

Theistic Evolution — Part 1

A Response to BioLogos' Theistic Evolution Teaching
Part 1 Our Beliefs Contrary to Evolution

OUTLINE:

INTRODUCTION

1. WE BELIEVE IN A YOUNG EARTH CREATION (YEC).
2. WE BELIEVE THAT EVOLUTION IS UNPROVEN THEORY, NOT TRUE FACT.
3. WE BELIEVE IN MICRO-EVOLUTION, BUT WE REJECT MACRO-EVOLUTION.
4. WE BELIEVE THAT GOD MIRACULOUSLY CREATED EVERYTHING.
5. WE BELIEVE IN CREATION BY DELIBERATE INTELLIGENT DESIGN.
6. WE BELIEVE IN CREATION WITH AN APPEARANCE OF AGE.

CONCLUSION

INTRODUCTION

Within this paper the reader will find the term “Our View” used to introduce a contrasting position to the BioLogos View which we believe to be in error. It should be understood that the term “Our View” is based on what we believe to be the biblical teaching.

We have recently written a paper on “The Rationale for Chronological Teaching in the Context of Animistic Worldviews.” We sensed this need in light of a recent emphasis by some “Free Grace” teachers on what some have labeled “a Crossless Gospel.” However, we believe the need is just as great for “The Rationale for Chronological Teaching in the Context of Evolutionistic Worldviews.” Many of us have been taught through our churches and our personal Bible study, that our omnipotent God miraculously created everything out of nothing, in six, literal days, just a few thousand years ago. But most of us have also been subjected to the idea of the billions-of-years evolution as taught through a school system devoted to the humanist religion.

Consequently, for the past few decades in western societies many of our evangelical people, churches and schools have been impacted by the timetable of geological evolutionism. The result has been the promotion of some form of Old-Earth creationism — either Progressive Creationism (PC) or Theistic Evolution (TE) — or, in some cases Intelligent Design (ID). About 10 years ago, when PC was getting increasingly popularized, partly through the ministry of Dr. Hugh Ross and his *Reasons to Believe* (RTB), we wrote a resource paper on PC. But now, there seems to be a current increase in the aggressive promotion of a somewhat new form of TE by very influential, “evangelical” scientists, pastors and biblical scholars identified with The BioLogos Foundation, founded by Dr. Francis Collins.¹ “BioLogos” is a new TE term coined and defined by Collins in his 2006 book, *The Language of God*. In his book, he devotes four chapters (7-10) to four different “Options,” each partially defined with a subtitle (within

¹ See Addenda #1 at the end of this paper for short biographical sketches of each BioLogos author whose quotes defending “evolution” appear in this paper.

parentheses). He strongly opposes the first three: [1] Ch. 7- Option 1: Atheism and Agnosticism (When Science Trumps Faith); [2] Ch. 8- Option 2: Creationism (When Faith Trumps Science); and [3] Ch. 9- Option 3: Intelligent Design [ID] (When Science Needs Divine Help). Then he climaxes his discussion with his own and only acceptable option in Chapter 10 — “Option 4: BioLogos (Science and Faith in Harmony).” BioLogos people often use less-offensive terms, such as science or nature, even though they mean evolution. The purpose for these terms is to make BioLogos very appealing to present day ecumenical evangelicals.

While still Executive Vice President of the BioLogos Foundation, the Nazarene professor, Dr. Karl Giberson, made these claims: “The BioLogos idea... gives us a chance to talk about evolution... BioLogos embraces theism... [and science] ... In embracing science we accept that the biological theory known as evolution is a reliable explanation for the development of the diversity of life on our planet... There has been no scientific discovery since Darwin — not one — which has suggested that evolution is not the best explanation for the origin of species.”² BioLogos writings give the impression that “Nothing in biology makes sense except in light of evolution.”³ Their official writings indicate their agreement with Dr. Collins that “[evolutionary] Science is the only reliable way to understand the natural world.”⁴ Although God is often referred to as Creator, it certainly seems like evolution is exalted for the creation of everything — either dead (such as sand, stone and stars) or living with cellular life (fungi, flora and fauna).

