense? When the scientists come out and say, "Yeah, if you look at that rock, that rock is 8 million years old." Someone who adheres to this position says, "You're absolutely right. That rock was here in Genesis 1, there were millions of years but humanity and what we know as our interaction with God has only been here for 6,000." So it's kind of, for lack

of better terms, to use our modern-day vernacular, it's kind of a hybrid position. You've got the best of both worlds.

So what's the con to this position? It doesn't sound like a con but it really is a con. The con to this position is what I call the Bible jigsaw puzzle. Everything to defend this premise is Scripture, that Jeremiah 4 is talking about Genesis 2. It's the only time that the formless and void phrase is used. Now, when it says replenish, it presupposing that there was something else there before. When it says, "Let there be," that's stating it wasn't a creative position. If any of those verses do not actually mean what this position says they mean, the whole position falls because it's all based on every one of these passages and verses and words referring to this event that took place in verse 2. Now, the pro of that con is: it states that the Bible is inerrant and perfect. The con of it is: it is seen through this light in meeting what claims it is meant in that light. Does that make sense? It's kind of a pro but it's also a con at the same time because it rises and falls on these verses really meaning what they say that they mean.

Now, I realize I have hit you tonight with a fire hydrant of creation theology. I realize that nothing that we've talked about tonight determines whether or not your soul spends forever in heaven versus hell. I realize that but what we need to understand is we live in a world today where most people are beginning to believe that we did not come from God. They are beginning to believe that what we walk on every day was not established, was not created, it was not formed by God and as a believer in Jesus Christ, we need to be able to talk with these people about how they got here and how we got here and to be able to have a conversation with them.

Now, please understand that in all that I have shared, I understand there was some confusion but I promise you that every one of you leans to or adheres to one of these more than another one. That's okay. You may not always adhere to that one. You may change at some point and somebody sitting next to you, in front of you, or behind you may have a different perspective and guess what? We can all still be family, okay? This is how I like to equate this: creation theology is a lot like college football. Why did I get an "oh no" there? College football, everybody has their team. Everybody has the team that they root for and they are passionate about and usually whatever or whomever you root for, you cannot conceive that anybody would root for anybody else but your team. You do understand, what did I hear down there? I thought you said, "Go Tigers," and I thought after this week? I'll give you one more second to think about that. I'm sorry. That's bad. I'm sorry. I know Tiger fans, you're still upset about that situation. But please understand, as a fan of your team, you cannot fathom how anybody else could be passionate about any other team. You do understand that there are people in this world who are just as passionate about their team who cannot understand why you'd be passionate about your team but at the end of the day, you're both enjoying the game of football, you're just rooting for different teams playing the same game.

The reason I bring that up is when you look at this from the big picture, it's like college football. It's the same game. We were created and established by God to have a relationship with him. We're just debating which team we root for when we come to the

game. Now, that may be a bad analogy but I think it's an accurate analogy because, please hear me, I know this is the third time I've said it: your perspective and view does not necessitate whether or not you are a believer in Jesus Christ. I stand as your pastor and I will tell you that in 30+ years of walking with the Lord, I have held more than one of these positions on the board. Now, I think that I am more right today than I was then but that does not mean I'm more saved today than then and no, I'm not going to tell you. And it's not because I'm ashamed and it's not because I'm embarrassed and it's not because of any of those reasons. I do realize, I realize and I mean this seriously, I realize the weight of my position and I realize the importance of this but I also realize that there's going to come a day for every single one of you that the Bible says you're going to appear before the Lord Jesus Christ to give an account of your life and I don't want you simply to adhere to something just because your pastor does. I want you to dig and I want you to formulate and I want you to look at it and say, "I really like that," because I'm going to tell you, your pastor used to believe something different about this than he does today and I would really struggle with if I had told people X number of years ago, "This is the only position because this is the one I hold to," and now I hold to a different one.

Now, that's not to say that I was a heretic then and I'm not now but I think that the key here is wrestling with it and saying, "That's what I hold to." I think that's the one that when I talk to people, that's what I think, that's what I believe. But let me show you this: the criticalness of this is I want to challenge you to adhere to the one that you believe is the most faithful to Scripture, not the most faithful to learning, education or the latest news because if you haven't read the latest news lately, it's frightening what the "community of learning" can come up with. If you have not been paying attention, allow me to share with you since we talked of college football, obviously there wouldn't probably be anybody in the room here presently that would root for a team that has the mascot of the Bulldogs, right? No way. Is that correct? I'm just making sure. No Bulldogs, right? Particularly Georgia Bulldogs? That doesn't work in Tiger country, does it? So you're going to really like this, well, you're not going to like the illustration but there is a professor at the University of Georgia that came out this week with his latest scientific discovery. He does not believe that we came from God. He does not believe that God created us. He believes in strict Darwinian evolution, the fact that literally we are from a large accident, okay? That 2 things came in the air, boom, they collided, we showed up umpteen years later. He has to explain how does humanity come out of this great accident? And as you well know, the majority of evolutionary belief is the idea that from the "chimpanzee we came." Opposable thumbs, tails, you know, everything, whatever they come up with. And so you have to make the connection: how did we get from the chimpanzee to us? And there have been lots of different theories. There's been mutations in genes and this and that. Oh no, no, no: the latest published scientific theory is that a chimpanzee mated with a pig and formed us. Why are you laughing? This was published in the New York Times this week. This is scientific evidence and yet you laugh. The reason I say that is I want to laugh too but that's what happens when we start siding with what we have learned versus what the Bible says.

