



The Importance of Creation

by Jeremy Cagle

On May 5, 1925, John Scopes, a High School teacher from Dayton, Tennessee was charged with teaching evolution in one of his science classes. Tennessee had recently passed a piece of legislation entitled The Butler Act, which ordered Tennessee public school teachers to teach creation and avoid the subject of evolution. Scopes blatantly broke that law and a lengthy trial ensued in which Scopes eventually lost and was ordered to pay a fine of \$100.

But, for the rest of the nation, Scopes did not lose his trial. For generations to come, Americans considered the Scopes Trial to be a final proof that evolution was the scientific view of the origin of the universe and creation was the spiritual view. The press played a big role in that ideological victory¹ but the manner in which the trial itself played out did not help matters any for creationists. Dayton, Tennessee was a very rural community and the defending attorneys for John Scopes, the American Civil Liberties Union, came from a very urban community. To the outside world, the trial looked as if creation science was a backwards rural

farming concept while evolutionary science was a progressive urban idea.

To add to that, the prosecuting attorney, William Jennings Bryan, a three-time Democratic nominee for President of the United States, was out of his league on the subject of creation versus evolution. On being asked about the specific date for the flood in Genesis, the following conversation ensued between Bryan and Clarence Darrow (the defense attorney for John Scopes).

BRYAN: I would not attempt to fix the date. The date is fixed as suggested this morning.

DARROW: But what do you think that the Bible itself says? Don't you know how it was arrived at?

BRYAN: I never made a calculation.

DARROW: A calculation from what?

BRYAN: I could not say.

DARROW: From the generations of man?

BRYAN: I would not want to say that.

DARROW: What do you think?

BRYAN: I do not think about things I don't think about.

DARROW: Do you think about things you do think about?

BRYAN: Sometimes.²

The trial was full of ignorant statements like these in defense of creation. It all led one historian to write,

Scopes was found guilty of teaching evolution (the decision was subsequently reversed on a technicality). But in the trial by public opinion and the press, it was clear that the twentieth century, the cities, and the universities had won a resounding victory, and that the country, the South, and the fundamentalists were guilty as charged. No doubt anything Bryan said would have been seized upon by the press and labeled foolishness. Bryan did not, however, make the task especially difficult.³

To the jury, Scopes was guilty. But to the rest of the nation, Bryan was. He had no convincing arguments in support of his views on creation. And, when pressed on the issue, he folded completely.

But the Scopes trial leads us to wonder why this was such a problem in the first place and why it is still such a problem today. Creation versus evolution is not a dead issue in 2011. It is as alive in the beginning of the 21st Century as it was in the beginning of the 20th Century.⁴ The debate rages in the media and on college campuses and in churches, 86 years after the issue was debated in Tennessee. It is the purpose of this article to show why that is. Creation is worth fighting for. This article will show why.

I. DIFFERENT VIEWS OF CREATION

At the outset, it needs to be mentioned that, among creationists, there is not one concise view as to the origin of the earth. Creationists believe that God miraculously created all that there is but they do not agree as to how He did that. To be even more specific, they all believe that Genesis 1 is an accurate account of creation but they do not all interpret Genesis 1 the same way. Here

is a brief look at some of the different views/interpretations that they hold to.⁵

1. The Framework Interpretation View. This view states that the days in Genesis 1 are not sequential. They are out of order. Genesis 1 is a “framework” or an outline of the events of creation but it is poetic and figurative, not literal. Moses was writing poetry when he penned this chapter. He was not writing history. So the order of events can and should be rearranged to agree with the teachings of science.

Proponents of this view justify it by stating that, in order for creation to happen, the days would have to flip-flop. For instance, plants were created on Day 3 (Gen 1:11-12) but light was not created until Day 4 (vv. 14-16). Everyone knows that plants cannot perform photosynthesis without sunlight,⁶ so it raises the question, “How could this order be explained scientifically?” “How could light be created one whole day *after* plants?” The answer: it wasn't. Genesis 1 was poetry, not history. Moses was giving us a framework of the order of creation but he was not giving us anything more than that. Hence, Day 4 should actually come before Day 3.

