

PROGRESSIVE CREATIONISM

INTRODUCTION

Evangelical Christians normally believe one of two different viewpoints on the age of the earth, whether billions of years or under 10,000 years. The “old earth” view is generally held by those identified with *theistic evolution*, *progressive [or process] creation*, and “*gap-theory*”¹ creation. There is considerable variation within each of the three camps and some overlap between them. However, most folk in each camp have been influenced to accept generally the geological timetable of evolutionary theory. Those who accept the “young-earth”, or “recent creation” position tend to read the Bible using a more consistently literal approach than the theistic evolution or progressive creation people. This paper affirms the view of a *young earth* or *recent creation*² in six 24-hour days (Ex. 20:11). In the following pages, a case will be made to justify this view of creation.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND BIBLICAL AUTHORITY

The necessity for this clarification of the biblical teaching of creation is due to past developments and present trends within “evangelical” Christianity. Historically, “terms such as ‘evangelical,’ ‘conservative,’ and ‘fundamentalist’ were used synonymously until into the 1940s. The evangelical movement was a cohesive group until the teaching of theistic evolution and other issues shattered that unity.”³ And how did this evangelical shift come to pass?

No doubt it is rooted partly in “neo-evangelicalism” which also came on the scene in the 1940s. It was clear from the outset that neo-evangelicalism “differed from fundamentalism in its repudiation of separatism [from liberals] and its determination to engage itself in the theological dialogue of the day... [Also emphasized was] its reexamination of theological problems such as the antiquity of man, the universality of the flood, God’s method of creation, and others.”⁴ Then, too, within neo-evangelicalism there was a deliberate shift away from dispensational premillennialism with its more *literal* hermeneutic to accommodate for those evangelicals who embraced the more non-literal amillennialism of covenant theology.⁵

Through dialogue with unbelieving liberals, many influential evangelicals have moved away

¹ According to the “gap-theory,” Genesis 1:1 describes the initial creation of the universe. Then a global disaster destroyed all life on Earth and left a vast fossil graveyard everywhere. This disaster is thought to have occurred as a result of the rebellion of Satan and his angels against their Creator in Heaven, with God then casting them out of Heaven to the earth. Those who advocate the “gap-theory” agree that the six days of the creation week were literal days, but they interpret them only as days of recreation, with God creating again many of the kinds of animals and plants destroyed in the disaster. Answers in Genesis lists 5 different variations of the “gap-theory.” Many of these variations do not support an evolutionary model.

² This position on creation is evident in Trevor McIlwain and Nancy Everson, *Firm Foundations, Creation to Christ*, (pp.129-155).

³ John D. Hannah, “A Review of The Incredible Scofield and His Book,” *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July 1990, 363. [Hannah is/was the Chairman and Professor of Historical Theology at Dallas Theological Seminary].

⁴ Harold J. Ockenga, “Foreword,” Harold Lindsell, *The Battle For The Bible*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976).

⁵ Regarding this shift from premillennialism toward amillennialism see Lindsell, *The Battle For The Bible*, 112, 116.

from the doctrine of “biblical inerrancy”⁶ particularly in what some were calling “non-revelational”⁷ portions of Scripture having to do, not with “matters that make men wise unto salvation” but with history, the sciences, and the like. Such matters as “the antiquity of man, the universality of the flood, [and] God’s method of creation” were especially given much attention. By 1976 it could be stated that: “More and more organizations and individuals historically committed to an infallible Scripture have been embracing and propagating the view that the Bible has errors in it. This movement away from the historic standpoint has been most noticeable among those often labeled neo-evangelicals.”⁸ An example applicable to this paper is the statement of a prominent theistic evolution leader who wrote: “The Bible gives redemptive truth through the scientific thoughts of the time without ever intending that those scientific thoughts should be believed as inerrant... It does not correct the errant science of the times in which it was written, but rather incorporates that pre-scientific science in its redemptive message...”⁹