At the 1975 “Leadership Seminar” in Manila, Trevor McIlwain presented a “method of evangelism” which had proven effective in our church-planting ministry in the Philippine Islands. He, and other leaders there, referred to this as “A Chronological Approach to Evangelism and Church Planting.” By 1987, Trevor had developed the approach extensively for our missionaries by writing a nine-volume teaching series entitled *Building on Firm Foundations (BOFF)*. This led to the development, by Trevor McIlwain and Nancy Everson, of the more widely circulated 1991 book, *Firm Foundations — Creation to Christ (FFCC)*. The *Firm Foundations* chronological teaching is largely a literal view of inerrant Scripture, particularly Genesis 1-3, 6-9 and selected historical narratives from the Old and New Testaments of Holy Scripture. The *Firm Foundations* of both *BOFF* and *FFCC* include what Dr. Collins refers to as “Option 2: Creationism (When Faith Trumps Science).” And by science, Dr. Collins and his BioLogos colleagues mean evolution! And evolution is a “theory that all species developed from earlier forms,”⁵ having changed over time — a long, long time.

The term “chronological” also has to do with time. But we are NOT talking about multi-millions or billions of years. We believe that, when possible, Bible events should be taught as “arranged in order of time of occurrence.” We agree with Trevor who wrote “that the Scriptures were progressively revealed by God within the context and framework of history; and, therefore, the best way to teach divine truth in any culture is God’s way, within the chronological and historical framework of the Scriptures.”⁶ “The Chronological Approach to Evangelism and

² Drs. Giberson and Collins, *The Language of Science and Faith*, (InterVarsity Press) 2011, pp. 19-22. This first BioLogos book is written largely from articles already posted on the BioLogos Website. The purpose for this book is to show “how to understand evolution as the way that God created life.” p.114. After this, any quote from this book will be documented simply as “Giberson and Collins, *LSF*,” with a page number.

³ Giberson and Collins, *LSF*, p. 42. It is no wonder that Giberson has written a book entitled, *Saving Darwin...*

⁴ Dr. Francis Collins, *The Language of God, A Scientist Presents Evidence For Belief*, (Free Press) 2006, p. 6.

⁵ From, *Webster’s New World Mini Dictionary*.

⁶ Trevor McIlwain, *Building on Firm Foundations*, R. Sollis “Foreword,” v, 3rd printing, 1988.

church planting... lays a foundation for understanding the Gospel by beginning with the creation account in Genesis 1...⁷

This progression of events is important because in each historical dispensation, or divine economy, God has given us specific and varied instruction. Genesis contains significant historical events starting with the first day of God's creation, so that is where we start. In our *FFCC* teaching program, after Lesson 1 (on Biblical Inerrancy) and Lesson 2 (on Our Triune God), Lessons 3-12 (pp. 119-206) all have to do with the literal, 6-day, CREATION (including a literal Adam and Eve, their FALL, and the subsequent CURSE. However, BioLogos is serious and deliberate in their opposition to Young Earth Creationism (YEC) which is a big part of the firm foundation for our world-wide Chronological Teaching program.

1. WE BELIEVE IN A YOUNG EARTH CREATION (YEC).ⁱ

What does BioLogos think of YEC? They are convinced that "...belief in a young earth, is not scriptural and not an important belief."⁸ They have chosen to follow the many "biblical scholars who have studied the biblical languages and cultures [and] insist that the YEC interpretation of Genesis is not even close to what the text is saying."⁹