The problem with this view is that it does not agree with the normal reading of Genesis 1⁷ and that the argument from science does not support it. “Science covers the broad field of knowledge that deals with observed facts and the relationships among those facts.”⁸ While it is an observed fact of science that plants cannot function without photosynthesis, there is nothing about the process of God creating the world that is observable. We can look at the results of creation but we were not there to look at the actual process itself.

No one saw God create the sun and the plants because no one was around to see it! And, if God could create plants and the sun with only the words of His mouth, why could He not keep those plants alive for one whole day without sunlight? One miracle is not more incredulous than another. The Framework Interpretation View does not hold up under close scrutiny.

2. The Gap View. The Gap View states that the days in Genesis 1 are sequential but there are enormous gaps or epochs in between them. In the words of Henry Morris,

A widely held opinion among fundamentalists is that the primeval

creation of Genesis 1:1 may have taken place billions of years ago, with all the geological ages inserted in a tremendous time gap between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2.⁹

In other words, on Day 1, light was created (vv. 3-5). On Day 2, the sky and the sea were created (vv. 6-8). On Day 3, the land was created along with plants and vegetation (vv. 9-13). On Day 4, the sun and the moon and the stars were created (vv. 14-19). On Day 5, the fish and the birds were created (vv. 20-23). On Day 6, man and woman were created (vv. 24-31). But, in between these days, an enormous amount of time passed. Millions or perhaps even billions of years went by in between each day of creation.

Proponents of the Gap View point to geological studies¹⁰ for their proof. Fossil records and the different ways of dating the earth's stratosphere supposedly show that the earth is billions of years old and that it has passed through different geological ages. Each geological age was terminated and started anew by a catastrophic event like a worldwide flood or a meteor hitting the earth. So Gap View proponents put this evidence together with Genesis 1 and say that the days of creation started and ended with those catastrophic events.

The problem with this view is that, if it is true, then plants survived for millions of years before the sun was ever created. Again, plants were created on Day 3 and the sun and moon were created on Day 4. So, if millions of years passed between the days of creation, then millions of years passed between the creation of plants and the creation of the sun. So the Gap Theory, despite all its attempts to the contrary, does not square with science after all.

The other problem with the Gap Theory is the unscientific way of dating fossils, which cannot be discussed adequately here but is discussed in another article in this edition of /jtst/.¹¹

3. The Day Age View. The Day Age View is very similar to the Gap Theory but it states that each day of creation lasted much longer than a literal 24 hour day. Whereas the Gap View states that long gaps of time occurred between each of the days of creation, the Day Age View states that the days themselves covered long periods of time. As John D. Currid writes,

The day age view affirms the sequence of creation in Genesis 1. However, each "day" equals in indeterminable length of time; that is, each day could last aeons.¹²

Proponents of this view use the same scientific evidence as proponents of the Gap View: geological evidence and the fossil records. They also point to the fact that the Hebrew word for "day" often refers to a period of time longer than 24 hours. For example, Psalm 90:4 says,

For a thousand years in Your sight
Are like yesterday when it passes by,
Or as a watch in the night.

The word for "yesterday" in Hebrew is the same word for "day" in Genesis 1.¹³ And, it obviously means an age or an epoch in Psalm 90, so why could it not mean the same in Genesis 1?

The Day Age View has the same problems that the Gap View has. Plants existed for large periods of time before the sun was ever created. Fossil records and geological dating are suspect and based on evolutionary presuppositions. But the scientific evidence is not the only problem with this theory. It does not square with the Bible's description of creation. And this leads us to our next section.

II. THE RIGHT VIEW OF CREATION

As it is with many other things in

theology, the Biblically accurate view is also the oldest view.¹⁴ Centuries before the Framework Interpretation View or the Gap View or the Day Age View came about, scholars believed in what is today called the 24-Hour Day View of creation. To quote from John D. Currid again,

This position, often called "the literal view" maintains that each day mentioned in Genesis 1 is a literal twenty-four hour period. And each day of creation sequentially follows the one before it. So during the first "day," God created the light; on the second "day," the firmament; and so forth until the completion of creation at the end of six days. It is nothing less than a historical account of creation.¹⁵

The 24-Hour Day View takes the writings of Moses as literally as possible and concludes that Genesis 1 tells us that the earth was created in six back-to-back 24 hour days. God created the earth in six literal days and rested on the seventh day. The sun rose and the sun set (once it was created) on a week's worth of time when God made everything.