Many, even among those who claim to believe in biblical inerrancy, do not consistently use a literal historical-grammatical hermeneutic for biblical studies. This is especially true in the case of theistic evolution or progressive creation followers who believe that the “facts of nature may be likened to a sixty-seventh book of the Bible.” One such author states that “no contradiction between the facts of nature and the facts of the Bible is possible” and that “one revelation of God’s truth cannot be held as inferior or superior to another.”¹⁰ God has revealed Himself through general revelation or “facts of nature” (Ps. 19:1-4; Rom. 1:19-20) as well as special revelation or “facts of the Bible.” However, special revelation is superior to general revelation because of 1) supernatural Bible facts that contradict the “facts of nature,” and 2) “progressive revelation.”¹¹

THEISTIC EVOLUTION

Theistic evolution is an attempt to integrate creation and evolution. The theistic evolution worldview is based on the basic assumptions of evolutionary theory. It is an evolution over billions of years that “relies on [natural] processes that allow increases in organization from the simple to the complex, from nonlife to life, and from lower to higher forms of life... God used evolution as a means of creating.”¹² Theistic evolution has been defined as “the theory that God guided the [evolutionary] processes that produced all living beings from a few

⁶ Biblical inerrancy refers to the original inspired writings, neither copies nor translations of them. The beginnings of the continuing evangelical slide into biblical errancy has been carefully documented in Lindsell, *The Battle for the Bible* (1976) and H. Lindsell, *The Bible in the Balance* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1979).

⁷ Lindsell, *The Battle For The Bible*, 113ff.

⁸ Ibid., 20, 204.

⁹ Paul H. Seely, *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation* (first issue). Cited in Lindsell, *The Battle for the Bible*, 130.

¹⁰ Hugh Ross, *Creation and Time: A Biblical and Scientific Perspective of the Creation-Date Controversy* (Colorado Springs: NavPress, 1994), 55-58. The author states this even though he believes in Divine miracles, which are contrary to the facts of nature.

¹¹ The “facts of nature” in theistic evolution/progressive creation writings quite often include scientific theories that contradict, or take preference over, the Bible. And scientific theories continue to change, but the Word of God abides forever without any change (1 Pet. 1:23-25).

¹² Werner Gitt, *Creation Magazine*, Sept-Nov 1995, 49-51. www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c015.html

ancestors.”¹³ Earlier the same author stated that theistic evolution “assumes that all living things, including man, are biologically descended from a common ancestor.”¹⁴ “Theistic Evolutionists often reject the entire Creation account. For some, the only active role for God is that He started the ‘Big Bang’ and occasionally stepped in to supersede natural processes.”¹⁵ A leading progressive creation teacher writes: “If Theistic Evolutionism and Recent Creationism are on the left wing [more liberal] and the right wing [more conservative] of the evangelical spectrum respectively, Progressive Creationism is somewhere in the middle.”¹⁶ Some prominent Recent Creationists have identified progressive creation as one of “the semantic variants of the fundamental system of theistic evolution.”¹⁷ Since progressive creation is on the conservative side of the continuum and is having the greatest impact on “evangelicals,” the remaining portion of this paper will deal mostly with progressive creation.

PROGRESSIVE CREATION¹⁸

Progressive Creation adherents believe that God has created the universe, including the world and everything in it, through progressive steps and natural processes. A basic tenet in Progressive Creation is this: Progressive Creation “attempts to delineate the immanence of God in His providential involvement in His Creation. Natural selection is viewed as one of the processes utilized by God in His creative activities... to bring forth the varieties of life forms in His creation... [Progressive Creation] posits that God is involved in His creation in a dynamic way by shaping the variation of the biological world through mechanisms such as natural selection...¹⁹ Progressive Creation “supports the foundational tenets of evolutionary science. ... [The more liberal among the Progressive Creation followers] picture God as doing relatively little in the way of actual creative acts during the supposed billions of years of creation. God simply steps in now and then, to create new life forms. The more conservative Progressive Creationists present God as doing many more creative miracles.”²⁰

Their differences largely depend on how they understand the doctrine of God’s “immanence,”²¹

¹³ Russell L. Mixter, “Three Views of Origins,” *Christian Life*, June 1981, p. 25. [For many years Mixter served as professor of zoology at Wheaton College and as editor of the *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation*, which he helped found. Although confessing to be a progressive creation man, “most [ASA] members are theistic evolutionists.” Carl F. Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority*, Vol. 6, 1983, 149.

