



# INTRODUCTION

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**We** boldly *profess*, at times, to be sincere Bible-Believing Christians *genuinely* committed to searching the Scriptures  $\oplus$  ‘*to prove all things*’ and ‘*hold fast that which is good and true*’ (1Thessalonians 5:21). Yet, very often, we somehow choose to remain enslaved to erroneous *traditional* church beliefs even when the same are found to contradict the plain Scriptural teaching. By all means, *Tradition* and *Dogmas* reign supreme in our hearts and minds influencing thereby our convictions and beliefs just as it was in the bygone dark  $\bullet$  ‘*Middle Ages*’.

In the process, we end up behaving like religious *fanatics*. And then, we make it our Mission to criticize those who actually preach sound *Biblical Truth*. We unjustly label *such*, given our inherent prejudice, as *heretics* because what is preached by them seems to have no supportable base in *church history*; or, because what is taught by them is found to *contradict* our traditional *doctrines* and ‘*hide-bound*’ *beliefs* and *concepts*.

Nevertheless, notwithstanding our *holy* bias, “*The truth or untruth of any doctrine does not depend on whether or not it was **ever** taught in church history. Its truthfulness depends solely on whether or not it is taught in the Bible. Now, admittedly, a teaching that no one has ever before heard about might be suspect, but the Bible, **not** church history, is the standard against which all teachings must be measured.*”<sup>1</sup> (*Italics, underline or bold* type for *emphasis* are mine throughout, except where *as* specified).

At one time, in the history of *professing* Christianity, it was assumed by *some* that the *earth* was *flat*<sup>2</sup>. It was also believed that the earth was the *centre* of the *solar* system in keeping with ‘*Ptolemy’s earth-centered model of the cosmos*’<sup>3</sup>. But then, Copernicus and later on Galileo proposed that a *spherical* earth *revolved* around the *sun* along with some other planets. Eventually, based on discoveries that *seemed* to support the ‘*sun-centered model of the cosmos*’, Galileo published in 1632 his first ‘*scientific masterpiece*’ entitled ‘*Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems*’<sup>4</sup>


---


1: Charles C. Ryrie, *Basic Theology: A Popular Systematic Guide to Understanding Biblical Truth*, Moody Press, Chicago, USA 1999, p. 91.


2: Jeffrey B. Russell, *The Myth of the Flat Earth*, American Scientific Affiliation Conference, 1997

3: Stephen Hawking and Leonard Mlodinow, *The (Elusive) Theory of Everything*, Scientific American, India, October 2010, p. 50.

4: World Book E encyclopedia, 1992, Vol.8, p.13-14; 5: *ibid*, p. 13-14

Obviously, it is very, very difficult and overwhelmingly painful, given our prejudice to *unlearn* unbiblical and or unscientific concepts and *replace* the same with **truth!** Nevertheless, as stated by Pope John Paul II, “*We cannot but deplore certain attitudes (not unknown among Christians) deriving from a shortsighted view of the rightful autonomy of science: they have occasioned conflict and controversy and have misled many into thinking that faith and science are opposed.*”<sup>11</sup> Galileo’s views, however, did upset the *belief* in the ‘*earth-centered model*’ resulting in a serious *conflict* between Science and the Roman Catholic Church, at the time. Accordingly, “In 1633, the Inquisition found Galileo guilty of the charge (of heresy), forced him to recant and sentenced him to life imprisonment.”<sup>5</sup> Eventually, the Church came to terms with Galileo’s views. So, “In 1971, in the face of the optical proof of the fact that the earth revolves round the sun, Benedict XIV had the Holy Office grant an imprimatur to the first edition of *The Complete Works of Galileo.*”<sup>6</sup> Next, Pope John Paul II declared in 1979 that the “*Church may have been mistaken in condemning Galileo*”<sup>7</sup> and ‘*instructed a church commission to study the case*’. Finally, in 1983 the Roman Catholic Church acknowledged that “*Galileo should not have been condemned*”<sup>8</sup> and subsequently, Pope John Paul II  apologized in general on March 13, 2000 for the then “*sins of the church*”<sup>9,10</sup> and for condemning Galileo, Martin Luther and others.

However, when ‘*things as they appear*’ are viewed according to the recently formulated theoretical “*Model-Dependent Realism*”<sup>12</sup>, the Roman Catholic Church was ***not unrealistic*** in insisting to maintain and hold on to Ptolemy’s ‘*earth-centered model*’! Even as, in 1893 Pope Leo XIII stated in his encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*, the *ancients* wrote and *believed* about things  “*as things appeared to them*” and “*— described and dealt with things in more or less figurative language, or in terms which were commonly used at the time and which in many instances are in daily use to this day even with the most eminent men of science.*”<sup>13</sup>

In a similar vein, Galileo, convinced as he was by his *observations*, was not *guilty* of ‘*heresy*’ for endorsing Copernican revolution by adopting the ‘*sun-centered model*’, thereby finally ‘*dissociating*’ faith from an age-old Ptolemaic *cosmology*! Because, in tune with the scientific model of  “*Phenomenological*”: “*Language of Appearances*”, “*...the same physical situation can be modeled in different ways... to describe the universe we may have to employ different theories... Each theory may have its own version of reality; but according to model-dependent realism, that diversity is acceptable, and none of the versions can be said to be more real than the other*”.<sup>14</sup>

---

6: Luigi Accattoli, WHEN A POPE ASKS FORGIVENESS, *The Mea Culpas of John Paul II*, (Translated by Jordan Aumaann), Alba House, New York, 1998, p. 140, (2005 reprint) 7: World Book Encyclopedia, *op. cit.*, p.13-14; 8: *ibid.*, p.13-14.

9: Online News Hour: A Papal Apology, March 13, 2000; ([www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/religion/jan-june00/apology\\_3\\_13](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/religion/jan-june00/apology_3_13)); 10: [www.pbs.org/world/2000/mar/13/catholicism.religion](http://www.pbs.org/world/2000/mar/13/catholicism.religion)

11: Luigi Accattoli, WHEN A POPE ASKS FORGIVENESS, *op. cit.* p.126

12: See Article by Stephen Hawking and Leonard Mlodinow, *op.cit.* p. 49-51, for details.

13: Quoted by Hans Wijngaards in ‘*Historicity in the Old Testament*’, Theological Publications in India, Bangalore, 1971, p.82

14: Stephen Hawking and Leonard Mlodinow, *op.cit.* p. 51.

Obviously, to any *unaided* observer on earth with his or her naked eyes the *round* earth *appears flat* and *stationary* and the sun *appears to rise and move* from the East, and *set* in the West. Such subjective inferences based on ‘*appearances*’ are *realistic* and *acceptable* within the framework of *Model-Dependent Realism*. Still, the Bible states that the earth is *circular* (Isaiah 40:22), and *not flat*; and that, the sun (Psalms 19:6), and the stellar heavens (Job 22:14) have their *circuits* (or, circular movements)!