There is an entire article in this edition devoted to the extra-Biblical evidence for the 24-Hour Day View of Creation,¹⁶ so the scientific support

of this view will not be mentioned here. But proponents of the literal view point to several things in the Bible to support their position.

1. The Numbering of Yom. The Hebrew word for “days” in Genesis 1 is *yom*. It can mean day, period, or age depending on its context.¹⁷ It can refer to a long period of time or it can refer to a figurative period of time or it can refer to an actual 24 hour day. But the meaning of *yom* depends on the passage where it is found.

This is kind of like our English word “rock.” In some sentences, “rock” can mean a piece of the earth. “I fell and hit my head on some rock and had to go to the hospital.” In other sentences, “rock” can mean bouncy. “The boat kept rocking because of the waves and it was a rough ride.” In still other sentences, “rock” can refer to a genre of music. “I just love to hear rock music from the past and the 1970’s era is my favorite.” The meaning of the word “rock” depends on the context.

Yom is the same way. Depending on where it is found, its meaning can vary considerably. But in Genesis 1, the only thing *yom* could refer to is a literal day because every use of it in

Genesis 1 has a number in front of it. And, in the Hebrew Bible, *yom* is never used to refer to a long period of time or a figurative period of time if it is numbered. If the Hebrew word for “day” is numbered in the Old Testament, it always refers to a sequential 24-hour day.¹⁸ And, because it is numbered in Genesis 1, that is exactly what it refers to.

2. The Vav Consecutive. A second reason scholars hold to the 24-Hour Day View of creation is the use of the *vav consecutive* in Genesis 1. In the words of one Hebrew scholar,

The Wayyiqtol [or *vav consecutive*] is the primary tense biblical Hebrew uses for telling a story . . . In *prose* it is almost always a simple past tense, and therefore it dominates narrative texts such as Genesis, 1 Kings, and Ruth . . . it is often translated with “and” as in, “and he saw.” It generally means something like “and he did.”¹⁹

In other words, the *vav consecutive* is a conjunction used in Hebrew to communicate a sequential historical event. It literally translates “and he did.” When the Hebrew authors want you to know that some event was happening back-to-back-to-back, they would include a *vav consecutive* in their writings. And, if it was literally

translated, it would read something like “And then he did such-and-such . . .” “And then he did so-and-so . . .” “And then she did this . . .” “And then she did that . . .”

In Genesis 1, the *vav consecutive* is used about 30 times! There is almost one *vav consecutive* for every verse in the chapter, meaning that Moses was describing a sequential historical event when he wrote about creation. He was telling us about something that happened chronologically or consecutively. He did not see gaps of millions or billions of years between Genesis 1:1 and Genesis 1:3 or between any of the verses in Genesis 1. The whole chapter is full of “And then God did this . . .” “And then God did that . . .” The whole chapter is a back-to-back-to-back event.

3. The Evening and Morning. Genesis 1:5 states that “And there was evening and there was morning, one day.” And this phrase “and there was evening and there was morning” is repeated all throughout the chapter (vv. 8, 13, 19, 23, 31). Such a repetition and such a phrase would not make sense if Moses was referring to ages or large amounts of time.

After all, what does evening and morning mean when you are referring to millions of years? Does evening refer to the last million years and morning to the first million years? Does evening refer to a darker or more unstable portion of time within that epoch and morning to a brighter and more stable period of time? There are a lot of unanswered questions if one takes an allegorical approach to Genesis 1.

Not only that but, if this is symbolic language, then why does Moses put the evening before the morning? If evening and morning refer to an age of time, then the order should be “And there was morning and there was evening” to make the passage make sense. If “evening” refers to the end of the age, then it should come after the morning, not before. No age begins with its evening or with its destruction; it begins with its morning or with its commencement. Every age begins with its “morning” and ends with its “evening,” as in the phrase, “The dawning of a new era.”