Now, a couple of years ago there was a movie written or made, if you've never seen it, let me encourage you to, it's called "Expelled." It's a Ben Stein movie and it is dealing with

this idea of intelligent design. Intelligent design, sometimes it's called ID, is the idea that there was an intelligent being that created us. It's not necessarily a Christian position, okay? It's just the idea of a theistic position. A lot of the intelligent design guys are over here in this camp, they believe that God or something like God did it, that we did not come from a sheer accident or sheer evolution. That being said, in this movie, "Expelled," Ben Stein is interviewing one of the foremost scientists in the world. How did the stuff that made us who we are, the goo, you know, because, some of y'all like my phrase we came from the goo to the zoo to you. How did the goo get here? And this brilliant man with umpteen educational degrees says, "Well, at one point in time, this goo was on the back of crystals that were floating through space and these crystals landed on what we know as earth and millions of years later we're sitting here talking." And Ben Stein looks at him and says, "Crystals? The back of crystals?" And this renowned scientist looks at him like, "You would have to be an idiot not to think this," and Ben Stein is looking at him like, "You're an idiot for thinking this."

Now, the reason I bring those illustrations up is you begin to think that we came on the back of crystals and that apes and pigs formed us when you start thinking outside of these pages to explain how we got here. These views, though 4 out of the 5 you probably don't agree with and that's okay, they at least stay within the pages here to say that, "In the beginning God," and then obviously there is the rest of the story.

Any questions, concerns, comments, rude statements? Oh yes, ma'am. Jeremiah 4:23 through 27 is the passage of Scripture. We dealt with it last time we were together so I didn't go much into it tonight. That's the passage of Scripture that the "gap theory" utilizes to say that there was a judgmental event in time past that cannot be Noah's flood that pictures a complete destruction which is what they will view Genesis 1:2 as when Satan fell. Does that help?

Anything else? Yes ma'am. Okay, that's a great question. Would a whole world of people have fallen with Satan? The Bible speaks that when Satan fell, this is in 2 Peter 2:4 and it's also in the book of Jude, verse 6, it says, "the angels that left their first estate." He speaks of the angels that fell with Satan, that the inhabitants thereof, once again, we're dealing with this area right here, that this event in verse 2, that those inhabitants were not humans because on day 6 of creation he creates us, that means out of nothing we're brand new, that you would have had the angelic beings that rebelled with Satan would have been the inhabitants thereof. Does that make sense? 2 Peter 2:4 and Jude 6.

Yes ma'am. That's correct. Right. Okay, that's a great question because I'm going to end on this question because of time and we need to pray. The question is: okay, he tells Moses, "Moses, why don't I scrap everybody and just start over with you?" Remember, Moses says, "No, no, no, if we can find 10 people." You know that whole story, Sodom and Gomorrah, right? And so the idea is if you back that up, is it possible, what she said here is a great question: is it possible that Adam and Eve were starting over because a previous group had messed up and you get this kind of cycle going? The evidence contrary to that is, once again, and I know I keep going to this position, in Genesis 1 right here, it says "and he created them male and female." That humanity on day 6 was unlike



anything that had ever been done before, a brand new, "after his likeness and after his image." You get to and I'm going to utilize this question, you go to Genesis 6, he really did start over with one man named Noah. He didn't create a new entity, he just gave humanity a second chance. With Moses, he was basically saying, "Moses, I'll give you all a third chance." In other words, "I'll just start over with you." He never said, "Moses, Noah, I'm wiping everything out and I'm going to restart a living organism." He never varied from humanity after Genesis 1:26. Does that help? Hopefully.

Anything else before we pray? I know it's been a fire hydrant tonight. Please submit the questions, bring them in next week. We are drawing from the box. We are starting afresh. The reason we did this tonight this way is because we were on the tail end of this last time we met and we had a whole can out there that we just had to deal with. So anything else before we pray?

Yes ma'am. Yes he did. Yes sir. The question is simply: if Satan fell at one time in the past and the angels fell with him, why is it not possible today? In Revelation 12, there is the famous story of Satan casting a third of the stars out of heaven. The reason that we say that that was that initial event is because John Milton, the English author in the book "Paradise Lost" said that it was in the past but if you read Revelation 12 carefully, that event is at some point in the future. So the Bible does say at one point in the future there will be an additional falling of the angelic beings. Now, I know for a fact in the past there has been some and I know in the future there will be some, I cannot speak to today. If that communicates. Does that help you out at all? But the falling of angelic beings is not over. There will be a time period at some time in the future, it will occur again and it says that a third of them, I'm just assuming a third that are "left" will fall. That leaves a lot of angels in damnation because we don't know how many fell in the past. It doesn't say specifically but the idea that a third of the angels fell with Satan comes from "Paradise Lost" not from the Bible. Just to let you know. That's the power of English class.

So, anything else? That's a great question. Alright, prayer sheets.