Even though the Bible contains culturally loaded statements based on the *logic* of *appearances* which seem to *contradict* the *scientific spirit* of our times yet the Scriptures do not err nor contradict true Science. The problem at the heart of any debate even *now* as it was *then* concerns biblical hermeneutics. “Paradoxically, Galileo, a sincere believer, showed himself to be more perceptive in this regard than the theologians who opposed him.”<sup>15</sup> For, he stated: ■ “*If Scripture cannot err, certain of its interpreters and commentators can and do so in many ways.*”<sup>16</sup>

### **Atheistic Evolutionary Myths** **V/s Biblical Language of Appearances**

In the course of time, the *traditional* Roman Catholic and Protestant *doctrine* of “*Six-day Creationism*” or the *belief* of a ‘*creation of the cosmos in six days, some six to ten thousand years ago*’ which is “*based on a more or less literal interpretation of the Genesis 1 account of Creation*”<sup>17</sup> got openly challenged and very much shaken by Charles Darwin’s publication “*On the Origin of Species*”, some 150 years back. In his pretty *controversial* publication, “*Darwin proposed that life on earth began hundreds of millions of years ago and developed by evolution through natural selection --- a stark contradiction of the Christian fundamentalist view that God created everything in six literal twenty-four-hour days.*”<sup>18</sup>

Of late, *atheistic theories* claim that our *complex* universe has *evolved*, say, from ‘*a soup of hydrogen atoms*’; **or** that, it ‘*came into being in one big bang*’; **or**, by ‘*inflation*’ of ‘*tiny microscopic pockets of space-time*’ giving rise to ‘*self-reproducing inflationary universes*’ and so on, *ad nauseam*. Unfortunately, the *theories* rather ‘*guesses*’ keep on ‘*mutating*’ and *novel* theories ‘*evolve*’, *ad infinitum*. So now we are told that, “*According to the prevailing cosmological theory, our universe spawned from a microscopic region of a primordial vacuum in a burst of exponential expansions called inflation.*”<sup>19</sup>

---

15: Luigi Accattoli, *op. cit.* p. 133; 16: *ibid*, p.133

17: *Creation and Evolution? Christian Odyssey*, Grace Communion International, March 2009, Volume 6, No.1, Ca., US, p. 5. Also available on the Internet at: [www.christianodyssey.org](http://www.christianodyssey.org)

18: *ibid*, p. 5

19: Mariette DiChristina, *Life Quest*, Editorial, *Scientific American India*, Jan. 2010, p.4;



The vague *atheistic theories* are adorned with a *scientific garb* which only the *scientifically* attuned but *spiritually* closed minds willingly accept. Some *atheistic* scientists, however, very well know that the diverse *Theories of Evolution* are *absurd*; nevertheless, they blindly accept the same rather than submit to God's authority and accept Him as the *Creator of all that is*. But then, to confront the "*pseudo-scientific community*" with the inspired *Divine Language of Appearances* constituting *Biblical Creation Truth* is to make oneself '*look foolish, ignorant or hostile*'<sup>20</sup> if not downright '*anti-scientific*'!

Surprisingly, Darwinism is *gaining wider acceptance*<sup>21</sup> even amongst the Christians at a time when it keeps changing and '*mutant versions*' of the same and related *theories* of evolution make their subtle appearance, each *contradicting* the other. In a way, as of now, in spite of lack of evidence "--- *many major Christian denominations have come to terms with Charles Darwin's theory, in one way or another. The Church of England has officially apologized to him for the decades of misrepresentation.*"<sup>22</sup>

Much earlier, Pope John Paul II, in his (October 22, 1996) Message to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences stated: "*In his encyclical Humani Generis (1950), my predecessor Pius XII had already stated that there was no opposition between evolution and the doctrine of the faith about man and his vocation, Today, almost half a century after the publication of the encyclical, new knowledge has led to the recognition of the theory of evolution as more than a hypothesis. [... la théorie de l'évolution plus qu'une hypothèse.] It is indeed remarkable that this theory has been progressively accepted by researchers, following a series of discoveries in various fields of knowledge. The convergence, neither sought nor fabricated, of the results of work that was conducted independently is in itself a significant argument in favor of this theory.*"<sup>23</sup>

*Darwinism, neo-Darwinism* and related theories of evolution *attempt to explain* but *in vain*, the "**origin**" of *matter and life* so as to do away with any *belief* in a Creator God. As a matter of fact, the *educational system* worldwide in almost all the fields of higher learning is entirely centered around "*evolutionism* – *the atheistic philosophy that denies the possibility* (rather, the *reality*) *of a Creator.*"<sup>24</sup>

As is always the case, "*Man's natural mind leaves God out, and wearies itself in endless speculations.*"<sup>25</sup> But when "*faith brings Him in, \_\_\_everything is simple. No one need be afraid that discoveries of geology, or any other science, will ever shake the truth of Genesis 1. It is God's record, and all true science will be found in harmony with it. Any theory which definitely conflicts with the Biblical account of creation is certainly wrong*"<sup>25</sup> Therefore, unscientific evolutionary theories or myths that conflict with the Biblical accounts of direct divine creation should be rejected outright. \_\_\_\_\_

---

20: *Christian Odyssey, op. cit. p. 5.*

21: *Timothy G. Strandish, Why Darwin's Triumph? Signs of the Times, May-June 2010, Seventh Day Adventist Publication, Australia.*

22: *Christian Odyssey, op. cit, p.6*

23: *Luigi Accattoli, WHEN A POPE ASKS FORGIVENESS, op. cit., p. 137*

24: *Dennis Gordon, Christian Odyssey, op. cit. p. 7.*

25: *Charles A. Coates, An Outline of the Book of Genesis; Kingston Bible Trust, UK, 1991, p. 2.*

And, rather than simply assuming that “*new knowledge has led to the recognition of the theory of evolution as more than a hypothesis*” as is assumed by Pope John Paul II, “...we need to recognize that there are many strong creationists, not only among lay Catholics, but also among Catholic scientists as well. We could mention Dr. Guy E. Berthault of France, for example, whose studies on sedimentation have been profoundly significant in refuting geological uniformitarianism. Two Italian creationists Dr. Roberto Fondi (paleontologist) and Dr. Giuseppe Sermonti (geneticist) have published important scientific books and papers refuting evolution. There are many others.”<sup>26</sup>

As a matter of fact, “... millions of Christians still firmly reject evolution in favor of an explanation (mainly, the “*traditional six-day creationism*) based on a more or less literal interpretation of the Genesis 1 account of Creation.”<sup>27</sup> However, the *traditional six-day creationism* is a product of faulty interpretation of Genesis 1. It definitely falls short of a *hermeneutic* that is in *harmony* with the *creation accounts* in Genesis 1. Here, Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 are wrongly interpreted by *mixing up* the same with the true biblical six-day creationism which is distinctly described in Genesis 1:3-31 in a very unique way. Genesis 1:1-31 is actually an *independent* and *exclusive* creation account, in itself.

Alternatively, to counteract the *threat* of billions of years challenging the *belief* that “*God created everything in six days some six to ten thousand years ago*”, various attempts have been made to accommodate the dubious “*long ages*”. Accordingly, diverse controversial *theories* to account for the speculated *long ages* have been put forth by way of compromise. Three dominant theories, amongst others, include the following:

➡(1) The Gap Theory – *the belief that there is a gap of indeterminate time between the first and the second verse of Genesis 1* (2)➡ Progressive Creation – *wherein God supposedly intervened in the processes of death and struggle to create millions of species at various times over millions of years* (3)➡ Theistic Evolution – *wherein God supposedly directed the evolutionary process of millions of years, or just set it up and run.*”<sup>28</sup>

With the exception of committed ***Biblical Gap adherents***<sup>29</sup>, *Theistic Evolutionists*, *Day-Age Creationists* and *Progressive Creationists* presume a *literal* interpretation of Genesis 1 “*flies in the face of scientific research*”<sup>30</sup> and that, “*for many, it defies common sense.*”<sup>30</sup> So, guided by their unreliable “*common sense*”, they speculate that the so-called “*development of species over vast periods of time tells us that God either created some form of evolutionary process in the beginning or continually created new species by fiat over billions of years. In either case, creation was no cosmic ‘accident’.*”<sup>31</sup>

---

26: Henry M. Morris, *Evolution and the Pope*, [www.scienceofcreation.org](http://www.scienceofcreation.org)

27: *Creation and Evolution*, *op. cit.* p.52

28: Ken Ham, <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/nab/could-god-have-created-in-six-days>

29: Jack W. Langford, *The Gap Is Not a Theory*, Xlibris Corporation, USA, 2011

30: *Creation and Evolution? Op. cit.* p. 6; 30: *ibid*, p. 6. 31: *ibid*, p. 6

They presume that “*In the beginning*”, through a peculiar explosive ‘*big bang*’ or through some other way, God brought into existence undifferentiated ‘*space-mass-time universe*’, *poetically* referred to as ‘*heavens and earth*’ by Moses in Genesis 1:1. And that, next on earth God created ‘*some form of (biological) evolutionary process*’ giving rise to male and female “*homos sapiens*” of which one pair He named as Adam and Eve; or else, if our fine-tuned “*common sense*” permits us we may confidently believe that God ‘*continually created new species by fiat over billions of years*’ finally creating the *human species*, both male and female, out of which *perhaps* He randomly chose a *male* and a *female* and named them as Adam and Eve some six to ten thousand years ago. As such, Christ’s genealogy should then be traced to some *simple single-celled sinless* life.