Yet, in Genesis 1, Moses writes that “there was evening and there was morning, one day.” Why did he do this? Because he was giving a literal account. Every literal sequential day

had an end to it when God pronounced it good²⁰ and it had a beginning when God began His work of creation.

4. The Minimal Amount of Figurative Language in Genesis 1. A fourth reason that creationists hold to the 24-Hour Day View is that there is a minimal amount of figurative language in Genesis 1. And, as one author put it, “The dearth of figurative language in a chapter that some consider figurative is quite striking.”²¹ In a chapter that is supposed to be allegorical, there is very little allegoric language in it.

To be fair, there is some figurative language in Genesis 1. Verse 20 says “Let the waters teem with swarms of living creatures.” The word “teem” means swarm²² and is a metaphor for “Let the waters *move*” with living creatures. The water that God created was still until God created fish to live in it. There might have been some movement due to waves but the fish really made it move. The fish made it swarm. Once they entered the water, the water “teemed.” But, as we all know, water cannot teem or swarm on its own; it is an inanimate object. So verse 20 was a figurative expression.

Other examples of figurative expressions in Genesis 1 include the fish “filling” the waters (v. 22), man being commanded to “fill” the earth (v. 28), and God creating man in His “image” (v. 27). But none of these expressions are emphasized in the passage, which is strange if the entire chapter was devoted to a figurative account of creation.

The simpler explanation would be that Moses was not writing allegory, he was writing history. He did not emphasize his metaphors and he did not use many metaphors because he was not writing a metaphoric account of creation. When he said “day,” he meant “day.” When he said this happened, then this happened, then this happened, that is exactly what he meant. According to Moses, creation occurred in six 24-hour days, meaning that Moses was a proponent of the 24-Hour Day View.

Science should not be allowed to re-interpret the Bible. Science can shed new light on the Bible but it cannot call it into question, especially where it concerns subjects that are outside its field of study. In the words of the Old Testament Scholars, C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch,

Exegesis must insist upon this, and not allow itself to alter the plain sense of the words of the Bible, from irrelevant and untimely regard to the so-called certain inductions of natural science. Irrelevant we call such considerations, as make interpretation dependent upon natural science, because the creation lies outside the limits of empirical and speculative research, and, as an act of the omnipotent God, belongs rather to the sphere of miracles and mysteries, which can only be received by faith (Heb. 11:3); and untimely, because natural science has supplied no certain conclusions as to the origin of the earth, and geology especially, event at the present time, is in a chaotic state of fermentation, the issue of which it is impossible to foresee.²³

III. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE RIGHT VIEW OF CREATION

The story is told of a Seminary student who made the following comment to his professor, “Doctor, you say that everything we study in this school is most important and should have our utmost attention. You say that the languages are the most important thing for us to study. You say that the theology classes are the most important thing for us to study. You say that our history classes are most important. Well, which one is it? Languages or theology or history? How can they all be most important?” To which the professor replied, “I said that they are all most important because they are

all most important. And you will be graded accordingly.”

There is no such thing as an unimportant subject of theology because every subject impacts our understanding of God. God does not operate in a vacuum. Everything He chooses to do impacts everything else He chooses to do. So it is all important. Soteriology²⁴ is important. Anthropology²⁵ is important. Pneumatology²⁶ is important. Ecclesiology²⁷ is important. Eschatology²⁸ is important.

And cosmology or the study of creation²⁹ is no different. Everything flows out of creation. If you get creation wrong, then to some degree, you get everything else wrong as well. If the foundation of your building is off, then it is inevitable that your building will collapse. If you do not understand how God started everything, then you will not understand how He continues it and eventually ends it. As Francis Schaeffer writes,

These chapters tell us the *why* of all history man knows through his studies, including the why of each man’s personal history. For this, Genesis 1-11 is more important than anything else one could have.

In these chapters we learn of the historic, space-time creation out of nothing; the creation of man in God's image; a real, historic, space-time, moral Fall; and the understanding of the present abnormality in the divisions that exist between God and man, man and himself, man and man, man and nature, and nature and nature. These chapters also tell us the flow of the promise God made from the beginning concerning the solution to these divisions. This is what Genesis 1-11 gives us, and it is climatic . . . If I am to understand the world as it is and myself as I am, I must know the flow of history given in these chapters. Take this away, and the flow of the rest of history collapses.³⁰

So with that said, here are some specific reasons why creation is important.³¹ Or, to be more specific, here are some reasons why the 24-Hour Day View of creation is important.