¹⁴ Russell L. Mixter, “A Letter to President Edman, March 26, 1962,” *Bulletin of Wheaton College*, May 1962 Cited in Frederic R. Howe, “The Age of the Earth – Part 1: An Appraisal of Some Current Evangelical Positions,” *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan. 1985, 34.

¹⁵ Mark Van Bebber, “What is Progressive Creationism” www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-c009.html

¹⁶ Pattle P. T. Pun, “A Theology of Progressive Creationism,” for the Department of Biology, Wheaton College, IL www.wheaton.edu/biology/faculty/ppp/web/progtheo.html

¹⁷ Morris, Henry and John, *The Modern Creation Trilogy*, Vol.1 — *Scripture & Creation*, 41.

¹⁸ The first “progressive evolution” enthusiast to use the term “Progressive Creation” may have been Bernard Ramm in his book, *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954) 76.

¹⁹ Pun, “A Theology of Progressive Creationism.” www.wheaton.edu/biology/faculty/ppp/web/progtheo.html

²⁰ Van Bebber, “What is Progressive Creationism?”

²¹ “In contemporary theology immanentism is most commonly discernible in the writings of those who... maintain that God’s activity takes place solely within the normal course of nature and that his ‘creative’ operations are discernible in the natural development of new organic forms in the supposed evolutionary process...” *Baker’s Dictionary of Theology*, 280.

the Darwinian notion of “natural selection”²² and what God’s part has been in so-called “stellar evolution.” “Although there is little widespread agreement among Progressive Creationists, they generally believe the following:

1. The ‘Big Bang’ is interpreted as God’s way of producing stars and galaxies through billions of years of natural processes.
2. The Earth and universe are billions of years old.
3. The days of Creation were overlapping periods of millions and billions of years.
4. Death and bloodshed have existed from the very beginning of Creation and were not the result of Adam’s sin. Man was created after the vast majority of earth’s history of life and death had already taken place.
5. The flood of Noah was local, not global and it had little effect on the Earth’s geology which represents billions of years of history.”²³ [The following will contrast the Recent Creation View with the Progressive Creation View in each of these five areas.]

1. THE BIG BANG

Progressive Creation View: A leading progressive creation enthusiast considers Genesis 1:1 to be “the most eloquent statement of the big bang ever penned.” He pictures the big bang as “a carefully controlled burst of matter, energy, space and time from a reality which exists beyond... the hand of the transcendent God of the Bible.”²⁴ This big bang is supposed to have happened billions of years ago. God has also used, and is using, evolutionary processes in the formation of the stars and galaxies. For instance, the same author stated, “This entire process of stellar evolution is by natural process alone” without “Divine intervention at any stage.”²⁵ Regarding “the initial evolution of the solar system,” he wrote, “The solar system began as a giant interstellar cloud. Then it collapsed into a flattened disk. Then separated into a series of concentric rings that eventually coalesced into proto planets.”²⁶ [Facts of nature?]

Recent Creation View: This view does not accept the notion that God created His orderly universe through natural or evolutionary processes that started with the so-called “big bang” billions of years ago. If there was some kind of a “bang” when God spoke the universe into existence, it was not the kind described in most of the theistic creationism/Progressive Creation teaching.

²² “Natural selection is the increase in succeeding generations of the [inherited] traits of those organisms that leave more offspring... The nature of the population gradually changes as more and more individuals with those traits appear.” Raven and Johnson, *Understanding Biology* (third edition), 1995, 14. However “as a screening device for eliminating the unfit, natural selection is a valid concept... for preventing harmful mutations from effecting and even destroying the entire species. And that is all it does.” Morris, *The Modern Creation Trilogy, Vol. 2, Science & Creation*, 34, 35. [Certainly there is “horizontal variation” within different created “kinds” of organisms.]