Next, we are told that the so-called “*scientifically accepted facts*”, “*show that evolution is the most likely explanation for the development of species*”<sup>32</sup> including the *human species*. The biased and totally ignorant ‘*traditional six-day creationists*’ are now asked to *come to terms* with these *facts* or else, boldly “*offer a proven, rigorous and valid scientific alternative to evolution*”<sup>33</sup> to account for the existence of human life. But, instead of challenging anyone “*to offer a \_\_\_ scientific alternative to evolution*”, theistic evolutionists should first read “**SHOULD CHRISTIANS EMBRACE EVOLUTION? *Biblical and Scientific Responses***” [Norman C. Nevin, Ed., www.prpbooks.com] and **RESPOND well**.

Admittedly, the so-called *battle* between the *Bible* and *True Science* is a logical consequence of adopting a *defective hermeneutic* that contradicts *biblical* and *natural* revelation. Actually, it is very much a *battle* between *Science* and the *Traditional Six-Day Creationism* concerning the *origins* and the diverse *ages* of the earth and of the universe and *related* aspects. Such a meaningless *battle* could have been fore-stalled if the *biblical creation accounts* and related *scientific facts* were *accurately* interpreted. Accordingly, *vulnerable* Christians would not be prone to allow “*modern vague theories to replace the Genesis account of creation*” thereby “*erring concerning the faith*”.

*Theistic Evolutionists, Progressive Creationists* and *others* have hopelessly compromised with the *biblical truth* of *Creation* in Genesis 1-2. They refuse to interpret the same *literally* based on the ‘*analogy of faith*’. Instead, they have embraced the **atheistic** theories of *evolution* by *blind faith*. Subsequently, many *nominal* and even *committed* Christians, instead of *interpreting* the creation accounts *literally* and accept the same by *realistic* faith, have accepted the vague *atheistic* concepts by *blind* faith.

Obviously, *Theistic Evolutionists* confidently believe that the *true* God is a ‘*Creator of Evolution*’<sup>34</sup> who, they think, has *created* and *set in motion* a ‘*macro-evolutionary process*’ to bring the *complex* universe and life forms into existence in the course of *billions of years*. In doing so, they worship an ‘*Unknown God of Evolution*’. They “*have no difficulty with, say, the concept of biological evolution, arguing that God fully gifted the creation with the ability to be and to become*”<sup>35</sup> which is not only *contrary* to Romans 8:20-22 but also very much totally *contrary* to Carnot’s laws of thermodynamics.

---

32: *Creation and Evolution? Op. cit.* p. 6; 33: *ibid*, p. 6. 34: *ibid*, p. 5; 35: *ibid*, p.5;



Next, **Theistic Evolutionists** --- in stark *contrast* to what is stated in Psalms 104:2b, Isaiah 40:22b as to ‘*how*’ and ‘*how fast*’ of the *original* creation and in Genesis 1:31-2:1 as to ‘*how long*’ of the *six day* re-creation--- are of the opinion that “*The Bible only says that God created all things that exist; it does not speak to the question of the manner of the creative process or how long the creative process took – or whether it is continuing even today.*”<sup>36</sup> Their basic *presupposition* underlying their weird *Creation-Evolution Unbiblical Theology* is that “*Genesis 1 is about the Who of creation, not the How.*”<sup>37</sup> --- However, biblical *revelation* relating to *creation* communicated through the ‘*language of appearances*’ was never meant to provide specific scientific details. The exact manner of the **‘How of Creation’**--- which is actually even scientifically ‘*unknowable*’ (Ecclesiastes 3:11; Job 37:23) and therefore, a divine ‘*mystery*’ vindicating the ‘*Absoluteness and Sovereignty of God*’--- is *left* by the theistic evolutionists to *atheistic* scientists to *explain*, who are only *experts* in propounding unfounded theories.

*Atheistic* theories are adopted by committed *theistic* evolutionists to formulate and reformulate their *theory* of **‘Theistic Evolution’**. They don’t “*deny the evidence from science that indicates a long history of life on this planet*”<sup>38</sup> ending up in ‘*The Descent of Man*’ from some ‘*Common Ancestor*’. On the other hand, some zealous Catholic theologians postulate ‘*Moderate Doctrine of Evolution*’<sup>39</sup> to accommodate *evolutionary concepts* contrary to *biblical* views relating to *creation*. Obviously, *theistic* evolutionists have been duped into believing *evolution* is a *scientific fact*. They falsely claim God *is* its Creator. In a way, they indirectly deny the Creator God the power to create *instantly* by *fiat*; *Who* in fact *did* create the *original* heavens and earth as a *perfect* universe *instantly* by fiat, in the *dateless* past (Genesis 1:1). God did *not* create the universe and life by *creating* and *setting in motion* any *evolutionary process*; *nor* did God create the *entire* original *perfect* universe during the course of “*six days*”, *six to ten thousand years back*.


Undoubtedly, the common prevalent belief of a ‘*Creation in Six Days* some *six to ten thousand years back*’ is based upon a *faulty* interpretation of *Genesis 1*. The early *proponents* of the *traditional six-day creationism* have *overlooked* the fact that Genesis 1:1 is actually a *distinct* and an *independent* creation account *different* from that of the *work* of the *six days* of Genesis 1:3-31. As a consequence of persistent pervasive *failure* to *distinguish* and *differentiate* between the *two creation accounts* in *Genesis 1:1* and *1:3-31* it has been *erroneously believed* all along that God *created* the *original heavens* and the *earth* recorded in *Genesis 1:1*, during the *phased work* of the *six-days*. **Never!**

‘*Traditional Six-day/Young-Earth Creationism*’ is a by-product of *superficial* interpretation *resulting* from a *failure* to *rightly divide* the *Word of Truth* relating to *Creation*! It’s high time, modern *adherents* of the *traditional six-day creationism* admit their *failure*. They need to consider all the *Scriptures* given ‘*line upon line, --- here a little and there a little*’ and *divide* the *Word of Truth* relating to *creation accounts* and *interpret* the same *accurately*. Subsequently, they need to correct their *Theology of Creation* instead of persistently clinging on to ‘*hide-bound*’ concepts!

---

36: *ibid* p.5;    37: *ibid*, p.5;    38: *ibid*; p.8    39: Michael Schmaus, **DOGMA Volume 2: God and Creation**, Sheed and Ward, Inc, NY, USA, 1969, p.125.

 **Towards Re-Evaluating**  
**Traditional Six -Day Creationism**

Whether we agree with it or not, the heavens and earth that were created “*In the Beginning*” (Genesis 1:1) had to be *perfect* (Deuteronomy 32:4) and *complete*. As such, **Genesis 1:1** in just one blessed sentence covers within its grasp a *creation account* that actually encompasses the ‘*totality of all original perfect creation*’. It is next exhaustively covered by Natural or General Revelation subsequent to its *restoration* (Genesis 1:3-31) from a later *chaos* of Genesis **1:2** some six thousand years back. Next, Genesis **1:3-31** clearly describe as to what *exactly* was *created* and *made* during the first six literal days. As a matter of fact, *Exodus* 20:11, 31:17 aptly summarize the *work* of the first *six* days. In no way, do these include the *original* creation of Genesis 1:1. The *six-day-work* is biblically an *additional later work* that has been wrongly *mixed up* with the original *instant creation* of the universe (Genesis **1:1**) in the  eternity past.