1. It Demonstrates the Clarity of Scripture. The Bible makes several statements to indicate that it considers itself to be a clear book. In Psalm 19:7-8, King David says that

The law of the Lord is perfect; restoring the soul;
The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple.
The precepts of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart;
The commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes.

The Bible is so clear that it can make a simple man wise and it can enlighten the eyes of the blind. In Luke 16, as Abraham is talking to the rich man in Hell, he says,

If they (the rich man's brothers) do not listen to Moses and the Prophets, they will not be persuaded even if someone rises from the dead (v. 31).

The Bible is so clear and so obviously true that, if the rich man's brothers cannot believe in God because of its testimony, then they will not believe even if they saw someone rise from the dead.

And, going along with all of this, one reason that a 24-Hour Day View of creation is important is because it demonstrates the clarity of Scripture. If Moses is taken at face value in Genesis 1, then the reader can come to no other conclusion than that he is saying that God created the earth in six literal, consecutive days. To interpret this chapter any other way, is to force an interpretation that Moses did not intend and to ignore what the Bible says about its own clarity.

If the reader asks himself this question: "Suppose the writer of Genesis wished to teach his readers that all things were

created and made in six literal days, then what words would he use to best convey his thought?" He would have to answer that the writer would have used the actual words in Genesis 1. If he wished to convey the idea of long geological ages, however, he could surely have done it far more clearly and effectively in other words than in those which he selected. It was clearly his intent to teach creation in six literal days.³²

2. It Reveals the Perfection of God. Several times in Genesis 1, Moses writes that what God created was "good." In fact, the first time that something is called "not good" is when God says in Genesis 2:18 that, "It is not good for the man to be alone; I will make him a helper suitable for him." But, before that statement, everything in creation is called good.

For instance, in 1:4, the light is called good and in verse 10, the land and the seas are recognized as being good. In verse 12, the plants are good and in verse 18, the sun and the moon are good. The fish and the birds are good in verse 21, the animals are good in verse 25, and man himself is given the designation of being good at the close of the chapter. As Moses is wrapping up his description of creation, he even finishes with this statement: "God saw all that He had made, and behold, it was very good" (1:31).

Good. Good. Good. Good. Good. Very good. The creation was a reflection of the Creator. It was perfect as He is perfect.³³ What God made showed Who God is. Before sin and death entered the world, everything was very good.³⁴

But all of that is lost if the passage is only figurative. In fact, it is all meaningless if there were gaps in the creation account divided up by catastrophic events. Catastrophic events are not good. There is nothing perfect about death and destruction. They are the antithesis of what is good and perfect. Not only that, but there is no reason for death and destruction to occur in Genesis 1. Death is a punishment³⁵ and God is not punishing anything in the beginning because everything is good. Death and destruction and catastrophes do not enter the picture until man sins.

The best explanation for the perfection of creation is the most obvious explanation: Genesis 1 refers to a literal account.

3. It Teaches Us about the Uniqueness of Man. Not only do we see the clarity of Scripture and the perfection of God in creation but we also see the

uniqueness of man. The Bible does not say that man descended from primates. It does not tell us that man is an accident or a victim of randomness. The Bible says that man was created in the image of God and that he has a unique role to play in creation. Genesis 1:27-28 state,

God created man in his own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them. God blessed them; and God said to them, “Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it; and rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over every living thing that moves on the earth.”

Man is not on the same level as the rest of creation. God did not place him alongside the birds and the fish and the beasts of the field and the plants. Man is set apart. Man is different. Man is the only one who has been made in God’s image and he is the only one who has been given the right to rule over all of the others.

A lot of movies today give human characteristics to plants and animals and make it seem as if they are no different than human beings.³⁶ It would seem at times that many environmentalists are more influenced by this as well, for they send the message that people are

not above trees and seals and dogs³⁷ but God would disagree. Man is to rule over everything, not alongside everything, because God created him that way. This does not give man the right to abuse nature but it does give him the right to use nature as he sees fit.

