

God is the creator

Creation Vs Big Bang Theory

Creation! A mystery that is difficult for humans to understand. By the word of His mouth, God created all that we see. The sun, moon and stars, the animals and plants. Many hold the Creation account of Genesis to be a fable. Yet, as the open minded individual studies the wonders of nature, the unfolding of a flower, the pink glow of a newborn's hand, the planets in their precise order, one can not help, but have a greater appreciation of who God is and the miracles that He can perform.

Many see the Genesis account of Creation as the sole Biblical evidence of Creation. Yet, there are many other places in the Bible where the Creation of the world is referred to by God as well as His people. God truly is Lord and Creator.

When we come to discuss this topic, we should pray to God for spiritual guidance, since the Holy Spirit can teach us what our pride usually rejects.

Genesis 1:1

"In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth."

Volumes have been written about the first verse of Genesis. There are two main interpretations of what this verse really means. Some say that the verse is a summary of the rest of the Genesis creation account. Others say that the verse represents the first creative act of God. How can we tell which interpretation is correct?

Day 1

The answer is really quite simple - keep reading! Reading Genesis 1:1 or any other Bible verse outside its context is one of the worst things that a person can do. When we look at Genesis 1:2, we see that it begins with the conjunction "and." This fact immediately tells us that Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 are part of one continuous thought.

Remove the period at the end of Genesis 1:1 and read it as originally intended:

"In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth and the earth was formless and void..."

The conjunction at the beginning of Genesis 1:2 tells us that Genesis 1:1 is *not* a summary of the creation account!

This verse is a factual statement of what God did at the beginning of the first day. There are other context clues that tell us that this is not a summary statement. If we continue reading the Genesis creation account, we come to the real summary at the end (Genesis 2:1). It would be superfluous to have a second summary at the beginning. As we continue to read Genesis one, we will notice how succinct the creation account really is.

So, we conclude that the text claims that God created the heavens and earth on the first day. What do the heavens consist of? Stars, galaxies, etc. So, we know that God created, at minimum, the stars and the earth. Actually, the Hebrew phrase translated "heaven and earth" refer to the entire created universe. Some people claim that God created the earth first and that the rest of the heavenly bodies were created later. However, we are led to contemplate why God said that He created the "heavens and the earth." To accept this interpretation, we would have to say that God created "nothing" and the earth. If God had only created the earth, the Genesis 1:1 would have said, "In the beginning God created the earth." So, we can safely say that God created the *entire* heavens and earth at the beginning of the first creation day.

Genesis 1:2 - the early earth

Keep your Bible open as we zoom on to Genesis 1:2. Those interpretations that claim Genesis 1:1 is just a summary have a problem in this next verse. If Genesis 1:1 is just a summary, then there is no mention in Genesis of God creating matter - it is just suddenly mentioned as if it had existed all along. Such a model is compatible with the LDS (Mormon) theology, but not Christianity.

It is important in Genesis 1:2 to examine the context and the perspective to determine where the action is happening. Let's read the text:

And the earth was formless and void, and darkness was over the surface of the deep; and the Spirit of God was moving over the surface of the waters. (*Genesis 1:2*)

Where is God? In heaven? In outer space? NO! God, our personal Creator and Savior, is on the surface of the waters of the earth doing His creating "up close and personal." Imagine that - God personally came to earth to create and shape it for habitation! The important thing about this verse is that it defines the conditions as they appeared from God's perspective on the surface of the earth. What are the conditions? "...the earth was formless and void, and darkness was over the surface of the deep..." Why was the earth dark? Genesis one does not say, but other creation accounts in the Bible *do* say. In fact, in the book of Job, God Himself tells us the answer:

"Where were you when I laid the foundation of the earth? ...When I made a cloud its garment, And thick darkness its swaddling band" (*Job 38:4-9*)

So, we know that when God created the earth it was dark because it was covered with thick clouds. This fact will be important to understand the next few verses.

