

**Creation Science Rebuttals**  
**The Order of Creation**  
**Claim published in on Answers in**  
**Genesis, 4 April 2006**  
**Review By Greg Neyman**  
**© Old Earth Ministries (Answers In Creation)**



First Published 4 April 2006  
Answers In Creation Website

On 4 April 2006 Answers in Genesis author Terry Mortenson makes the argument that the order of the creation events is very important. He says that the order from evolution is contrary to the order presented in the Bible.<sup>1</sup>

I agree that the matter is important. If someone presents an order that is different than the Bible, then it should be discounted as false. However, the order via old earth creation, and some would argue, theistic evolution, is exactly the same as the order Mortenson presents here as his viewpoint. The order that he claims evolutionists believe only applies to atheistic evolution. If you interpret it correctly, though, theistic evolution, and the day-age view of progressive creation, is in perfect harmony with an inerrant, literal interpretation of Genesis. The problem is not the science...it is the Biblical interpretation.

At the beginning of this article, Mortenson lists many items in rapid fire succession, that he claims are proofs of a young earth. All of these have been discredited. However, these are not the main points in this article.

In a table in the middle of the page, Mortenson lists 23 items which he says are different when you consider evolution versus creation. Old earth theory solves them all.

Since each day is millions (or billions) of years, they encompass many events within the creation story. Looking at Day Three, the creation of plants, Mortenson claims that sea creatures come before plants in the evolutionary record. He is correct in this when referring to atheistic evolution, but not theistic evolution. Day Three does not address a time frame, a set amount of time...it denotes an event, the creation of plants. Day Three encompasses the creation of all plants. We see new plants throughout the fossil record, indicating God was active creating plants

over a period of 3.8 billion years. As such, Day three started 3.8 billion years ago, and continued concurrently with the following Days four, five, and six. This is called "creation overlap." You can still maintain this, while using a literal interpretation of Genesis. The main objection, of course, is the word "YOM" which is translated day. It can be interpreted as long ages without any negative implications to the Bible...in fact, in many locations in the Old Testament, it was translated many different ways, from "12 hours" all the way to "eternity." For more, see Word Study: Yom.

In case you are wondering, the first evidence we have in the fossil record is indirect evidence of simple algae, which is photosynthetic...a plant. These remained the main life form on the planet for three billion years, as they contributed to the "oxygenation" of the planet, to prepare it for further life.

Using creation overlap, this eliminates all the plant arguments. All the animal arguments are also eliminated. For instance, the events of Days Five and Six can run concurrently without any theological issues.

Other arguments disappear for other reasons. The first, the "sun before the earth" according to evolution, and "earth before sun" in Genesis, is a frame of reference issue. The observer of the creation account, in Genesis 1:1, gives his frame of reference...the observer is standing on the face of the earth. In a primordial earth, there were many gases, obscuring the sight of the stars, the sun, and the moon. When God said "Let there be light," light was visible for the first time on the surface, through these gases. While the gases cleared, God worked the shape of the continents (Day Two), and the first life forms appeared (the algae) on Day Three. Finally, after 700 million years of atmospheric development, the sun, moon, and stars could finally be observed first-hand.

This argument fits the standard understanding of planetary evolution, and it fits the Bible, using the overlapping days theory.

Another issue is the thorns issue. Mortenson erroneously interprets that thorns were created after Adam. The creation events ended with the creation of Adam and Eve, and God entered into His rest. Look at the verse in question, Genesis 3:18:

*Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee, and thou shalt eat the herb of the field;*

God said that when Adam planted a crop, it would bring forth thorns and thistles. We know that the Garden of Eden, where Adam was, was a special place, separate from the rest of the world (Gen. 2:8–9). Perhaps there were no thorns or thistles there. Now that Adam was being kicked out, he was exposed to these thorns and thistles. But one thing we know with 100 percent certainty...God was finished with creation prior to Adam's sin, and He did not start creating again, with the thorns and thistles.

After the chart, Mortenson shows a picture, with the days contrasted. Interestingly, he shows Day Three, the creation of plants, as a bright, sun-filled day...and then shows the sun being created in the Day Four picture...oops.

One thing that is of interest is that Mortenson claims the world has been flooded twice. It was flooded during Noah's day, but also during the first two days of creation, before dry land appeared. This is something that old earth creationists need to think about, as there are three solutions to this creation-week flood.

When it comes to planetary formation, much is not known. After all, we have never seen a planet form! There are competing theories, and I don't have access to all the journals to provide a definite answer. With that said, on to the solutions. In solution number one, the primordial earth, according to some, would have been a very volcanic place, with much lava, as pictured by Mortenson in his first picture. The Hebrew word for water in Genesis 1:2 clearly means water in Hebrew. The water, and the lava, do share a connection in that they are both liquid, thus one could say it was lava. (The word lava (and volcano) do not appear in the Old Testament in the King James Version). I do not know if there was an ancient Hebrew word for lava, so the author may have chosen the best word he could.

In solution number two...here is Genesis 1:2;

*And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God moved upon the waters.*

Please keep in mind that Genesis is written from the point of view of a person standing on the surface. However, at this point in Genesis 1:2, light had not been created (was not visible). This occurred in the next verse. Thus, the observer is observing nothing but darkness. However, there is the sound of the lava, even though the medium that carries the sound waves, our atmosphere, was mostly gasses other than oxygen. The sound of a molten sea of lava could give you a sound similar to an ocean...or a boiling pot of water, if it was releasing more gases. Thus, the observer could not see the waters...but he could hear the liquid.

The third option is from Dr. Hugh Ross of Reasons to Believe. Apparently, some planetary models have an earth with a global water coverage, which would match Genesis 1:2. At the end of Mortenson's article he gives a quote from a secular book, showing the evolutionary belief that the young earth was a molten earth. Mortenson contrasts this with the claim that Hugh Ross, in his debate on the John Ankerberg Show, said the earth begins with water over the whole surface. He says "Dr. Ross is simply wrong."

The view of Dr. Ross can be read in his book *The Genesis Question*, on pages 23–27. As far as the initial earth being covered in water, Ross gives sources, listed in footnotes 49 thru 51. Anyone with access to these sources should check them out. It is interesting that Mortenson claims that Ross is wrong, when Ross actually agrees with Mortenson that the early earth was covered in water. They are just off by a few billion years.

Which view is right? Given Ross' expertise, I would lean this way, but verify. It does appear to contradict the evolutionary model of a molten earth.

Of course, both could be right. After the earth's molten condition subsided, the water condensed/rose to the surface, and covered the planet. This view appears to be the best to take, but I leave that up to the reader to decide.

## Conclusion

Mortenson summarizes by saying that you cannot harmonize the Bible with millions of years without rearranging the text and moving verses around. Not true. All you have to do is understand it as the days of creation equaling creative events, and not a specific amount of time. You can do this, and still maintain inerrancy....with or without a belief in evolution.

Mortenson says "The Bible firmly resists any attempts to marry it with evolution and millions of years." No, the Bible does not resist this....young earth creationists who are dogmatic in their beliefs are the ones resisting. It is their interpretation of the Bible that is in question...not the Bible itself.

<sup>1</sup> Evolution vs. Creation; The Order of Events Matters!, published at [answersingenesis.org/docs2006/0404order.asp](http://answersingenesis.org/docs2006/0404order.asp)