BioLogos View: BioLogos President, Dr. Darrel Falk (another Nazarene Professor), states that "[YEC] is the standard argument put forward by those who believe in a young earth created by God in six twenty-four hour days less than 10,000 years ago."¹⁰ That is true, but BioLogos makes it sound bad by stating that "Young earth creationism [YEC] insists on an ultra-literal¹¹ reading of Genesis [that] is neither consistent with the vast body of scientific data nor required by scripture."¹² "BioLogos respectfully proposes that YEC has taken an unnecessarily narrow view of Scripture. In the first place, we do not believe that YEC's interpretation of Genesis is correct."¹³ Dr. Collins speaks of our "insistence that every word of the Bible must be taken literally...."¹⁴ Dr. Falk even claims that "YEC runs into trouble with modern science... [and] smacks of a God who is deceptive"¹⁵ and "the YEC perspective is the equivalent of insisting that two plus two is really not equal to four."¹⁶ Dr. Collins seems to believe that YEC is "built on a foundation of lies about nature" with confidence in "this image of God as a cosmic trickster" or

⁷ From the "Edit 11/22/95" file on "Statement on The Chronological Approach to Evangelism." This statement may have been written by Dr. Donald Pederson who was in leadership in our Research and Planning Department. Don has also written another excellent "rationale" article published in the *International Journal of Frontier Missions (IJFM)*, Vol. 14:4. Oct.-Dec. 1997) entitled, "Biblical Narrative as an Agent for Worldview Change." See http://www.ijfm.org/PDFs_IJFM/14_4_PDFs/03_Pederson.pdf .

⁸ Giberson and Collins, *LSF*, p. 152.

⁹ Giberson and Collins, *LSF*, p. 69.

¹⁰ Falk, "On Living in the Middle," Posted 6/24/10. <http://biologos.org/blog/on-living-in-the-middle>,

¹¹ The ultra-literal tag possibly comes from Dr. Collin's book, *The Language of God*, pp. 174-175).

¹² Collins, "With All Your Mind," *Sojourners Magazine*, Aug. 2009.

¹² Collins, *The Language of God*, p. 175.

¹³ Giberson and Collins, *LSF*, p. 69; Collins, *The Language of God*, p. 175.

¹⁴ Collins, *The Language of God*, p. 175.

¹⁵ Possibly because YEC groups believe that God created everything with an appearance of age. See Falk, "On Living in the Middle," <http://biologos.org/blog/on-living-in-the-middle>

¹⁶ Collins, *The Language of God*, p.174.

“the great deceiver... Young Earth Creationism has reached a point of intellectual bankruptcy, both in its science and in its theology.”¹⁷

So, in BioLogos thinking, how old is planet Earth and the universe? BioLogos scholars claim that a “mountain of scientific data supports the idea that the earth is around 4.5 billion years old... and the universe... about fourteen billion years old.”¹⁸ In fact BioLogos scholars, in agreement with Dr. Collins, claim, “We now know that the universe is approximately 14 billion years old.”¹⁹ But when, where, and how has God been involved in creation all this time? Supposedly BioLogos is and has the answer! We are a YEC mission, in this sense, we must be among those who have chosen what Dr. Daniel Harrell, a pastor from Minnesota, has labeled, “Option #1,”²⁰ which BioLogos opposes as “not tenable.” Pastor Harrell’s Option #1 is YEC.

Why does BioLogos exist? Dr. Darrel Falk makes it clear: “BioLogos exists in no small part to marginalize this [YEC] view from the Church. A fundamental part of our mission is to show that Option #1 is not tenable. Daniel Harrell knows this. [In fact,] all members of the BioLogos community know this. And the leaders of powerful young earth organizations like Answers in Genesis [AiG], Institute for Creation Research [ICR], and Grace to You [J. F. MacArthur] know that BioLogos exists to show that Option #1 is not tenable... [BioLogos folk] are diametrically opposed to Option #1”²¹ With reference to AiG, Dr. Falk wrote that “we [BioLogos folk] are committed to countering this [YEC] movement... [of course] in a spirit of Christian love... The entire context of Harrell’s article—let alone the context of BioLogos’s hundreds of other posts—ought to make it clear that we do not believe Option #1 is viable...not in today’s world... None of us [BioLogos folk] would give Option #1 a moment of our time, except to contrast it with a position that we do believe is a viable option.”²² In “My take: Jesus would believe in evolution and so should you,” Dr. Giberson wrote that “Genesis... does not contain scientific ideas about the origin of the universe, the age of the earth or the development of life... We now know that the human race began millions of years ago in Africa — not thousands of years ago in the Middle East, as the story in Genesis suggests.”²³ Apparently, anyone identified with BioLogos must also be in opposition to all YEC organizations, including us.