²³ Van Bebber, “What is Progressive Creationism?”

²⁴ H. Ross, “Big Bang Breakthrough: Ripples Reach Headlines,” *Facts & Faith*, Second Quarter, 1992. [Most quotes are from the writings of Ross since he is probably the most prominent promoter of Progressive Creationism].

²⁵ H. Ross, quoted in Van Bebber / Taylor, *Creation and Time, A Report on the Progressive Creationists Book by Hugh Ross*, 61.

²⁶ H. Ross, *Genesis 1: A Scientific Perspective, Revised Edition*, 1983, 11. Cited in J. Stambaugh, *ICR Impact*, Aug. 1991.

2. THE AGE OF THE UNIVERSE AND EARTH

Progressive Creation View: Most Progressive Creation followers believe that “it’s really impossible to interpret the universe without accepting a creation date billions of years ago.”²⁷ They consider the universe to be about 15-20 billion years old and the earth to be about 4-5 billion years old. They reckon it would take that long before the earth would be prepared for the creation of living organisms culminating in man himself. Many believe that only “recently” starting “about 2 to 4 million years [or at least 1 million years] ago God began creating man-like mammals,”²⁸ and that “bipedal, tool-using, large brained hominids roamed the earth at least as long ago as one million years...”²⁹

Recent Creation View: It seems that such statements are mostly based on evolutionary assumptions. In contrast, the Recent Creation view teaches that: “In the beginning [not much more than 6-7000 years ago, our triune] God created the heavens and the earth.” He used nothing but His spoken Word. Christ Himself, our creator, referred to our first parents’ creation by declaring that it was “from the beginning of the creation, [not billions of years after the beginning of the creation, that] God made them male and female” (Gen.1:27; Mk.10:6). Like every other created *kind*, God made them fully grown, or with a “superficial appearance of age.” After six days of creation “the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which He had made and rested [or ceased] ... from all His work” (Gen. 2:1, Heb. 4:4).

3. THE “DAYS” OF CREATION

Progressive Creation View: In most Progressive Creation teaching the days in Genesis 1 represent long ages (the “day-age” theory). It is claimed that “based on scientific dating records [facts of nature?], each of God’s creation days is several hundred millions years old.”³⁰ Many also believe that God’s creative activity took place during overlapping day-ages. One Progressive Creation assumption is that most stars were created “prior to the Creation week [when] approximately 10-15 billion years of stellar evolution occurred.”³¹ It is even thought possible that life may have been created “in the oceans before the events of the six creation days” when the Spirit brooded over the waters.³² And it is claimed that “the seventh day of the creation week carries on through the centuries,” until God’s creation of the new heavens and the new earth.³³

Recent Creation View: This view maintains that “*in* six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that *is* in them, and rested the seventh day; [and that’s why] ... the

²⁷ H. Ross, “Focus On The Family,” April 18, 1991. Cited in J. Stambaugh, *ICR Impact*, Aug. 1991.

²⁸ H. Ross, “Genesis One, Dinosaurs and Cavemen,” (audiotape), Pasadena, CA: Reasons to Believe, 1989. Cited in Van Bebbler/Taylor, *Creation and Time*, 51.

²⁹ H. Ross, *Fingerprint of God*, (Orange, CA: Promise Publishing, 1989), 160.

³⁰ H. Ross, *Genesis 1: A Scientific Perspective*, Revised Edition, 1983, 11. Cited in J. Stambaugh, *ICR Impact*, Aug. 1991.

³¹ Van Bebbler / Taylor, *Creation and Time*, 61 in reference to Ross, *Creation and Time*, 52 and *The Fingerprint of God*, 158-159, 165ff.

³² H. Ross, *Creation and Time*, 153.

³³ *Ibid.*, 49.

Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.” (Ex. 20:11).³⁴ Each time the word *day(s)* is used in this verse, it refers to a literal 24-hour day. At times the context makes clear that “*yom*” (Heb. day) is used to represent something other than the normal 24-hour day (i.e. Joel 2:1-2). However its use in Genesis 1 with ordinal number modifiers in the context of sequential chronological events along with the repeated phrase, “the evening and the morning” indicates that “day” represents the normal 24-hour time period. In Genesis 1:14 both *days* and *years* are used as time markers based on earth’s rotations. Therefore, the day-age theory does not line up with a literal account of the creation record. Likewise, there are no Biblical genealogical gaps (Gen. 11:12; Matt 1:8) that can be stretched to include thousands or millions of years.

4. DEATH AND DECAY BEFORE ADAM

Progressive Creation View: It is a Progressive Creation claim that: “While the sin we human beings commit causes us all naturally to react negatively to decay, work, physical death, pain, and suffering... there is nothing in Scripture that compels us to conclude that none of these entities existed before Adam’s first act of rebellion against God. On the other hand, God’s revelation through nature provides overwhelming evidence that all these aspects did exist for a long time period previous to God’s creating Adam.”³⁵ Progressive creationism followers generally believe that death “in the physical world was in existence before the Fall of man and it may not be the result of evil....” They would go on to say, “The fossil record is replete with carnivores who existed long before the appearance of man. God used natural selection to propagate those species most adapted to survive, thereby ensuring that the resources in His creation not suffer from depletion and that the population of the creatures remain under control. He has allowed natural selection to maintain a finely tuned ecological balance.”³⁶

Recent Creation View: At the end of the six days of creation “God saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good” (Gen. 1:31). There was no pain, no shedding of blood, no decay, no suffering and no death of either man or animals. Such things came into the created world only as the result of God’s judgment for man’s sin. Prior to this terrible curse both man and animals were vegetarian, not carnivorous (Gen. 1:29-30).³⁷ Apparently during the Millennium animals will again be herbivorous, not carnivorous (Isa. 11:6-9; 65:25).

The Bible says that “the life of the flesh is in the blood” (Lev. 17:11) which was not shed until God clothed Adam and Eve with “coats of skins” (Gen. 3:21) after they had fallen into sin. The “life” and “death” of edible plant life is of a totally different quality from that of animal and human life referred to in Scripture. Adam’s sin brought death into the world as God had promised (Gen. 2:17; Rom. 5:12). Adam at once died spiritually, but the process of his dying physically also affected him the rest of his life. Adam’s new sin nature was passed on to his posterity so they/we too all sin and suffer the effects of decay and death (Rom. 5:12). In fact the whole creation has been suffering from this curse and “bondage of corruption” (Rom.

³⁴ From the only portion of Scripture ever “written with the finger of God,” on “tables of stone” (Ex. 31:17-18).

³⁵ H. Ross, *Creation and Time*, 69.

³⁶ Pun, “A Theology of Progressive Creationism.”

³⁷ Man was not permitted to eat meat until after the flood in Noah’s day (Gen. 9:3).

8:19-23)³⁸ ever since the Fall and only because of the Fall.

5. THE UNIVERSAL FLOOD

Progressive Creation View: Most Progressive Creation advocates argue that there “is no geologic evidence for a worldwide flood in the era since man first appeared on the earth... [And even though the Bible] description of the flood does read as if the water covered the entire globe. [The author thinks that perhaps] ... the writer would have had no concept of *planet*, or *globe*. ‘The whole earth’ or ‘the face of the whole earth’ to an ancient might mean something like ‘from horizon to horizon.’ Or, ‘as far as anyone has ever ventured.’ The size and sphericity of the earth are relatively recent discoveries.”³⁹ Another, even though he claims to accept a “universal” flood of Noah’s day, for several reasons, states clearly, “...I conclude that the flood cannot be global.” He thinks that “the only place in the world where massive flooding has occurred since the advent of modern man is the region of Mesopotamia.”⁴⁰