"Let there be light"

Genesis 1:3 begins with another conjunction, so we know it is part of the continuing action. God is still on the surface of the earth. "And God said, 'Let there be light,' and there was light." Where is the light? It's on the surface of the earth for the first time. Where does the light come from. The text does not say directly, but it gives a lot of clues. Did God create the light? No! If God had created the light, the text would have said so, like it does in the rest of Genesis one. It says that God "let it be." Let's read the rest of the first day to get the clues.

"And God saw that the light was good; and God separated the light from the darkness. And God called the light day, and the darkness He called night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day." (*Genesis 1:4-5*)

How long is day 1?

Many Christians assume that all the Genesis creation days are exactly 24-hours long. Neither the Genesis 1 text nor other Bible verses directly address how long the first day was. However, there were a lot of things that happened on the first day. God created the entire universe. There are other Bible verses that address at least part of *how* God created the universe. No fewer than 11 verses from five different inspired authors claim that God stretches out the heavens. Many of these verses use present tense, indicating that God is still stretching out the heavens. How long did it take to stretch out the trillions and trillions of stars. The Bible doesn't say, but if we measure the current rate that the universe is being stretched, it would suggest a very long time.

Notice that *every* thought is begun with a conjunction, so we know that all of this is part of the continuing action. The text says that there was day and night on the earth on the first day. This tells us that the light that was shining on the earth was directional (from one source). Let's put it all together. God created the earth with a thick layer of clouds around it that caused it to be dark. When God said "Let there be light" it is most logical to conclude that God removed at least some of those thick clouds so that light would fall on the surface of the earth. Where did the light come from? The Sun shining on a rotating earth. You might protest, "But the text never said God created the Sun." It actually does. As stated previously, the Hebrew term "the heavens and the earth" in Genesis 1:1 refers to the entire created universe. So, the Sun, stars, and earth were all created at the beginning of day 1.

Day 2

On the second day, God allows a separation of the waters above from the waters below (Genesis 1:6-7). The text seems to be describing the setting up of a water cycle on the earth. The waters above (i.e., clouds) are separated from the waters below (the "deep" or seas mentioned in verse 2). The separation is called "heaven" (also translated "skies").

How long is day 2?

It is difficult to say how long the second day was. Part of the verse indicates that God "let the separation be" (suggesting natural process), but then the text goes on to explain that God "made" the separation. The Hebrew word *asah* translated "made" suggests that God formed the separation from materials that already existed, rather than creating it brand new. As such, the formation could involve both supernatural and natural processes. If the separation was allowed to form on its own, it would be expected that the second day could be a very long period of time.

Day 3

God did a couple things on the third day. God's first action was the formation of dry land:

Then God said, "Let the waters below the heavens be gathered into one place, and let the dry land appear"; and it was so. And God called the dry land earth, and the gathering of the waters He called seas; and God saw that it was good. (*Genesis 1:9-10*)

Similar to the first two days, God "let" the dry land appear. The land already existed, although it was underneath the original seas. Psalm 104 (the "creation Psalm") tells us how God accomplished the appearance of the land. According to the Psalm, "The mountains rose; the valleys sank down To the place which Thou didst establish for them." The description suggests that God used some form of tectonic activity to form the dry land. If tectonic activity were used by God to form the dry land, it would suggest that the beginning of the third day would be a very long period of time.

Creation of plants

Then God said, "Let the earth sprout vegetation, plants yielding seed, and fruit trees bearing fruit after their kind, with seed in them, on the earth"; and it was so. And the earth brought forth vegetation, plants yielding seed after their kind, and trees bearing fruit, with seed in them, after their kind; and God saw that it was good. (*Genesis 1:11-12*)

How long is day 3?

There is no plant in the world that can germinate and produce seeds within a 24-hour period of time. It gets worse for the 24-hour interpretation. Not only do we have plants, we have trees that grow and produce fruit with seed in it. It takes fruit trees several years of growth before they produce any fruit. You might say that God could have caused everything to happen super-quick. However, God says, "Let the *earth* sprout vegetation..." and the text says, "And the *earth* brought forth vegetation..." In order to claim that God miraculously created all the plants, seed, etc. in 24-hours, one would have to claim God was a liar. Not a good accusation to make! So we know that the second part of the third day was at least several years long.