Our View: Our publications (*BOFF*, *FFCC*, and the Resource paper on Progressive Creationism) have all clearly identified us as a YEC mission — at least in substance, if not by name. Our whole chronological approach for evangelism is built on the firm foundation of God’s miraculous, glorious, historical, and literal creation of all things, with or without life, as indicated in Genesis 1:1- 27 and Exodus 20:11. In fact, “God was able to create everything in only six days because He is almighty.”²⁴ By “young” we mean less than 10,000 years. We acknowledge that

¹⁷ Collins, *The Language of God*, pp. 176-177.

¹⁸ Giberson and Collins, *LSF*, p. 53. See also p. 110.

¹⁹ Collins, *The Language of God*, p. 88.

²⁰ Dr Harrell’s options are not to be confused with Dr. Collins’ four Options. Harrell’s Option 1 (YEC) is identical to Dr. Collins’s “Option 2: Creationism.” See Dr. Daniel M. Harrell in Addenda #1.

²¹ Falk, “On Living in the Middle,” <http://biologos.org/blog/on-living-in-the-middle>

²² Falk, “On Living in the Middle,” Posted 6/24/10.

²³ <http://religion.blogs.cnn.com/2011/04/10/my-take-jesus-would-believe-in-evolution-and-so-should-you/>. This short article is all about BioLogos confidence in the so-called truth of evolution, our next (and 2nd) point.

²⁴ Donald Pederson, “Biblical Narrative as an Agent for Worldview Change,” *International Journal of Frontier Missions*, Vol. 14:4 Oct.-Dec. 1997, p.165. See http://www.ijfm.org/PDFs_IJFM/14_4_PDFs/03_Pederson.pdf

there are some apparent gaps in Biblical genealogies.²⁵ But we are firmly convinced that such gaps cannot be stretched into either millions or billions of years. By using the 10,000-years figure (instead of 6-7000 years, which is probably more accurate) we are giving much more time than is needed for any “apparent gaps.” Naturally, if “evolution is true,” as claimed by BioLogos folk, then we have been promoting gross and serious error during our entire existence. Although Trevor and we refer to evolution as an unproven theory, many, if not most, leaders identified with BioLogos believe evolution to be the major fact of science. In this sense, BioLogos is certainly much more than just a “think-tank!”

2. WE BELIEVE THAT EVOLUTION IS UNPROVEN THEORY, NOT TRUE FACT.

Evolution, described as a theory, often appears in BioLogos writings. But “the word ‘theory’ is not intended to convey uncertainty; “for that purpose a scientist would use the word, ‘hypothesis’.”²⁶ So what does BioLogos really believe? Just what is their doctrinal measuring rod? What is the “firm foundation” on which BioLogos builds?

BioLogos View: “BioLogos is most similar to Theistic Evolution [TE]... the belief that evolution is the way by which God created life... Darwinism is the scientific theory of evolution by natural selection. [But] BioLogos accepts that evolution is true, and sees God as the author of this process”²⁷ “Because the term evolution is sometimes associated with atheism, a better term for the belief in a God who chose to create the world by way of evolution is BioLogos.”²⁸ “BioLogos is...not a strictly scientific theory but rather a holistic explanatory scheme promoting the belief that evolution is a correct science, and that it effectively describes the method by which God created the panorama of life forms that makes the earth so interesting... Because BioLogos takes science seriously... we take biological evolution seriously... Ultimately, all the life that has ever existed on earth is descended from a single-celled life form that lived almost four billion years ago,”²⁹ apparently after about 10 billion years of stellar evolutionary history. BioLogos writers would generally say that “almost all Christian biologists accept evolution...”³⁰ However, Dr. Collins claims, “No serious biologist today doubts the theory of evolution to explain the marvelous complexity and diversity of life.”³¹ Yet, he certainly must know of many YEC and ID Biologists.