A *faulty biased interpretation* of Genesis 1:1, **1:2**, 1:3-31, *Exodus* 20:11, 31:17 lies behind the ongoing ‘*battle for a true view of the beginning*’ or the history of the *origins*. Accordingly, “*The supposed battle-line is thus drawn between the ‘Old Earthers’ (this group consists of anti-God evolutionists as well as many ‘conservative’ Christians) who appeal to what they call ‘science’ versus the ‘Young Earthers’ who are said to be ignoring the overwhelming supposed ‘scientific’ evidence for an old Earth.*”<sup>40</sup> Obviously, the ongoing ‘*battle for a true view of the beginning*’ is but an inevitable consequence of *misinterpretation* of *creation accounts* and *geological findings*. If the *Scriptures* relating to *creation* were properly interpreted, the ensuing *accurate* understanding concerning the *Science of Creation* would leave no room for any *battle-line* to be drawn. It is, therefore, *important* that we interpret the *creation accounts* appropriately without prejudice, and with realistic *faith* come to grips with the actual **biblical creation truth**.

As such, we need to freely *choose* to evaluate the *traditional* belief of a “*creation of the cosmos in six days, some 6 to 10,000 years ago*”. Next, by rightly dividing the *Word of Truth*, we need to *reformulate* our *theology of creation* so as for the same to be in tune with the *biblical* and *natural* revelation. As otherwise, we should be *confidently* able to *address* and *resolve* convincingly the embarrassing *contradictions* inadvertently presented by the faithful adherents of the *traditional* doctrine of ‘*six-day creationism*’.

For example, instead of taking *Genesis* 1:1 at its *face value* - as a perfect ‘*totality of all creation*’ - Traditional Six-Day Creationists, *without any biblical proof*, state “*It is impossible to tell what form the matter took....! The universe – at least its energy and mass – began to exist in some form, though the light-giving stars and planets had not yet taken shape. What shape everything was in is not spelled out in explicit detail! ..... But in that first instant of creation, the ‘space-mass-time’ began to exist.*”<sup>41</sup> This *assumption* certainly *contradicts* Genesis 1:1 which, by Hebrew definition, implies the creation of perfect heavens and earth, and not any vague ‘*space-mass-time universe*’

---

40: Ken Ham, *A young Earth—it’s not the issue!* January 1998, [www.answersingenesis.org](http://www.answersingenesis.org).

41: John MacArthur, Jr., *The Battle for the Beginning: Creation, Evolution, and the Bible*, Indian Reprint by Grace to India, Pune; 2002, p.73.



*Traditional Six-day Creationists* experience *difficulty* in accepting the fact that *in the beginning* itself “*God created the heavens and earth*” as a completed *perfect* creation and *not* some *undefined* vague ‘*space-mass-time* universe’. Their *difficulty* lies in their *failure* to separate *Genesis 1:1* from *Genesis 1:2* according to which the “*earth was without form and void, with darkness upon the face of the deep*”. As such, *not only the earth*, but even the vast *universe* is looked upon as *incompletely* created, engulfed in *total darkness* supposedly *then* in need of further *development*. This is not only *contrary* to the Scriptures but also to God’s *character* whose works are *always* perfect and beautiful!

It is altogether *unimaginable* that God who is ‘*pure light*’ and is the ‘*Father of lights*’ (James 1:17), who ‘*dwells in unapproachable light*’ (1 Timothy 6:16), with whom *light dwells* (Daniel 2:22) and in whom is ‘*no darkness at all*’ (1 John 1:5) would ever, *contrary* to His character, create *heavens* and *earth* engulfed in *total darkness*. It is also *unimaginable* that God would create ‘*earth*’ as a lifeless ‘*barren empty dark place*’ to begin with, so as to simply work *meaninglessly* for six days, and then rest.

Certainly, God did not create the original heavens and earth the way *traditional* concepts tend to depict or portray it. The original creation was not simply some undifferentiated “*space-mass-time universe*”; nor, the earth was a wilderness that was barren and empty. The Bible nowhere states it as such. The original creation was complete and perfect and beautiful. For, the ‘*morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy*’ when once God laid the *cornerstone* (Job 38:4-7) thereof. Moreover, the “*Wisdom of God*” *rejoiced* in the *habitable part* of the *primeval* earth and took *delight* in the pre-adamic men (Proverbs 8:31). This would not be the case if the original creation was imperfect requiring further work for its completion. Proverbs 8:31 definitely refers to pre-adamic life on the *primeval* earth of Genesis 1:1.

In fact, **Proverbs 8:22-31** is the only passage in the entire Bible that deals with the prior planning and subsequent execution of the plan through the creation of perfect heavens and earth as was then witnessed by God’s Wisdom. In no way this unique creation passage is related to the phased works of the six days of Genesis 1:3-31.

As such, to even casually *assume* and *state* God created the *original* earth as described in Genesis **1:2** that is, ‘*waste*’ and ‘*empty*’ inundated with *waters* and covered with *darkness* is to *contradict* God who says *all His works* are *perfect*. Actually, ‘*waste*’, ‘*emptiness* or *desolation*’, ‘*flooding with waters*’ and ‘*darkness*’ are *always* results of *judgment*, and *not* of direct *creation*. And *darkness* on *earth* has been the *abode* of the *fallen angels* ever since they *sinned* (Jude 6; Job 38:8-9).

It is, therefore, *unbiblical* to interpret that *what* Genesis **1:2** states is the actual *state* of the *original* creation. To state as such is to impugn the character of God who is a Wise and Intelligent Designer, and not a God of disorder or chaos. Undoubtedly, the Genesis **1:2** *account* doesn’t at all cover the original creation of ‘*heavens and earth*’ of Genesis 1:1. It is certainly a description of a *later* occurrence of a *judgmental* outcome. As such, the *Traditional Six-day Creationism* cannot be biblically substantiated. It is built upon a misinterpretation of the *creation* accounts in the Scriptures.

The *traditional six-day creationism* is plagued with *assumptions* which are not only *contradictory* but also *biblically* and *scientifically inaccurate*. Therefore, it is not at all truly *convincing*. It contradicts *Natural Revelation* or *scientific facts* and *geological-fossil* evidence reflecting thereby a *misinterpretation* of *Genesis 1*.

Obviously, the phrase “*heavens and earth*” in *Genesis 1:1* is *not interpreted* by the *traditional six-day creationists* to mean a “*fully developed perfect universe*” though the *same phrase*, elsewhere in the Bible, is interpreted by them to mean *as such*. Instead, it is looked upon as an imperfect creation characterized by chaotic disorder surrounded by darkness. Thus they *contradict* themselves whenever they state that the term “*heavens and earth*” wherever it appears in the Bible is a Hebrew ‘*merism*’ indicating the “*totality of all creation*”. For example, Ken Ham states: “A *linguistic analysis of the words ‘heaven(s) and earth’ in Scripture shows that they refer to the totality of all creation.*”<sup>42</sup>

So, one is left wondering as to how the Hebrew “*merism: heavens and earth*” *only in Genesis 1:1* differs from the other similar ‘*merisms*’ referring to the *whole* of the completed *creation* so as to state “*it is impossible to tell what form the matter took*” in the Beginning; or that the “*barrenness described in verse 2 is simply the original state of the universe in the twenty-four hours immediately following its initial creation.*”<sup>43</sup>

The ‘*barrenness*’ in *Genesis 1:2*, however, wasn’t “*the original state of the universe ...following its initial creation*” but was a *later* chaotic *state* that actually ‘*evolved*’ on earth. In actuality, *Genesis 1:2* state *nothing* about the original heavens and earth but *only* about the *barrenness* that was next extant on *earth* subsequent to its perfect original creation.