Creation gives a view of man that is not found in evolution or in any other explanation of the beginning. If man was created over millions of years, through a process of evolution or through some random series of catastrophic events, then man is not unique. He has no special role to play in history. For, if human beings came from animals, then how are human beings different from animals? Doesn’t a creature’s origin explain its function? Doesn’t an organism’s beginning dictate how that organism will end up? Why would man have the right to rule over nature if his origins are the same as the rest of nature? Or, to ask this another way, if Genesis 1 is figurative, then why wouldn’t Genesis 1:27-28 be figurative as well? If man was not really created on the sixth day, then why should man have the right to rule over anything?

Only the 24-Hour Day View upholds the uniqueness of man.

4. It Shows Us the Origin of Marriage. Alongside the uniqueness of man, creation shows us the uniqueness of the male-female relationship. Homosexuality³⁸ is not the sexual relationship that God intended for man. Polygamy³⁹ is not the sexual relationship that God intended for man. Monogamy⁴⁰ is the sexual relationship that God intended for man. Genesis 2:21-24, adding some more detail to Genesis 1:27, tells us that,

So the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and he slept; then He took one of his ribs and closed up the flesh at that place. The Lord God fashioned into a woman the rib which He had taken from the man, and brought her to the man. The man said,

“This is now bone of my bones,
And flesh of my flesh;
She shall be called Woman,
Because she was taken out of Man.”

For this reason a man shall leave his father and his mother, and be joined to his wife; and they shall become one flesh.

This has huge implications for the world that we live in today. It is no secret that divorce rates are very high⁴¹ and, along with them, violence, promiscuity, and drug abuse.⁴² When the family breaks down, so does society. Why is this? It is because God’s original intention

for creation was for one man and one woman to start one family. Anything else ends in instability and disaster. Anything else is unnatural or contrary to nature.

And this is another reason why creation is so important. Creation, the 24-hour Day View of creation, is the only explanation for the connection between the stability of a family and the stability of a society. If man has evolved, then it follows that he should be allowed to take as many wives as he wishes and nature should prosper. The more wives he has, the more children he bears and the more control he has over his environment. In fact, he should not even have to marry if he does not want to. As long as he is reproducing, his species is getting stronger and that is all that matters.

But we are seeing the exact opposite today. The random reproduction of our species is not benefiting our society. As monogamous marriages are diminishing, so is the stability of our culture. And the reason for this is given in Genesis 1 and 2: there is no sexual relationship that benefits society except for the one that God has ordained. Monogamy is good. Other sexual unions are bad. They

are bad in God's eyes. And they are bad/destructive to the rest of creation.

5. It Shows Us the Origin of Sin.

Finally, the 24-Hour Day View shows us the origin of sin. Genesis 3 tells us that, at the serpent's tempting (vv. 1-5), Adam and Eve disobeyed God and ate from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (vv. 6-7). When they did that, everything that was once very good, suddenly went very bad.

To Eve, God said:

I will greatly multiply
Your pain in childbirth,
In pain you will bring forth children;
Yet your desire will be for your husband,
And he will rule over you (v. 16).

To Adam, God said:

Cursed is the ground because of you;
In toil you will eat of it
All the days of your life.
Both thorns and thistles it shall grow
for you;
And you will eat the plants of the field;

By the sweat of your face
You will eat bread,
Till you return to the ground,
Because from it you were taken;
For you are dust,
And to dust you shall return (vv. 17-19).

Pain in childbirth. A ground that grows thorns and thistles. And death.

All of this was a result of man's sin. All of this was punishment for man's disobedience to God's law.

Creation tells us about the origin of sin and, consequently, it tells us about the origin of all the misery we see around us. Man's misery originated with man's decision to break God's rules. Tornados do not happen randomly. Earthquakes and hurricanes and famines do not occur because the cosmos is out of control and has always been out of control. People do not die because nature was designed to be cruel. All of this occurs because man has sinned.⁴³

This is another place where the Framework Interpretation View and the Gap View and the Day Age View break down. If they are all true or if one of them is true, then creation was cursed long before Genesis 3. If the earth was around for millions of years before man entered the scene, then animals were dying for millions of years before man sinned. And the ground was cursed for millions of years before man sinned. And natural disasters were occurring for millions of years before man sinned. What God originally made was bad and it was bad

for a very long time with no explanation for it except to say that God is a very sloppy Creator.