“BioLogos” is an ecumenical term depicting the supposed unity between science and faith. But what BioLogos people really mean is unity between evolution and faith. BioLogos rejects both Intelligent Design (ID) and Creationism because both “deny [that] the biological process of evolution by natural selection could account for the present complexity of life forms on Earth.”³² That’s why Dr. Collins speaks of Intelligent Design as “When Science Needs Divine Help.” In

²⁵ For instance: Matthew 1:8 states that Joram begot (or fathered) Uzziah. However, Joram actually begot Ahaziah, who begot Joash, who begot Amaziah, who begot Uzziah. The term, begot, sometimes indicates that a man is a more remote ancestor than simply “father.”

²⁶ Collins, *The Language of God*, p. 142.

²⁷ <http://biologos.org/questions>.

²⁸ <http://biologos.org/questions/biologos-id-creationism>

²⁹ Giberson and Collins, *LSF*, pp. 24, 30.

³⁰ Giberson and Collins, *LSF*, p. 30.

³¹ Collins, *The Language of God*, p 99.

³² <http://biologos.org/questions/biologos-id-creationism>

the minds of BioLogos folk evolution (so-called “science”) needs no divine help. Supposedly God’s creation is non-miraculous. Evolution is simply “change over time,” through purely natural processes/laws.

Dr. Collins, founder of BioLogos boldly claims: “[Evolutionary] Science is the only reliable way to understand the natural world.”³³ “There’s lots of stuff we [BioLogos folk] don’t agree upon. But we do agree upon [1] descent from a common ancestor, [2] gradual change over a long period of time, and [3] natural selection operating to produce the diversity of living species. There is no question that those are correct. Those are three cardinal pillars [or firm foundations for BioLogos] of Darwin’s theory that have been under-girded by data coming from multiple directions and they are not going to go away. Evolution is not a theory that is going to be discarded next week or next year or a hundred or a thousand years from now. It is true.”³⁴ “The evidence supporting evolution is overwhelming: Most scientists would now say Darwin’s theory is as well-established as gravity.”³⁵ “Evolution, as a mechanism, can be and must be true... Darwin’s framework of variation and natural selection is unquestionably correct.”³⁶

Giberson and Collins claim, “The evidence for macroevolution... proves common ancestry with a level of certainty comparable to the evidence that the earth goes around the sun.”³⁷ BioLogos claims: “Creationists have to ‘explain away’ a gigantic mountain range of evidence that the scientific community has accumulated in the past century.”³⁸ [How/Why is evolution a fact? And what is this mountain of evidence?] The “recent evidence from the mapping of genomes proves beyond the shadow of a doubt, that humans share a common ancestor with other primates. Presenting this new evidence effectively is important to help people make the transition.”³⁹ In other words, faced with this DNA, “mountain of evidence for evolution,” evangelicals can more easily make the transition to BioLogos TE from the “faulty thinking” of both ID and YEC.

Dr. Darrel Falk is thought to be “a courageous voice [because] he will come out and say that common ancestry is simply a fact. And that if you’re not willing to concede that the genetic evidence points to common ancestry then you’re essentially denying the field of biology the possibility of having facts at all... The evidence is overwhelming... especially because we have this ability now to use the study of DNA as a digital record of the way Darwin’s theory has played out over the course of long periods of time. Darwin could hardly have imagined that there would turn out to be such strong proof of his theory because he didn’t know about DNA — but we have that information. I would say we are as solid in claiming the truth of evolution as we are in claiming the truth of the germ theory.”⁴⁰ Giberson claims that “Jesus would believe evolution,

³³ Collins, *The Language of God*, p. 6.

³⁴ “Francis Collins and Karl Giberson Talk about Evolution and the Church,” Part 2, 3/12/2011. <http://biologos.org/blog/francis-collins-and-karl-giberson-talk-about-evolution-and-the-church-2>

³⁵ Francis Collins, “With All Your Mind,” *Sojourners Magazine*, Aug. 2009. <http://www.sojournal.net/index.cfm?action=magazine.article&issue=soj0908&article=with-all-your-mind>

³⁶ Collins, *The Language of God*, pp. 107, 141.