On the third day God allows the earth to produce plants through germination (sprouting) and growth until seeds are produced. The Hebrew word *dasha* refers to a plant that sprouts from a seed until the seedling turns green. This verb tells us that God used processes identical to what we see on the earth today. Plants sprouted, grew to maturity, and produced seeds. Several kinds of plants are described. The Hebrew word *deshe* refers primarily to grasses; the word *eseb* refers primarily to herbs and the words *peri ets* refer to fruit trees.

Day 4

Many people believe that the text about day 4 says that God created the Sun, moon and stars on the fourth day. This is not what the text actually says, so let's read it again.

- Then God said, "Let there be lights in the expanse of the heavens to separate the day from the night, and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years; (*Genesis 1:14*)
- and let them be for lights in the expanse of the heavens to give light on the earth"; and it was so. (*Genesis 1:15*)
- And God made the two great lights, the greater light to govern the day, and the lesser light to govern the night; He made the stars also. (*Genesis 1:16*)
- And God placed them in the expanse of the heavens to give light on the earth, (*Genesis 1:17*)
- and to govern the day and the night, and to separate the light from the darkness; and God saw that it was good. (*Genesis 1:18*)

How can a day be longer than 24-hours?

Even though the Genesis text clearly indicates that the days are longer than 24-hours, some Christians insist that any interpretation of Genesis 1 that deviates from 24-hour days is not literal. The problem is that the Hebrew word *yom*¹⁷ has three literal definitions - 12 hour daylight period, 24 period of time, or a long, but indefinite period of time. A careful reading of the Genesis creation account reveals that the 24-hour interpretation is ruled out by the actual Genesis text. The first definitive example of a day that is longer than 24-hours can be found in the beginning of the Genesis 2 creation account, which says that the entire six days of creation are one day.

In verse 14 we have that unusual construction again of "let there be." It is not a statement of creation, but a statement of appearance. At this point, the clouds present at the initial creation of the earth were completely removed so that the bodies themselves appeared for the first time on the surface of the earth. The passage tells us that the lights were allowed "to be" so that they could be signs of the seasons, days, and years. It was necessary for the creatures of day 5 that the heavenly bodies be visible. We know that many of the migratory birds (created on day 5) require visible stars to navigate, hence the need to actually see these bodies. Verse 18 gives us another hint. The lights were placed in the sky to "separate the light from the darkness." Does this sound familiar? It is the exact Hebrew phrase used for God's work on the *first* day when, "God separated the light from the darkness" (Genesis 1:4) By using this phrase, the text is recounting the formation of the Sun, moon and stars from the first day. If we accept that God created the Sun, moon and stars on the fourth day, then He didn't really create the heavens in verse one. So, the 24-hour day interpretation suffers a contradiction between Genesis 1:1 and Genesis 1:16.

Day 5

On the fifth day, God created the animals described by the Hebrew word *nephesh*.

- Then God said, "Let the waters teem with swarms of living creatures [*nephesh*], and let birds fly above the earth in the open expanse of the heavens." (*Genesis 1:20*)

- And God created the great sea monsters, and every living creature [*nephesh*] that moves, with which the waters swarmed after their kind, and every winged bird after its kind; and God saw that it was good. (*Genesis 1:21*)
- And God blessed them, saying, "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let birds multiply on the earth." (*Genesis 1:22*)

The word *nephesh* is used of both animals and human beings, and primarily has the meaning "soul." The term encompasses the ideas of mind, will, and emotion. These characteristics apply to the higher animals, such as the birds and mammals. The kinds of creature created includes many different kinds of birds (*Genesis 1:21*) and the "great sea monsters," probably referring to the whales (also referred to as *nephesh* beings). These creatures were created in great abundance, as indicated by the verbs *sharats* and *ramas*. The fossil record confirms that there was a massive introduction of bird and mammal species at the beginning of the tertiary age.

Day 6

The sixth days describes the creation of animals that impact mankind and the creation of mankind himself.