When the Bible states that “*In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth*”, doesn’t it really mean that God created a *fully developed perfect universe* (*Deuteronomy 32:4*) in the dateless past? According to the *traditional six-day creationists*, “*Out of nothing, in an instant, the universe – with all its space and matter – was made by God’s decree.... Or, in that first instant of creation, the ‘space-mass-time universe’ began to exist.*”<sup>44</sup>

Such erroneous *assumptions* may suit one’s *traditional* beliefs but are *contrary* to *Genesis 1:1* account *literally* meaning the ‘*totality of all creation*’. Next, according to the *traditional six-day creationists* “*The entire panoply of heaven – including the moon, the sun, the stars, and countless galaxies – was complete and fully functioning on the day God made it.*”<sup>45</sup> Purportedly, all the *planets* and their *moons* except the *earth* were created on the *fourth Day*<sup>46</sup>; and not “*In the Beginning*” (cf. *Genesis 1:1*).

---

42: Hen Ham, [www.answersingenesis.org](http://www.answersingenesis.org), *op. cit.*

43: John MacArthur, *op.cit.* p. 76;      44: *ibid*, p. 73      45: *ibid* p. 107.

46: Donald DeYoung, *Astronomy and the Bible*, [www.answersingenesis.org](http://www.answersingenesis.org)

If that be the *case*, then how do we explain the existence of “*earth*”, prior to the *creation* of ‘*other planets and moons*’ on the *fourth day*? Wasn’t the “*earth*” a *constituent* of the “*solar system*” or of the “*panoply of heaven*” from the time of its *creation*? Was the planet “*earth*” alone apart from the rest of the solar system created *first*, and then miraculously kept floating in ‘*space-time*’ until the *fourth day*? Or did God have different *laws* for the *first* three days so as to *hang* the *earth* in *space* (cf. Job 27:7) without sun’s *gravitational pulls* to maintain it in a *fixed* orbit? As otherwise, how can one explain the *existence* of the *earth* without any *sun* during the *first three days* seeing that the *earth* is known to *revolve* around the *sun* being *held* in its *orbit* by its *gravitational pull*?

Next, it is stated that “*According to Genesis 1:1, the heavens of outer space had already been created.*”<sup>47</sup> In other words, the so-called ‘*heavens of outer space*’ were created first apart from the so-called ‘*panoply of heaven*’ which was supposedly created on the *fourth day*. However, the Bible doesn’t make any distinction between the ‘*heavens of the outer space*’ and the so-called ‘*panoply of heaven*’ purportedly consisting *not only* of the ‘*moon, the sun, planets and the stars*’ but even the ‘*countless galaxies*’.

Weren’t the ‘*countless galaxies*’ a part of the ‘*heavens of outer space*’, and the planet ‘*earth*’ truly a *constituent* of the ‘*panoply of heaven*’ from the *beginning* of their creation? If the ‘*entire stellar panoply*’ was created on the *fourth day* then of what the ‘*heavens of the outer space*’ were actually made up of when created in the *beginning* along with the *earth*? (Genesis 1:1). And what particular primal *gravitational forces* kept the earth floating in space if the solar system or the stellar panoply consisting of the sun, moon and the stars was created on the fourth day?

According to the *traditional six-day creationism*, the “*starry heavens of the outer space*” and the “*earth*” *sans* the ‘*starry panoply of heaven*’ were created on the *first day*. Accordingly, *Genesis 1:1-5* is supposed to be the ‘*biblical account of God’s activity on that first day of creation.*’<sup>48</sup> That is, “*As day one emerges from eternity, we find the earth in a dark and barren condition*”<sup>49</sup> as a constituent of the so-called “*space-mass-time universe*”. But the fact that the ‘*morning stars*’ sang and all the *angels* shouted for joy (Job 38:7) *proves* that *perfect heavens* and *earth* were *created* before the creation of Day 1 described in Genesis 1:3-5, perhaps soon after the creation of the Angelic hosts.

Certainly, the Bible states that “*In six days, the LORD made the heavens, earth and the sea and everything that is in them*” (Exodus 20:11; 31:17). However, the *heavens* and the *earth* and the *sea* God says in *Exodus 20:11, 31:17* that He *made* in *six days* refer to the *firmament* or to the *heavens* of Genesis 1:8, 14-19 and to the *dry land* called *earth* and to the *sea* of Genesis 1:10. These Scriptures doesn’t refer to the *stellar heavens* and *earth*, or to the round *globe* and the *waters* which God created *ex nihilo* in the *beginning*.

Scriptures clearly differentiate the ‘*Heavens and Earth*’ of Genesis 1:1 that ‘*were of old*’ (2 Peter 3:5) from those ‘*heavens*’ of Genesis 1:8, 14-19 and the ‘*earth*’ of Genesis 1:10 ‘*which are now*’ (2 Peter 3:7). The later were actually *made* or *fashioned* during the *additional work* of the *six days* described in Genesis 1:3-31. These obviously *include* the original parent-primeval ‘*heavens and earth*’.



*Traditional Six-day Creationists* wrongly assume the *creation* of the *stellar heavens* and the *spherical earth* with *chaos* and *darkness* as God's activity of Day One. However, God's activities of the *six days* actually *begin* from Genesis 1:3 onwards with clear commands such as "*Let there be*", specifying each single day's work. As such, what is stated in Genesis 1:1-2 is definitely not in any manner God's activity of Day 1. To state as such, is to leave the *seeker of truth* really feeling confused in spite of the evidence!

It is obvious that the *traditional six-day creationists* have somehow got it sorely wrong, whether it is *admitted* or *not*! The *barrage* of questions provoked by the *traditional six-day creationism* cannot be answered satisfactorily and, therefore, the *confusion* arising there-from is logically inevitable. As such, *traditional* creation concepts cause much confusion provoking unnecessary debate relating to the *origins*.

The only way to *clear* the existing *confusion* is to come to terms with the *fact* that the *six-day creation account* in Genesis 1:3-31 doesn't include in it the creation of *stellar heavens* and the *earth* nor the '*panoply of heaven*' created *instantly* (Genesis 1:1) in the *beginning*. The *phased work* of the *six days* is, therefore, *totally* and *uniquely* different from the earlier *work* of *instant* creation of *heavens* and *earth* of Genesis 1:1. Undoubtedly, the *work* of the *six days* is a *later work* subsequent to the *chaos* on earth (Genesis 1:2). It is in addition to the *original work* of *creation* of the perfect "*heavens and earth*" of Genesis 1:1.

### **Chaos and** **Darkness of Genesis 1:2** *Is It a Work of Creation or of Judgment?*

Genesis 1:1 is definitely an independent *creation account* of the original *perfect* heavens and earth. Subsequently, by rightly *dividing* and *separating* Genesis 1:1 account of *original creation* from that of the later *additional work* of the *six days* of Genesis 1:3-31 we are obviously left with Genesis 1:2 that records the *chaotic* conditions on earth. In fact, it is because of these chaotic conditions on earth God had to *further work* as planned in a *phased manner* for six days. As such, the *chaotic* conditions on earth cannot be a *product* of the original *perfect* creation of "*heavens and earth*" God says He created "*In the Beginning*".

*Traditional Six-day Creationists* do not *rightly divide* the *Word of Truth* and *separate* the creation account of Genesis 1:1 from Genesis **1:2** or from that of Genesis 1:3-31. Yet, such a *distinction* is biblically *warranted*. It is theologically appropriate as it clears the prevailing confusion in the traditional creation theology.

The fact that Genesis 1:1, **1:2** and **1:3** are independent creation *accounts* should not provoke "*Young Earthers*" to be unduly defensive. Such a distinct separation is a *theological necessity* whether we are dealing with a *young earth* or *ages-old* universe. However, as far as biblical revelation is concerned, there is no indication as to the actual *length of time* covering the *accounts* dealing with the *two phases* of God's creative acts.

After all, elusive “time”, as we measure it, was created *beginning* with *Day One* (Genesis 1:5) of the creation week. Time did not begin from the “*Beginning of the Creation*” of the *original* universe as is wrongly assumed by the *traditional six-day creationists*. The *creation* of heavens and earth *in the beginning* and the *conditions* on earth as in Genesis **1:2** were *before* the creation of *time* or the First Day.