Recent Creation View: The Genesis flood was “universal” or “global” because God said so. God made it clear to Noah, that because “all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth,” he would “destroy man from the face of the earth; both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air...” This would be accomplished by His sending “a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven” with the result that “everything that is in the earth shall die.” That’s why “the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth; and all the high hills, that were under the whole heaven, were covered. And all flesh died that moved upon the earth... and Noah only remained and they that were with him in the ark” (Gen. 6-7). This is an accurate, literal, God-inspired history of what actually happened. Jesus Himself declared that “...the flood destroyed them all” (Lk. 17:27). Peter makes it clear that only “eight souls” were saved when “the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished” (1 Pet. 3:20, 2 Pet. 3:6).

The rainbow is a token of an everlasting, unilateral, unconditional covenant that God made with “the earth” and Noah “and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth” that “the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh” (Gen. 9:9-17). God has kept His promise. Since that time, although there have been numerous and massive local floods with the loss of hundreds of thousands of lives, there has never been another global flood as in Noah’s time. Worldwide geological evidence supports the biblical evidence that the flood was a worldwide *catastrophe* that contradicts *uniformitarian* assumptions of evolutionary theory.

³⁸ Many scientists refer to this irreversible process as the Second Law of Thermodynamics, which has to do with an observed increase of entropy, “the measurement of molecular disorder” through natural processes. Entropy always decreases the availability of useful energy for work to maintain any natural orderly system. So everything runs down, deteriorates, decays, and dies. This universal law directly contradicts the myth of any so-called evolutionary process toward higher complexity. Even so, Hugh Ross stated that “the second Law of Thermodynamics has nothing to do with man’s sin.” Focus on the Family, April 18, 1991. Cited in J. Stambaugh, *ICR Impact*, Aug. 1991.

³⁹ Mal Scharer, <http://www.reasons.org/resources/faf/89q1rask.html>

⁴⁰ H. Ross, “The Waters of the Flood,” www.reasons.org/resources/faf/90q4faf/reason.htm

Answers In Genesis lists *Six Evidences for the Genesis Flood*:⁴¹

- 1) We find fossils of sea creatures in rock layers that cover all the continents.
- 2) We find extensive fossil “graveyards” and exquisitely preserved fossils.
- 3) We find rock layers that can be traced all the way across continents—even between continents—and physical features in those strata indicate they were deposited rapidly.
- 4) We find that the sediments in those widespread, rapidly deposited rock layers had to be eroded from distant sources and carried long distances by fast-moving water.
- 5) We find evidence of rapid erosion, or even of no erosion, between rock layers. Flat, knife-edge boundaries between rock layers indicate continuous deposition of one layer after another, with no time for erosion.
- 6) Rocks do not normally bend; they break because they are hard and brittle. But in many places we find whole sequences of strata that were bent without fracturing, indicating that all the rock layers were rapidly deposited and folded while still wet and pliable before final hardening.

In light of such evidence, there is no need for any believer to approach the Bible record thinking that it is either erroneous or needs to be reinterpreted allegorically or figuratively.

CONCLUSION

One writer expressed it well when he said: “The Bible does not purport to be a textbook of history, science, or mathematics; yet when the writers of Scripture spoke of matters embraced by these disciplines... they wrote what was true”⁴² because their writings were Divinely inspired. A recent creation has good support from both the biblical and the scientific evidence. Biblical revelation is a superior revelation to science or man’s understanding of nature. In situations where so called “science” disagrees with the Bible, it is better to put confidence in the Bible. The Recent Creation view upholds the doctrine of biblical inerrancy and takes the Word of God literally as it is read considering the normal use of language.