- Then God said, "Let the earth bring forth living creatures [*nephesh*] after their kind: cattle and creeping things and beasts of the earth after their kind"; and it was so. (*Genesis 1:24*)
- God made the beasts of the earth after their kind, and the cattle after their kind, and everything that creeps on the ground after its kind; and God saw that it was good. (*Genesis 1:25*)
- Then God said, "Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; and let them rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over the cattle and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth." (*Genesis 1:26*)
- God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them. (*Genesis 1:27*)

The sixth day begins with the creation of more *nephesh* creatures. These include the cattle (*behemah*), creeping (*remes*) *nephesh* (probably rodents), and "beasts (*chay*) of the earth" (translated "wild animals" in the NIV, usually referring to the wild carnivores).

The ultimate *nephesh* creation is mankind, created at the end of the sixth day. *Genesis 1:27* tells us that God created mankind as males and females. However, *Genesis 2* tells us more about the sixth day. From *Genesis 1:27*, we know that the sixth day extended at least through the creation of Eve, since the text indicates that God created both males and females on the sixth day. The following events took place after the creation of Adam

- God planted a garden in Eden (*Genesis 2:8*)
- God caused the garden to sprout and grow (*Genesis 2:9*)
- God brought all the birds, cattle and wild animals to Adam to name (*Genesis 2:19-20*)
- God put Adam to sleep, took a part of him and formed Eve (*Genesis 2:21-22*)

The events of the sixth day seem to require longer than 24 hours also. The text indicates that God planted a garden. This garden was not planted full-grown, since the text says that the trees were caused to sprout or grow (Hebrew *tsamach*). The amount of time allowed for the garden to grow is not stated, but would presumably take longer than 24-hours. After the garden had grown sufficiently, the man was placed into the garden to cultivate it. By this time, the trees were producing fruit so that Adam could eat. This process takes a period of time greater than 24 hours. Next, Adam was given the assignment of naming the birds, cattle and wild animals. The list includes only birds and mammals and does not mention fish or other lower life forms. Even so, it would require that Adam name at least 14,600 species (8,600 species of birds and 4,000 species of mammals). This would require Adam to name more than 10 species per minute (assuming he had the entire 24 hours). For those who believe in a young earth, it would require that Adam name not only all of the existing birds and mammals but all the ones in the fossil record also (since they would all have to be alive on day 6 - no animal death before the fall). Such a task would probably double the number of species to be named. However, Adam did not have the entire 24 hours, since part of it was required for the planting and growing of the garden, Adam tending the garden, and God putting Adam to sleep to create Eve. Realistically, Adam would have to name at least 20 species per minute, including all the species found in the fossil record. Following this naming of the animals, no suitable helper was found for Adam. So, we must conclude that the sixth day was most certainly longer than 24 hours.

Conclusion

We are left with only one internally consistent interpretation for the days of Genesis one. The literal, clearly indicated, meaning of *yom* for Genesis one *must be* an unspecified, long period of time. Since the Genesis text says that the third day must be at least several years long, none of the other days would be expected to be limited to 24-hours. All or nearly all of the other creation days would seem to require long periods of time, although the text does not clearly indicate the specific amount of time required.

PART2

The Big Bang Theory vs. God's Word

By WAYNE JACKSON

December 1, 1999

“We have tried over and over again to point out to readers that the big bang theory is not at odds with the Bible nor with the concept of God as Creator.” So wrote John N. Clayton, of South Bend, Indiana, in the September-October, 1999 issue of his paper, *Does God Exist?* In addition to teaching high school, Mr. Clayton has virtually made a career of lecturing most weekends of the year to churches across the country. His knowledge of science is woefully skewed with ideas of evolution; unfortunately, his acquaintance with the Bible is even more deficient.

A number of conservative Bible students have tried, “over and over again,” to get John Clayton to see that it is a serious compromise of scriptural truth to give credence to the big bang theory. In this article, we examine this materialistic concept of the origin of the universe.

Basically there are two views of the origin of the universe. One of these is the supernatural position set forth in the book of Genesis (chapters one and two), with ample confirmation from other inspired writings. The Genesis narrative affirms that God created the heavens and the earth on the first day of the initial week of earth's history. Subsequently, during the remaining five days of creation activity, attention was directed to this planet, the abode of man—who was uniquely fashioned in the image of the Creator (Genesis 1:26, 27). The sun, moon, and stars were also made (vv. 14ff). The Scriptures make it perfectly clear that the whole creation (inorganic and organic) came into being during this six-day period (see Exodus 20:11).