The so-called ages of the earth and universe whether in thousands of years or billions of years, biblically speaking, are irrelevant (2 Peter 3:8). In no way any “*age*” should ever bother Christians seeing that it is not at all a biblical issue. As such, the age of the earth or of the universe should be of much concern *to none*.

In a way, neither *Progressive Creation* nor *Theistic Evolution* over billions of years is biblically relevant. The *long ages* advocated by these theories need to be scientifically confirmed; *nor* the *ages* advocated by the ‘*young-earth creationists*’ can be relied upon to be accepted with conviction as *biblical truth*. Jesus’ statements concerning Adam and Eve as being made ‘*male and female*’ ‘*from the beginning of the creation*’ could mean *as such* from the *beginning* of *their* creation. It certainly doesn’t mean to imply that the earth is *young*<sup>50</sup> or that the universe is about 10,000 years old. {In Appendix-D, Jack W. Langford *proves* this fact}. Jesus who lives in ‘*timelessness*’ is neither a ‘*young-age creationist*’<sup>51</sup> nor is He ‘*ages-old earth advocate*’ (cf. 2 Peter 3:8).

Next, apart from dividing and separating Genesis 1:1, **1:2** and 1:3-31 from each other it is not possible to account for the *chaotic* conditions of Genesis **1:2** but to resort to *inaccurate* explanations based upon *traditional* beliefs. Anyway, the *chaotic* conditions (i.e. “*waste*” or “*tohu*” and “*emptiness*” or “*bohu*”, and “*total darkness*”) cannot be the products of *original creation* (Genesis 1:1) but are the outcomes of *judgment*. Similar *chaotic* conditions elsewhere in the Bible are always of *judgment*, a *fact* with which no *biblical theologian* will ever disagree.

Speaking of *judgment*, Isaiah 34:11b states: “... *He shall stretch out upon it the line of waste (tohu) and the plummets of emptiness (bohu)*”. Now, “*That pictures God as the Architect of judgment, using a plumb line of tohu, which is kept taut by weights made of bohu.*”<sup>52</sup> As such, the *chaotic* conditions on earth in Genesis **1:2** are of *judgment* as a *consequence* of *sin* and, therefore, cannot be a *state* of the *original* earth.

*Traditional six-day creationists* are of the opinion that there was *no sin* prior to the *creation week*. According to them, Lucifer sinned some time *after* Day 7 and subsequently Adam sinned. As such, the *chaotic* conditions on earth spoken of in Genesis **1:2** cannot be of *judgment*, we are told. They somehow *assume* the earth was created in an *unformed, imperfect* or *chaotic* state *inundated* with *waters* all over and *covered* with *darkness* at the *beginning* itself, supposedly on Day 1. And, that it was next developed and made *good* during the *work* of the remaining five days of Genesis 1.

---

50: <http://www.answersingenesis.org/get-answers/k/author-terry-mortenson/v/recent>.

51: Mortenson, *ibid*;

52: John MacArthur, *op. cit*, p. 74.

However, to *assume* as such is to *contradict* the Scriptures according to which the *waters* were *originally* in *one place* in the *beginning* (Proverbs 8:30). These waters eventually *deluded* and *covered* the earth in a universal flood (*cf.* Job 38: 8). Next, the *waters* then flooding the earth (*Genesis* 1:2) had to be *rebuked* to *return* to their *original* location (Job 38:8, 11; *cf.* *Genesis* 1:10). This aspect has no relevance to Noah's flood.

Whether the *traditional six-day creationists* openly admit it or not, Isaiah 14:12-15 and Ezekiel 28:12b-15 point to Lucifer's *rebellion* and *sin* as having taken place much prior to the creation week. Unfortunately, *six-day creationists* hardly seem to take into account these Scriptures. Instead, they seem to be somehow convinced all these Scriptures have nothing to do with the time of Lucifer's sin; or with the *chaos* on earth which can be only explained as a consequence of Lucifer's sin and that of his angels (Jude 6) and the pre-Adamite *world* (2 Peter 3:6). Nevertheless, God's planned and *phased* work of the *six days* of *Genesis* 1:3-31 which actually comprises the **true biblical six day creationism** with *evangelical* themes of *restoration* and *renewal* was occasioned by prior Satan-dominated *evil* chaotic conditions on a darkened and deluged earth.

*Traditional six-day Creationists* state, but not convincingly, that Lucifer sinned *some time after* Day Seven of the creation week and not before. However, their belief is not based upon any biblical evidence but is merely *assumed* as such. They, somehow, overlook the fact that the *Serpent* was already there in the Garden of Eden (*Genesis* 3:1 *read* with *Genesis* 1:25) before the creation of Adam. This fact (*cp.* *Revelation* 12:9) confirms that Lucifer *sinned* much *before* the creation week, and not *after*.

Obviously, Lucifer already had sinned before the creation week. As such, **Chaos** on earth had to be a consequence and an aftermath of Lucifer's *sin* [Isaiah 14:12, 17]. At the same time, it is a consequence of the sin of the *angels* (2 Peter 2:4; Jude 6), and that of pre-Adamic nations of *men* [Isaiah 14:12c] over whom Lucifer ruled. It may sound *heretical*; but, nevertheless, these are *biblically-based* pre-historical *pre-adamic* facts!

A relevant *question* would be: *when* did God actually *create* the vast Angelic Host including Lucifer and the angels that sinned with him? Were all the Angels, including Lucifer, created during the creation week as is assumed by the *traditional six -day creationists*? Next, weren't there any *pre-Adamite men* on earth under Lucifer's dominion and ruler-ship? How do we then explain the Scriptures such as Proverbs 8:31, Isaiah 12:14c, etc. that answers these questions pointedly and positively?

The prevailing belief of the *Traditional Six-day Creationists* that the angels were created during the creation week is biblically *untenable*. Such an *assumption* contradicts the biblical fact that the angels were already in existence long before the creation of the earth. The angels were already there to actually witness earth's creation and shout for joy (Job 38:7). As such, the angels could not have been created during the creation week. They were created *before* the creation of the *earlier* heavens and earth. Moreover, leaving aside any *geological-fossil* evidence there is *biblical evidence*, as highlighted herein, to *confirm* the existence of *pre-Adamic* life. This includes pre-Adamic *men* on the *original* primeval earth of *Genesis* 1:1 even as substantiated by Proverbs 8:22-31.



*Traditional six-day creationists* overlook the above biblical creation facts. They simply assume that God created the universe in a *chaotic* condition. Their *assumption* is contrary to God's nature and character and, therefore, *theologically* inappropriate. At the cost of repeating, *chaos* and *darkness* cannot be a part of the *original* work of an Intelligent Designer whose works of direct creation are always functionally perfect (Deuteronomy 32:4), and also *beautiful* (Ecclesiastes 3:11a).

Various other *discrepancies* characterize *traditional six-day and modern young-earth creationism* which certainly cannot be biblically and scientifically resolved. However, if we first *divide* the Word of Truth in Genesis 1 and allow the Bible to interpret it there cannot be any *inconsistencies* in the interpretation of the Scriptures relating to creation. As such, once the *traditional six-day creationists* come to terms with the fact of an *earlier* instant creation as *distinct* from that of the *later* work of the *first* six days there will be no room for any discrepancies.

Next, attempts made by *theistic evolutionists, progressive creationists and others* to accommodate the '*evolutionary long ages*' are only exercises in futility. The Bible is totally silent about the *ages* of the earth or of the universe so as for anyone to logically dispute as to whether we are dealing with a '*Young Earth and Universe*' or an '*Old Earth and Universe*'. As such, the debatable issue of earth's age is biblically irrelevant and a sheer waste of time. At the most, any speculated '*long ages*' of the earth or universe if at all substantially found to be *true* based upon any *relevant* scientific data could be then convincingly adjusted but only in relation to the so-called '*gap*'— rather, the '*white space*' between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 as well as the '*black space*' between Genesis 1:2 and 1:3.