This paper has not discussed all the scientific evidence in support of the biblical evidence for a “young” universe and earth along with a universal flood in the time of Noah. However, “there are *now thousands of scientists* who believe in a recent six-day creation. There are also organizations of scientists who are young-earth creationists in at least ten different countries, as well as in many states in this country.”⁴³ And many of these scientists who are well-qualified to interpret the scientific evidence have documented their position in hundreds of publications. A few of these are included in the recommended reading that follows. But even without all the scientific evidence, the Bible clearly teaches special (or recent) creation rather than either theistic evolution or progressive creationism.

It is sobering to realize that the “seminaries and colleges of the so-called mainline denominations

⁴¹ <https://answersingenesis.org/the-flood/geologic-evidences-for-the-genesis-flood/>

⁴² H Lindsell, *The Battle For The Bible*, 31.

⁴³ H. Morris, “Old Earth Creationism,” *Back to Genesis*, April 1997. www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-100a.htm

have almost all capitulated to ‘theistic evolutionism,’ and most evangelical colleges and seminaries espouse ‘old-earth creationism,’ or what many call ‘progressive creationism.’”⁴⁴ And, since such schools are mission board “fishing ponds” for mission recruits, it would be wise to exercise much care in the processing and training of missionary applicants. The admonition of Colossians 2:8 aptly applies in considering these issues.

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

BOOKS:

- Henry and John Morris, *The Modern Creation Trilogy, Vol.1 — Scripture & Creation, Vol. 2 — Science & Creation, Vol.3 — Society & Creation*, (Green Forrest, AR: Master Books, 1996).
- Henry Morris and Gary Parker, *What is Creation Science?* Rev. Ed., (El Cajon, CA: Master Books, 1987).
- Henry Morris and John Whitcomb, *The Genesis Flood*, (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1968).
- John D. Morris, *The Young Earth*, (Colorado Springs, CO: Master Books, 1994).
- John Whitcomb, *The Early Earth*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1986).
- John Whitcomb, *The World that Perished*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988).
- Mark Van Bebber and Paul S. Taylor, *Creation and Time: A report on the Progressive Creationist book by Hugh Ross*, (Mesa, AZ: Eden Productions, 1994).

ARTICLES:

- Charles C. Ryrie, “The Bible and Evolution,” *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan. 1967, 66-78.
- D. H. Lane, “Special Creation or Evolution: No Middle Ground,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* (Jan.-Mar..1994): 11-31.
- D. H. Lane, “Theological Problems with Theistic Evolution,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* (April-June 1994): 155-174.
- Danny Faulkner, “[The Dubious Apologetics of Hugh Ross](#)”
- Frederic R. Howe, “The Age of the Earth-Part I: An Appraisal of Some Current Evangelical Positions,” *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan – Mar 1985, 23-37 and “The Age of the Earth...Part II: ...” April 1985, 114-128.
- Henry M. Morris, “The Influence of Evolution,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* (April-June 1972).
- Ken Ham, “[What’s wrong with ‘progressive creation?’](#)”
- Jonathan Sarfati, “[Refuting Compromise — A biblical and scientific refutation of ‘progressive creationism’ \(billions of years\) as popularized by astronomer Hugh Ross](#)”

⁴⁴ Henry M. Morris, “The Vital Importance of Believing in Recent Creation,” *Back to Genesis*, 138, June 2000. See also Morris’ article, “The Influence of Evolution” in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. 129, April 1972. Morris also states that Dr. Hugh Ross’ “teachings have been promoted not only by numerous leading churches and Christian colleges, but also by the Navigators, Campus Crusade for Christ, Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, the Gideons International, Ligonier Ministries, Focus on the Family, Trinity Broadcasting Network, and many others.” Morris, *The Modern Creation Trilogy, Society & Creation* Vol. 3, 193-194. “Theology and Philosophy Scholars” who work with Ross include Norman Geisler, Earl Radmacher, Don Richardson, J. P. Moreland, and Kenneth Samples. The last two are Professors at Talbot School of Theology.

WEB SITES:

- <https://answersingenesis.org/>
- <https://www.icr.org/>
- <https://creation.com/>
- <https://christiananswers.net/creation/home.html>
- <https://www.rae.org/>
- <https://www.trueorigin.org/>