The second view of the beginning of the universe is wholly materialistic. Modern “scientism” prefers to grapple with its problems without appealing to God, although, as science writer Lincoln Barnett observed, “this seems to become more difficult all the time” (1957, 22). Isaac Asimov wrote: “The Bible describes a Universe created by God, maintained by him, and intimately and constantly directed by him, while science describes a Universe in which it is not necessary to postulate the existence of God at all” (1981, 13).

Theories concerning the mechanistic origin of the universe come and go. Today's “science” is tomorrow's superstition. A few years ago scientists were touting the steady-state theory as the most reasonable explanation of the origin of the universe. It asserted that new matter is constantly being created to replace that which is lost by the expanding universe. “Today most astronomers regard the steady-state theory as dead” (Weaver 1974, 625). The current inclination concerning the beginning of our universe is known as the big bang theory, but even the “bang” notion is receiving competition from a newer view called the plasma theory (DeYoung 1992, i-iv).

The Theory Defined

The big bang concept alleges that some twenty billion years ago (give or take ten billion), all of the matter in the known universe was tightly packed into a microscopic cosmic “egg.” One writer expresses it this way: “Astonishingly, scientists now calculate that everything in this vast universe grew out of a region many billions of times smaller than a single proton, one of the atom's basic particles” (Gore 1983, 705). This is truly an incredible statement!

In one of his books, Dr. Robert Jastrow asserts that in the beginning “all matter in the Universe was compressed into an infinitely dense and hot mass” that exploded. Over many eons, supposedly, “the primordial cloud of the Universe expands and cools, stars are born and die, the sun and earth are formed, and life arises on the earth” (1977, 2-3). Dr. Jastrow is describing, of course, what is commonly known as the big

bang theory, and it does not require much critical acumen to conclude that the concept is **evolutionary** to the core.

Where the cosmic egg came from no one seems to know. Certainly no cosmic chicken has been located! Some allege that the egg always existed. They speculate that it possibly resulted from some earlier universe that collapsed upon itself. This assumes that matter is eternal. But this idea is refuted by our knowledge of physics (e.g., the second law of thermodynamics). Jastrow concedes that “modern science denies an eternal existence to the Universe, either in the past or in the future” (15). Others, like Professor Victor Stenger of the University of Hawaii, muse that perhaps the universe came from nothing (the egg laid itself!):

[T]he universe is probably the result of a random quantum fluctuation in a spaceless, timeless void . . . the earth and humanity, are not conscious creations but an accident. . . . [I]t is not sufficient merely to say, “You can’t get something from nothing.” While everyday experience and common sense seem to support this principle, if there is anything that we have learned from twentieth-century physics, it is this: Common sense is often wrong, and our normal experiences are but a tiny fraction of reality (1987, 26-27).

One thing is certain: one is required to lay aside his “common sense” in order to accept the foregoing incomprehensible speculation. None of these materialistic theories has any credibility—biblically or scientifically. Some scientists should take a hint from the Scottish skeptic David Hume: “I have never asserted so absurd a proposition as that anything might arise without a cause” (1932, 187).

Dr. Mart de Groot, who views the big bang concept as “a possible way of understanding the opening statement of the Bible, ‘in the beginning God . . .,’” admits that there is an objective difficulty to the theory. And it is this: even if the “primordial matter” exploded, he says, resulting in our present universe, “what is the origin or source of this matter?” He confesses that “probably the most serious shortcoming of the big bang is its inability to go back to the very beginning of time and space” (1999, 20-23). The theory has far more shortcomings than the matter of “matter commencement”!