Anyway, "*the issue is not 'young Earth' versus 'old Earth', but this: Can fallible, sinful man be in authority over the Word of God? Compared to what God knows, we know 'next door to nothing'! This is why we should be so careful to let God speak to us through His Word, and not try to impose our ideas on God's Word... this message needs to be proclaimed to the Church as a challenge to return to Biblical authority, and thus stand tall in the world for the accuracy of God's Word. Ultimately, this is the only way we are going to reach the world with the truth of the Gospel message.*"<sup>53</sup> But then, how often we *read into* the Bible *what is not there* such as earth's *age* instead of letting the Bible speak to us and tell us only what is *actually* there. We are accustomed to read into our Bibles traditional concepts we have been taught which we have assumed to be true.

It is important to consider what the Bible says about God's works of creation in all its creation-accounts. Otherwise, we can *end up* with *wrong* interpretations of Scriptures when taken in *isolation*. As an *example* of such wrong interpretation, consider the following: "*The question is what God says that He did! And what He said in writing was this, recorded with His own finger on a table of stone: 'In six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day' (Exodus 20:11; see also Exodus 31:15-18),*"<sup>54</sup> interpreting the same as referring to '*all creation*'

---

**53: Ken Ham, A Young Earth – It's Not the Issue, [www.answersingenesis.org](http://www.answersingenesis.org)**

**54: Henry Morris, Old Earth Creationism, April 1, 1997, [www.icr.org](http://www.icr.org)**

What God *actually* says in *Exodus* 20:11 that He did is the *work* of the *six days* described in *Genesis* 1:3-31. This *work* is in *addition* to the *original creation* of heavens and earth. *Exodus* 20:11 or 31:17 doesn't state that God *created* the *original* universe during the *six days*. These scriptures do not refer to the creation of "*stellar heavens of the outer space*" but to the "*firmament*" called "*heavens*" of *Genesis* 1:8 made on the *second* day. This firmament includes the solar system and also the stars re-arranged on the fourth day (*Genesis* 1:14-19). Next, it does not even refer to the "*original earth*" or the "*globe*" but to the "*dry land*" called "*earth*" of *Genesis* 1:10 that God made to appear on the *third* day after gathering the waters into one place constituting the "*seas*". The Bible describes *two* inter-related but distinct '*heavens*' and '*earth*'; one, created in the beginning (*Genesis* 1:1); and the other, on the second and third day with a re-arrangement of the solar system on the fourth day (*Genesis* 1:7-10, 14-17).

God's *systematic* work of the *six days* actually involves a *work* of restoring *functional* order out of the chaos brought about by Lucifer's rebellion upon the original once beautiful earth. These *redemptive* and *restorative* aspects of God's *work* of the *six days* differentiate it from the *original* earlier *perfect* work of *instant creation* wherein dwelled *light* and righteousness until Lucifer sinned. And just as God restored physical order out of chaos on earth through His work of the six days resting on the seventh day so also God has been *working* all this long, during the last 6000 years, to restore *spiritual* order out of moral chaos brought about by Adam's sin.

In fact, the very nature of God's *phased* work of the six days culminating in God's *resting* on the *seventh* day portrays that every *single* day of the creation week has a *typological* and *prophetic* significance. The six-day work points to God's work of *restoring* spiritual order out of spiritual chaos as a result of man's sin under Satan's rule on earth through six millennial days. It is followed by the Millennial Sabbath during which Satan will be forced to take millennial rest in a *bottomless pit*. These are *fundamental* evangelical truths underlying six-day work followed by the 7<sup>th</sup> day Sabbath.

As such, the *typological*, *restorative* and the *prophetic* aspects of the *phased work* of the *six days* sets it apart as *distinct* and uniquely different from that of the *original* work of an *instant* creation of primeval heavens and earth by *fiat* wherein dwelled *righteousness* until the day Lucifer and his angels and pre-adamic men sinned. Next, the *uniqueness* of the *phased* work of six days also sets it apart from the *future* work of *instant* creation of new Heavens and a new Earth in the eternity future.

Whether the *traditional six-day creationists* freely admit it or not the *fundamentalist* belief of a creation of heavens and earth or of the universe during the six days of the creation week is hopelessly untenable, both biblically and scientifically! The Bible proves it to be so and Science confirms it and that should settle it, once for all, without any further debate! As such, the need of the hour for the *traditional six-day creationists* is to abandon their faulty *traditional six-day creationism*. Modern adherents of the *Traditional six-day creationism* have no other option but to admit that the *traditional six-day creationism* is theologically *flawed* and biblically *incompatible*. And, accordingly, they need next to convincingly align with the actual ***biblical creation truth***.

We need to consider what the Bible actually teaches about creation, “*here a little and there a little*” (Isaiah 28:10, 13). And next, rightly *divide* the Word of Truth about God’s *past* works of creation and re-creation as well as the prophesied *future works* and formulate a **Theology of Creation** which is *free* from *contradictions*.

Hopefully, *traditional six-day creationists* will revise their theological position after evaluating the same in the face of the many questions it raises. As long as these questions cannot be answered convincingly with *biblically* supported *answers* it is of no real value to hold on to the *traditional six-day creationism* but adopt a *creation position* which is certainly *free* from *contradictions*.

*Traditional Creationism* cannot serve any *evangelical* purpose seeing that it is plagued with inconsistencies. It provokes questions that cannot be biblically and scientifically answered prompting unbelievers to question biblical integrity. In fact, it acts as a stumbling block in the way of those genuinely seeking truth relating to creation. As such, a vibrant *Biblical Theology of Creation* is a dire need of the hour.

The modern *militant* Church should not hesitate to aim towards such a goal. We need to rightly divide the creation accounts as explained earlier and by properly interpreting the same formulate a **Theology of Creation** mainly for evangelical purposes.

As noted succinctly by John MacArthur, “*Our view of creation is the necessary starting point for our entire world-view. In fact, so vital is the issue that Francis Schaeffer once remarked that if he had only an hour to spend with an unbeliever, he would spend the first forty-five minutes talking about creation and what it means for humanity to bear the image of God – and then he would use the last fifteen minutes to explain the way of salvation.*”<sup>55</sup>

This *treatise* aims to address the *basic biblical facts* relating to the different *phases* of creation by rightly dividing the Word of Truth in Genesis and elsewhere in the Holy Bible. To any one attempting such an exercise *objectively* it will be obvious that the true ***biblical six-day creationism*** described in Genesis 1: 3-31 summarized by Exodus 20:11 and 31:17 is totally different from the ***traditional six day creationism***. After all, it has wrongly *mixed up* the work of the *six days* (Genesis 1:3-31) with the work of instant creation (Genesis 1:1) in ‘*timelessness*’ thereby inadvertently doing *violence* to biblically based *Theology of Creation*.

“***Biblical Creation Truth***”, the subject matter of this book verily differs from the biblically untenable *traditional six-day creationism* according to which it is assumed that God created the *universe* in six days. At the cost of repeating, it is wrongly assumed that the creation week of Genesis 1 begins with Genesis 1:1 and not with Genesis 1:3. In fact, the universe was created much earlier in the *dateless* and *ageless* past, much before the actual work of the six days of Genesis 1:3-31 which truly constitutes the true *biblical six-day creationism*. This sharp *distinction* is essential to our *understanding*.

---

55: John MacArthur, *op. cit.*, p. 43.



The *distinction* between the creation *accounts* in Genesis 1:1 and 1:3-31 is a *theological necessity* and is *biblically warranted* whether one really agrees with such a distinction or not. But the Bible is definitely clear about it! To deliberately ignore such a *biblically-based* distinction *affirming a radical theology of creation* is to hopelessly remain enslaved to naïve *tradition*. Undoubtedly, given the human nature for what it is, one's *bias* based upon one's preconceived notions and presuppositions underlying the prevailing belief in the *traditional six-day creationism* will surely come into play. Such bias makes it difficult to acknowledge the errors and embrace the truth. However, if we are to remain faithful to God's Word then we should not hesitate to prove all things and faithfully hold fast that which is biblically true constituting sound doctrine!