But that is not true. The creation that God made was good . . . very good. It was not until man's sin that it became bad. And that was after God created the earth in six literal days.

CONCLUSION

Much more could be said about the importance of creation but let me end on this note. The greatest benefit of a Biblical view of creation might be hope. Carl Sagan, a well-known scientific author, once wrote that,

Our planet is a lonely speck in the great enveloping cosmic dark. In our obscurity, in all the vastness, there is no hint that help will come from elsewhere to save us from ourselves.⁴⁴

Those are bleak words but they are true words. If there is no Creator, then creation is not heading anywhere and there is no reason to think that mankind will ever be saved from itself. There is no hope because there is simply nothing to be hopeful about. We are no better off than the primates and the fish and the amoebas from whence we came because, in the end, we are no

different from them. Our end will be their end because our beginning was their beginning.

But the Bible tells us that there is much to be hopeful about. There is a Creator and that Creator made everything good in the beginning and He will make everything good in the end. Revelation 5:11-13 describes a vision the Apostle John had of Heaven.

Then I looked, and I heard the voice of many angels around the throne and the living creatures and the elders; and the number of them was myriads of myriads, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice,

“Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom and might and honor and glory and blessing.”

And every created thing which is in heaven and on the earth and under the earth and on the sea, and all things in them, I heard saying,

“To Him who sits on the throne, and to the Lamb, be blessing and honor and glory and dominion forever and ever.”

Why was every created thing praising God? John makes it very clear that everything here means everything: everything in, on, and under the earth, and everything on the sea (v. 13). That would be everything. This would

include the plants and the animals and the earth and the sky and the sea and the sun and the moon and the stars. Everything that God created will one day praise Him. Why?

Because God is going to resurrect everything.⁴⁵ God is going to raise creation from the dead. One day, He is going to make all things new. He is going to make everything like it once was: very good. The curse of sin will be removed and all will be made the way it should be. Jesus Christ, the Son of God has been crucified to pay for the sins of man and through His blood, His followers will be resurrected but they will not be the only ones. Creation will be resurrected, too. A new heavens and a new earth will be created for them to live in.⁴⁶

There is a Creator and there is a Savior. May this edition help you to see this and may it help you to find hope.

End Notes

- 1 George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, Second Edition (Oxford: University Press, 2006) 187. For instance, H. L. Mencken, a reporter for the Baltimore Sun, wrote that after the trial, the prosecuting attorney, William Jennings Brian “lived too long, and descended too deeply into the mud, to be taken seriously hereafter by fully literate men, even of the kind who write school-books.” He also wrote that Bryan’s “place in Tennessee hagiography is secure. If the village barber saved any of his hair, then it is curing gall-stones down there today.” Pail Patterson, owner of the Baltimore Sun, paid Scope’s fine of \$100.
- 2 Quoted in *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 187.
- 3 *Ibid.*, 186. This information for the Scopes Trial was found in *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 184-188 and *The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. by J. D. Douglas (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978) 889.
- 4 For a look at the creation versus evolution debate, see our article “Evolution Versus Creation” in this year’s edition of /jtst/.
- 5 The following views, with the exception of the Gap View, are taken from John D. Currid’s article, “The Hebrew World-and-Life View” in *Revolutions in Worldview*, ed. by Andrew Hoffercker (Phillipsburg, N. J.: P & R Publishing, 2007) 51-55. Information for the Gap View is taken from Henry M. Morris’ *The Genesis Record: A Scientific & Devotional Commentary on the Book of*

Beginnings (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1976) 46-48.