³⁷ Giberson and Collins, *LSF*, p. 49.

³⁸ K. Giberson, “Why I am not a creationist,” Oct. 21, 2008, Dr. Giberson was Vice-Pres. of BioLogos. <http://blog.beliefnet.com/blogologue/2008/10/karl-giberson-why-i-am-not-a-c.html>

³⁹ K. Giberson, “Crossing the Bridge” <http://biologos.org/blog/crossing-the-bridge/>

⁴⁰ See “Collins and Giberson Talk about Evolution and the Church, Part 2.”

of course. [And why is this so?] He cares for the Truth.”⁴¹ Evolution is the “firm foundation” on which BioLogos builds their claims.

Our View: In contrast, we desire to build our teaching program on the “firm foundation” of inerrant Scripture. *FFCC* correctly makes this statement: “Virtually everyone in our society has been told by the educational system, television programs, and the print media that evolution is an established fact and that only the naïve or uneducated question it. For the most part, evolution is assumed to be fact, not theory.”⁴² However, we remain firmly convinced (because of our view of Scripture) that any genomic similarities (homologies) between living organisms are a marvelous witness of only one, glorious, Master Designer of every living thing! Each species has a common designer (as manifested in DNA similarities), not a common ancestry.

And, of course, many species were created with common functional features (as also shown by DNA similarities), but not for common ancestry. And why was this? It was for common purposes, not a common ancestry! For example, God has miraculously and genetically programmed all organisms that have clasping hands with similar genetic DNA and RNA information to make such a skill possible. Naturally the similarities between the nucleic acids of both man and primates display amazing commonality. But such similarities are NO proof for evolution!⁴³ We believe that the DNA similarities simply prove the incredible wisdom of our common Master Designer who has created many creatures with thousands of common features (such as heart, liver, intestines, skin (or hides), bones, muscle, legs, eyes, ears, tongues, brains, hands, etc.) for common functions (such as pumping blood, breathing air, digesting food, protection, walking, seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling etc. etc.)

We believe that Answers in Genesis (AiG) is correct when they state, “Proponents of the evolutionary worldview expect everyone to accept evolution as fact. [But] This is a difficult case to make when the how, why, when, and where of evolutionary history are sharply contested or unknown by the scientists who insist evolution is a fact. Evolutionists often claim that creation is not scientific because of the unprovable assumptions that it is based on. The fact that evolution is based on its own set of unprovable, untestable, and unfalsifiable assumptions is often unrecognized in the scientific community.”⁴⁴ If, as BioLogos claims, evolution is truly a fact, then everything that is said or written against evolution must be FALSE! That makes this issue very, very, serious. And when BioLogos claims that evolution is a fact, they are NOT merely talking about microevolution or change within species. They are talking about Darwinian, “Origin of Species by Natural Selection.” And that is definitely macroevolution!

3. WE BELIEVE IN CHANGE WITHIN SPECIES, BUT NOT MACRO-EVOLUTION:

There is a huge difference: Change within species is not evolution, even though it is often referred to as Microevolution. For instance, we believe that on the sixth day of creation, God created the dog-kind of animal with all the DNA genetic information to reproduce only other kinds of dogs — never ducks, cats, or horses. There are very strict limits to variation that are

⁴¹ <http://evolutionarychristianity.com/blog/general/why-jesus-would-believe-in-evolution%E2%80%94and-you-should-too?>

⁴² *FFCC*, p. 129.

⁴³ Even if human DNA (with 3 billion nucleotides) were 96% identical with some primate, there would still be about 120 million base pair differences between them. That’s about 40 books of information.
<http://www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c018.html>

⁴⁴ <https://www.answersingenesis.org/evidence-against-evolution/biological-evolution/>

never crossed. No new information is ever added to the gene pool by mutation and natural selection. Macroevolution, sometimes called speciation, refers to change that leads to new species. And what does BioLogos believe about Macroevolution?