⊕ Resistance to correction is inevitable! And, even as one chooses to evaluate *traditional* beliefs he or she is likely to experience *dissonance*! The *disturbing* question is: How could the Church simply ever *err* all along in its *doctrine of creation* so as to *believe* that which is *biblically untenable*? Instead of merely looking to *church history* to defend one's *belief* on the *premise* that it has been accepted *as such* all along one will do well to check the *truthfulness* of any belief as to *whether* it is really *biblical* or *not*. Anyway, it may be conveniently stated that no *traditionally accepted belief system* is *complete* and *final* but is subject to scrutiny in the light of any *new* understanding of *biblical truth* no matter how much uncomfortable one feels with it. As such, we need to be always willing to '*prove all things and hold fast that which is true*' even if it means facing the *cost* of giving up one's established *traditional, historical* beliefs and hide-bound concepts and erroneous beliefs.

◆ On the whole, we need to be fully cautious and be aware of the fact that "*The argument from church history seems to rear its head almost every time any doctrine is discussed. If the doctrine was taught in ancient times this supposedly makes it more reliable. If, on the other hand, it has not been taught until more recent years, then it is suspect. Of course, the argument itself is invalid. The truth or untruth of any doctrine does not depend on whether or not it was ever taught in church history. Its truthfulness depends solely on whether or not it is taught in the Bible. Now, admittedly, a teaching that no one has ever before heard about might be suspect, but the Bible, not church history, is the standard against which all teachings must be measured.*"<sup>56</sup>

Anyone who experiences unhealthy '*cognitive dissonance*', will do well to acknowledge the same and lay aside any resistance arising there-from. Next, for the sake of *truth* come under *grace* and choose to be *honestly objective* so as to freely '*prove all things and hold fast that which is true*'. As such, the reader to be *objective* will do well to act on the principle of '*bracketeering*' by creating an empty mental space ( ⊕ ) freed from all *bias* resulting from *traditional beliefs*. Next, let the Bible do the plain speaking; that is, involve oneself in "*exegesis*", by reading *out* of the text instead of impulsively or with *bias* engage in "*eisegesis*" by reading *into* the biblical creation texts one's *established* assumptions or *traditional beliefs*. And then *objectively* evaluate the *three-phased-creation theology* constituting the core truths of "*Biblical Creation Truth*".

---

<sup>56</sup>: Charles C. Ryrie, *Basic Theology: A Popular Systematic Guide to Understanding Biblical Truth*, 1999, Moody Press, Chicago, USA, p. 91.

The *focus* of “**Biblical Creation Truth**” is not merely to review the biblical facts in understanding the Theology of Creation, *per se*. The *focus* goes much beyond that. It takes into consideration the *evangelical* aspects and the *spiritual application* as is symbolically portrayed by the physical creation events. Its goal, notwithstanding the prevailing faulty and confusing *Traditional Six-Day Creationism* and *Theistic Evolution* is to *affirm a radical evangelically-based biblical theology of creation* rooted in the very *first* chapter of the Bible – Genesis 1.

To conclude, **Genesis 1:1** definitely deals with a perfect creation wherein dwelled *light* (life, truth and righteousness) until Lucifer when, once placed on earth sinned by rebelling against God bringing in *darkness* and chaos on earth (Genesis 1:2) as a consequence, necessitating God’s work of the six days (Genesis 1:3-31). Accordingly, “*In Genesis 1 we have a picture of the work of God in connection with His counsels. You may say it is a picture of creation, but it is a wonderful picture of God's work which leads right on to the rest of God. Thus Genesis (1:3-31) gives a description of the work of the six days, and it ends with the Sabbath of rest, and it is thus a picture of the end to which God is really working. He is working up to a certain point and that is to secure rest and satisfaction for Himself in the full blessing of man. Depend upon it, which is God's object.*”<sup>57</sup>

Hermeneutically speaking, the very *first two verses* of Genesis 1 when rightly *divided* and *separated* from each other and studied *exegetically* with the help of other related Scriptures make it clearly evident that these *two verses* actually describe *two* different *states* of God’s physical creation:

One, the *initial perfect state* of the *original heavens and earth* as in Genesis 1:1 when the earth was under the dominion of Lucifer and angels, wherein once dwelled *light* symbolizing *life, truth, righteousness* and *peace*.

Two, the *later imperfect state* as in **Genesis 1:2**, depicting the original *once* perfect earth *next* in total *chaos* inundated by *waters* all over and covered by *darkness*, undoubtedly as a consequence of Lucifer’s sin and that of his subjects; and, perhaps, a creation that is *subjected* to futility and uselessness (Romans 8:20-21) and which is now under Satan’s dominion and control (Luke 4:6).

Accordingly, “... *in the light of the first Epistle of John... sin existed at that time, but it did not exist in connection with man nor in relation to the creation brought before us in the opening of Genesis and which God pronounced to be ‘very good’.* Sin existed already in relation to Satan; he was the original sinner – he ‘*sineth from the beginning*’ or ‘*outset*’, but there was a created scene down here without sin.”<sup>58</sup>

---

57: Charles A. Coates, *Miscellaneous Ministry on the Old Testament*, Vol.30, Kingston Bible Trust, UK, 1991 reprint, p.3.

58: J. Pellatt, *Departure and Recovery in ‘The Closing Ministry of J. Pellatt’, (1843 –1913)*, Vol.1, Kingston Bible Trust, UK, p. 150-151.

**Genesis 1:3-31** describe God's *additional* phased works of the *six days*. This additional *phased* work performed through specific six days by its very nature and methodology distinguishes it from that of the original instant creation of Genesis 1:1.

Unlike the instant creation by fiat of Genesis 1:1, the *work* of the six days is peculiarly characterized by specific "commands" (cf. 2 Corinthian 4:6) as if to address or to order the cosmic forces of *darkness* to **"Let There Be..."** functional conditions necessary to sustain *new* life on earth. That is, the specific work of each of the six days *begins* with "And God said" thereby giving specific commands to "Let There Be" life sustaining conditions on *earth* that *was* barren and void. **"Let There Be' in Genesis 1 - the unanswerable fiat"** <sup>59</sup> is said to be the equivalent of 'Thou Shalt... in the moral world' <sup>60</sup>; and in each case, it is a **"commandment"** which is the "divine language" <sup>61</sup> to *restore* order out of the prevailing *chaos*. In the *one* case, it is to restore order out of the physical chaos in the physical universe; and in the *other* case, it is to restore order out of the moral chaos in the moral world or universe.

No specific commands were given at the time of the original creation and neither such commands were necessary. God simply visualized it, *willed* it, and spoke it into existence by fiat; and the perfect heavens and earth came into existence. And since it was all perfect, the heavenly host shouted for joy. Next, the Wisdom of God, Personified, rejoiced in the habitable part of the earth and took delights in the pre-adamic "sons of men" [of old cp. Proverbs 8:22b], dwelling in the habitable part of the primeval earth or world [Heb.= Tebel]; as such, these 'sons of men' are also called 'the dust of the world' [Heb =Tebel (Proverbs 8:26c, 31a)]. Definitely, **Proverbs 8:22-31** refer to God's works of old [Proverbs 8:22b > cp. 2 Peter 3:5b] and not to the phased works of the six days; nor do the 'sons of men' of Proverbs 8:31b refer to the post-Adamic sons of men.

Thus, the *work* of the *six days* is basically *restorative*, culminating in the creation of the seventh-day Sabbath. It symbolizes God's *dispensational work* of six millennial days to be followed by a millennial-dispensational Sabbath of heavenly rule on earth next culminating in the physical creation of *new heavens and new earth* (Isaiah 65:17).<sup>62</sup>

---

59: R. E. O. White: *Biblical Ethics*: John Knox Press, Atlanta, USA, 1979, p. 18.

60: R. E. O White, *ibid*, p.18

61: *ibid*, p. 18.

62: Alfred Edersheim, *Biblical History: Old Testament, Text: Public Domain, Database@2004, WORDsearch Corp., Volume 1.*

\*\*\*\*\*