- 6 www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/458172/photosynthesis/as_of/5/24/11.
- 7 See Section II below.
- 8 *The World Book Encyclopedia*, Volume 17 (Chicago, Ill.: World Book, Inc., 1994) 191.
- 9 Morris, 46.
- 10 There is not enough room here to discuss the inaccuracies of geological dating, also known as radiometric or radioisotope dating. For a helpful discussion of it, see Mike Riddle’s article, “Does Radiometric Dating Prove that the Earth is Old?” in *The New Answers Book: Over 25 Questions on Creation/Evolution and the Bible*, ed. by Ken Ham (Green Forest, Ariz.: Master Books, 2007) 113-124.
- 11 See “The Evidence and Creation.”
- 12 Currid, 53.
- 13 The word is yom. For the meaning of this word, see Section II, Point 1 below.
- 14 www.answersingenesis.org/articles/nab2/idea-of-millions-of-years/as_of/5/24/11. For example, the Day Age View did not come about until the late 17th to 18th Century.
- 15 Currid, 53.
- 16 See “The Evidence and Creation” article in this edition of /jtst/.

17 H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis*, Volume I (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1996 ed.) 57-58.

- 18 *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: Old Testament*, ed. by John F. Walvoord & Roy B. Zuck (Colorado Springs, Col.: Cook Communications Ministries, 2004) 28. For an example of this, see Gen 27:45; 33:13; 1 Sam 27:1; Isa 9:13; Jonah 3:4.
- 19 Duane A. Garrett, *A Modern Grammar for Classical Hebrew* (Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2002) 113.
- 20 See Section III, Point 2 below.
- 21 Currid, 54.
- 22 Leupold, 78. The Hebrew word is sharats, which means to swarm or to teem. Literally, the Hebrew translates: “Let the waters swarm with swarms” but because of the ambiguity of the phrase, the New American Standard Bible translates verse 20, “Let the waters teem with swarms of living creatures.”
- 23 *The Pentateuch in Commentary on the Old Testament*, Volume 1 (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2001 ed.) 32.
- 24 Stanley J. Grenz, David Guretzki, & Cherith Fee Nordling, *Pocket Dictionary of Theological Terms* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1999) 108. Soteriology is the study of salvation.
- 25 *Ibid.*, 11. Anthropology is the study of human beings.
- 26 *Ibid.*, 92. Pneumatology is the study of the Holy Spirit.

- 27 Ibid., 42. Ecclesiology is the study of the church.
- 28 Ibid., 46. Eschatology is the study of end times.
- 29 Ibid., 31.
- 30 A Christian View of the Bible as Truth in *The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer, Volume Two* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway Books, 1982) 114.
- 31 To see some other reasons why creation is important, see “The Implications of Creation” in this edition of /jtst/.
- 32 Morris, 54.
- 33 Ps 18:30; Matt 5:48.
- 34 Lk 18:19; Rom 8:28.
- 35 Gen 2:17; 3:3; Rom 6:23.
- 36 The Disney movie “Bambi” demonstrates this well. In Bambi, the deer and the rabbits talk to each other in a very human way. And they seem to experience the same emotional and societal issues that people experience. Yet, in reality, animals do not talk to each other the way humans do and, while they experience emotion, there is no parallel between what they experience and what people experience. For example, animals do not commit suicide because of intense emotional trauma.
- 37 www.betterworld.net as of 5/24/11. For an example of this, the talk show host, Ellen DeGeneres was once as saying, “I ask people why they have deer heads on their walls. They always say because it’s such a beautiful animal. There you go. I think my mother is attractive, but I have photographs of her.”
- 38 Millard J. Erickson, *The Concise Dictionary of Christian Theology, Revised Edition* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway Books, 2001) 92. Homosexuality is “Sexual attraction to persons of the same sex.”
- 39 Ibid., 156. Polygamy is “The state of being married to more than one person at the same time.”
- 40 Monogamy is an ongoing sexual relationship with one person of the same sex.
- 41 For some information on this, especially as it relates to Christians, see George Barna’s article “Born Again Christians Just as Likely to Divorce as are Non-Christians,” found at www.barna.org as of 5/24/11.
- 42 For some information on this, see Patrick Fagan’s article “The Effects of Divorce on Children,” found at www.worldcongress.org as of 5/24/11.
- 43 See footnote 34.
- 44 *Pale Blue Dot* (New York: Random House, 1994) 9.
- 45 Romans 8:18-23 describes how creation is looking forward to that day. 2 Peter 3:10-13 describes a little bit of what this resurrection will look like.
- 46 Rev 21:1-5.