Flaws in the Big Bang Scenario

There are a number of logical problems with the big bang scheme of origins:

(1) The big bang scenario speculates that the marvelously ordered universe randomly resulted from a gigantic explosion—a “holocaust,” to use Jastrow’s term. Never in the history of human experience has a chaotic explosion been observed producing an intricate order that operates purposefully. An explosion in a print shop does not produce an encyclopedia. A tornado sweeping through a junkyard does not assemble a Boeing 747. No building contractor dumps his materials on a vacant lot, attaches dynamite, and then waits for a completed home from the resulting bang. The idea is absurd. Evolutionist Donald Page was correct when he wrote: “There is no mechanism known as yet that would allow the Universe to begin in an arbitrary state and then evolve to its present highly ordered state” (1983, 40).

(2) If the universe started with an explosion, one would expect that all matter-energy should have been propelled radially from the explosion center—consistent with the principle of angular momentum. It would not be expected that the universe would be characterized by the curving and orbiting motions that are commonly observed, e.g., the revolution of our earth around the sun (cf. Morris 1984, 150).

(3) For years scientists have been attempting to measure the microwave radiation that is coming in from all parts of the universe. It is conjectured that this radiation is the left-over heat from the original big bang. The problem is, wherever this radiation has been measured, it has been found to be extremely uniform, which does not harmonize with the fact that the universe itself is not uniform; rather, it is “clumpy,” i.e., composed of intermittent galaxies and voids. If the big bang theory were true, there should be a correlation between the material composition of the universe (since everything emits thermal heat) and the corresponding radiation temperature. But such is not the case.

Over the past few years, the news media have made much of the report that new measurements of background radiation reveal some variation. The press has hailed this as proof of the big bang. The facts are:

(1) The temperature differential supposedly detected was only about thirty millionths of one degree, and there are other possible explanations for this circumstance apart from the hypothetical bang.

(2) Some of the scientists involved in the project question whether the instruments employed for measuring the radiation are sensitive enough to warrant the conclusions that are being drawn.

(3) Others, who claim that additional testing has confirmed their assertion of temperature “ripples,” confess now that it is “harder than ever” to explain “how these ripples grew into the starry structures that fill the universe” (Flam 1993, 31).

Even the respected science journal *Nature* suggested it is a “cause of some alarm” that the media have characterized this flimsy evidence as “proof” of the big bang (1992, 731). Why do some **religionists** gravitate to these groundless theories in deference to plain Bible statements?

We will not, at this point, discuss other flaws in the big bang hypothesis, but simply refer the reader to several other sources (Morris 1984, 149-151; Major 1991, 21-24; Morris 1992, d; Humphreys 1992, i-iv).

Fatal Compromises

It is to be expected, of course, when “science” announces some amazing new “discovery,” which purportedly supports its view of the origin of the universe, that liberal religionists will jump on the band wagon—in this case the “bang” wagon—affirming that such is consistent with the Genesis record. When the big bang theory was first heralded, Pope Pius XII wrote that “scientists are beginning to find the finger of God in the creation of the universe.” More recently (1990), Gerald L. Schroeder, an Israeli nuclear physicist, wrote a book titled, *Genesis and the Big Bang*. Therein he contended that there is no contradiction between the biblical account of creation and the current big bang theory (see Ostling 1992, 42-43).

In addition to Clayton (cited above), Arlie Hoover, a professor at Abilene Christian University, has argued similarly:

It is entirely possible, though not at all firmly established, that God used a big bang as His method of creation. You cannot affirm it as a certainty, but neither can you deny it apodictically. Because the Bible does not specify how God did it, we are left to choose the hypothesis that seems to have the best supporting material . . . nothing in the biblical doctrine excludes the big bang (1992, 34, 35).

In an incredible display of illogical meandering, the professor attempted to show why it is possible to accept both the big bang concept and the Genesis account. He suggested, for example, that the question, “Where did I come from?” can be answered a number of correct ways: from God, from mother’s womb, from a hospital, etc. Similarly, he says, one might suggest that the universe came both from God and the big bang. The problem with this line of argument is this: In Hoover’s illustration, each of the possible answers—God, mother, hospital—can be supported with evidence. In the matter of the big bang, this alleged “cause” has not been proved. It is just that simple. But let us go back for a moment to the “Where did I come from?” question. Suppose one responded in this way: “From God. From the hospital. From the stork!” Is each of these answers equally valid? If not, where is the flaw?

