

Evolution 101

Lesson 5

Is Progressive Creation Tenable?

This scheme claims that God first created everything in **Genesis 1:1** and then destroyed it and started over after **Genesis 1:2** which describes the chaotic condition of the earth. Supposedly, this created a huge gap between the first two verses of **Genesis 1**. During this gap of millions or billions of years (fill in the blank) and after creating the plants and animals, God destroyed the first creation during which the present fossil record was laid down in the earth's crust. Apparently, the earth and fossil record was not completely destroyed in the process and continued on in the recreation that took place after **Genesis 1:2**.

The proponents of this line of thinking usually contend that Noah's Flood was only local, not world wide, and was not responsible for the present fossil record. This exegesis is supposed to silence the geologists and astronomers most of whom are evolutionists and demand eons of time for their scheme to work.

One proof text for this interpretation of the Bible is **Genesis 1:2** where *was* is replaced with *became*. Even though the translations of the four Bibles in the Layman's Parallel Bible use *was*, these scholars render **Genesis 1:2** as, "And the earth **be-came** without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." This is supposed to describe the condition of the earth when the second creation account began.

The other proof text is **Genesis 1:28** which states, ". . . God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and *replenish* the earth, and subdue it;" Replenish is supposed to mean to refill an earth that had been previously filled. This is not imperative since the Hebrew dictionary lists *fill* as a synonym for *replenish*. Three of the four bibles mentioned above use *fill* instead of *replenish* in this passage.

These proof texts seem to be a less than convincing premise to embark on the grand scheme of declaring, in effect, that God couldn't get it right the first time. One suspects that these scholars would never have thought of this scheme to help God out had they not been strongly swayed by the geologists and astronomers, most of whom are atheists.

This writer recalls the alibi of a famous politician who declared that there is "no controlling legal authority" that condemns his misdeeds. But there is a "controlling legal authority" that covers the issue raised in this essay. That would be **Exodus 20:11** which states, "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day." If replenish means to fill a second time as claimed for **Genesis 1:28**, then *made* in the verse above should have been translated "*remade*" to indicate remaking the leftover from the first creation. This controlling, watershed verse demands a creation from nothing, not from the remains of a previous creation.

There should be no confusion about **Exodus 20:11**. It is not just inspired scripture; it is inscribed scripture, written by the finger of God on a stone tablet. As a part of the Fourth Commandment, it was delivered to the people at a time when they all understood from long experience that a day was a solar day, not just a vague period of time. God surely understands Hebrew.

We are faced with deciding if the earth is young or old. God's word can't mean both. Only one is right and the other is blasphemy. This decision about the age of the earth should not be influenced by the opinions of pagan scientists. You will recall in an earlier lesson that it is impossible to prove empirically that the earth is millions or billions of years old.

One needs to remember the loss of credibility suffered by the church over the Galileo affair. The church had sanctified the finding of the Greek astronomer, Ptolemy, who contended that the earth was the center of the solar system. The scientists soon changed their minds as they do all the time and pronounced the sun as the center of our solar system. But the church cannot change a supposedly doctrinal absolute without losing credibility. Is the church inviting another disaster by adapting to the speculations and lies of the atheistic scientists concerning evolution and the age of the earth?

In trying to help God out, these progressive creationists trash the understanding that God's curse brought death into the world as the result of the sin of one man, Adam. If the progressive creationists are correct, the fossil record already showed that animals (including early man) had already lived and died. If

death had already stained the creation before Adam arrived, then the Bible is in error and Jesus did not die for our sins and was only a martyr.

Occam's principle, followed in science and logic, teaches that the simplest explanation of a proposition is the correct solution. For example, the shortest distance between two points is a straight line. A convoluted explanation, therefore, is wrong.

Taking the Genesis account of creation and Noah's flood at face value as historical narrative and **Exodus 20:11** as reinforcement, satisfies Occam's principle, also known as the rule of parsimony. The progressive creationists' convoluted solution is to postulate an original creation of life and animals including early man which was then destroyed and resulted in the fossils now found in the earth's crust. This was supposedly followed by the second creation described in Genesis beginning with **Genesis 1:2**.

How convoluted can one get? To complicate things even more, they claim that death of animals and early man found as fossils do not dispute the doctrine that sin and death entered the world only through Adam. These earlier men, they say, were not spiritual persons like Adam and only Adam's sin counted as the cause of the curse. Whew!

www.FineTunedUniverse.com