The Bible versus the Big Bang

Are the Bible and the big bang theory in agreement? No. And informed persons, on both sides of the issue are aware of this fact. Paul Steidl, an astronomer, has noted:

[N]o astronomers would ever think of the big bang as the creation event of Genesis. The big bang was invented specifically for the purpose of doing away with the creation event. An astronomer would laugh at the naivety of anyone who chose to equate the two events (1979, 197).

Evolutionist Paul Davies, in a discussion of the big bang, says that this theory of origins “differs greatly in detail from the biblical version.” He then quotes Ernan McMullin of Notre Dame University:

What one cannot say is, first, that the Christian doctrine of creation “supports” the Big Bang model, or second, that the Big Bang model “supports” the doctrine of creation (1983, 17-20).

The fact is, there are significant contradictions between the big bang theory and the Bible record. Let us reflect on some of these:

- (1) As noted earlier, the Bible plainly teaches that the entire universe, including the earth with its various “kinds” of biological organisms, came into being during the six, literal days of the creation week (Genesis 1; Exodus 20:11). The big bang theory postulates eons of time.
- (2) Some, of course, contend that there may have been a vast “gap” between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2, thus accommodating the alleged time involved in the expansion and development of the universe following the big bang.
- (3) It is argued that the “days” of Genesis 1 were not literal days.
- (4) And perhaps there were “gaps” between the days of the creation week, etc.

But none of these twisted theories has an ounce of credibility if one seriously considers that God has communicated the historical record in an understandable fashion through his inspired word. Each of the theories mentioned above is designed to bring the Bible into harmony with evolutionary chronology. (For further study see Jackson 2003.)

The big bang myth allows that the sun was formed long before the earth. Various theories have been formulated to explain how the universe came to be organized after the initial explosion. Take your choice: the planetesimal theory, the nebular theory, the dust cloud theory. They all have one thing in common—they assert that the earth is a new-comer compared to the sun. However, the Bible teaches that the earth was created **first**, and the sun came later—on the fourth day of the first week (Genesis 1:1, 14-16). The same point can be made regarding the stars. The Bible puts them **after** the earth; the evolutionary model teaches otherwise. Of course some have attempted to solve this difficulty with yet another slippery compromise. They allege that the “creative acts” of Genesis 1 are not necessarily “in chronological order” (Willis 1979, 92).

The big bang theory supposes that the universe started with a chaotic explosion which then proceeded toward order. The Bible teaches the exact opposite. God created the universe as a beautiful and orderly masterpiece, but it has been degenerating toward disorder in the intervening millennia (Psalm 102:25ff; Hebrews 1:10-12).

Big bang cosmology postulates a universe that is nearly twenty billion years old, with the human race evolving only three or four million years ago. According to this view, a vast period of time separates the origin of the universe from that of mankind.

But the Scriptures affirm:

(1) The human family came into existence the same week as the universe (Genesis 1; Exodus 20:11). Man has thus existed from the beginning of the creation (Isaiah 40:21; Mark 10:6; Luke 11:50; Romans 1:20).

(2) Human antiquity extends to only a few thousand years before Christ, as evinced by the genealogical records of the Lord’s ancestry all the way back to Adam, the first man (1 Corinthians 15:45). There are some two millennia spanning the present back to Jesus Christ; another two thousand years push history back to the time of Abraham. There are only twenty generations between Abraham and Adam (Luke 3:23-38). Even if one concedes that some minor gaps exist in the Old Testament narrative (cf. Genesis 11:12; Luke 3:35-36), surely no responsible Bible student will contend that twenty billion years can be squeezed into those twenty generations. The universe thus cannot be billions of years old.

Big bang chronology and biblical chronology are woefully at variance.

Conclusion

The big bang theory is without validity. It has the support of neither genuine science nor responsible biblical exegesis. For once we agree with several evolutionists who admit: “Cosmology is unique in science in that it is a very large intellectual edifice based on very few facts” (Arp et al. 1990, 812).

In view of that, it can hardly be classified as “science.”