BioLogos View: BioLogos folk claim that “...the distinction between micro and macro evolution is arbitrary... The emergence of a new species through macroevolution, a process called speciation, involves nothing more than a long series of microevolutionary changes within a subgroup of a species”⁴⁵... “until those changes become significant enough that they prevent interbreeding within that species.”⁴⁶ [But has anyone even seen this happen? Not at all! And why not?] BioLogos claims, “Species change slowly, so these processes are, for practical purposes, invisible... Nevertheless we do have great confidence that all of today’s species have descended from ancestral forms that no longer exist.”⁴⁷ They go on by making this claim: “With enough time, macroevolutionary changes leading to speciation can occur... [But] Many still wonder why [after all these years] macroevolutionary changes have never been observed. The simple answer, as Darrel Falk puts it, is that “we haven’t been watching long enough”⁴⁸ Darwinian evolution is “Origin of species by natural selection.” Basically, that’s what BioLogos believes by “evolution.” It is evolution that leads to new species. It is speciation by natural selection. It is macro-evolution.⁴⁹

BioLogos claims: “We don’t observe such macroevolutionary changes because they take such a long time, often millions of years, and they leave very uneven records.”⁵⁰ [And do they not call this “science?”] Even so, the same authors write, “The evidence for macroevolution that has emerged in the past few years is now overwhelming. Virtually all geneticists consider that the evidence proves common ancestry with a level of certainty comparable to the evidence that the earth goes around the sun... Mountains of data arrive on a daily basis as more genomes are mapped, providing compelling evidence for macroevolution. This data, however, does not specify, by itself, how these changes occurred, when they occurred or how long they took. Other information is needed...”⁵¹ But we can be encouraged! “Science” has changed! We are now told that “we did not come from monkeys or any other presently existing species [of primates] ... The chimps are thus more like our distant cousins than our grandparents.”⁵² So much for our encouragement!

Our View: Macroevolution, which we reject, insists that all organisms on earth, including humans, share a common ancestor by descent with modification. We believe that most honest scientists would admit that “despite hundreds of years of observation, there has been no experimental proof of macroevolution. Scientists have only directly followed minor microevolutionary changes, and primarily within a single species, [such as] ... the variation of

⁴⁵ Giberson and Collins, *LSF*, p. 45-46.

⁴⁶ <http://biologos.org/questions/what-is-evolution>

⁴⁷ Giberson and Collins, *LSF*, p. 36.

⁴⁸ <http://biologos.org/questions/what-is-evolution/>. Is this a good example of evolutionary “science?” See Dr. Falk’s book, *Coming to Peace With Science...* p. 131.

⁴⁹ BioLogos also differs from RTB (Progressive Creationism) who also reject macroevolution.

⁵⁰ Giberson and Collins, *LSF*, p. 47.

⁵¹ Giberson and Collins, *LSF*, p. 49.

⁵² Giberson and Collins, *LSF*, p. 50. We used to be told that we came from monkeys and, to prove it, they even had pictures and charts showing the progress we have made over time.

finches' beaks in the Galapagos Islands..."⁵³ We do not believe that macroevolution simply "involves... a long series of microevolutionary changes within a subgroup of a species."

If macroevolution were actually true, then we should expect to see billions times billions of obvious and proven intermediate forms between species, either fossilized or still running around. But where in the world are they? Is there any solid, scientific proof that even one ever existed? But they say, "Evolution is slow!" In fact, cockroach fossils have supposedly been around for some 350 million years (150 million years, as claimed, before the first known dinosaurs). And they "remain in our world today in a nearly unchanged form... Mylacris species [fossilized] are nearly identical to living specimens found today."⁵⁴ Can any evolutionist provide us with even one organism where new information was added to DNA as observed by so-called "science?" Macroevolution is a myth!

4. WE BELIEVE THAT GOD HIMSELF MIRACULOUSLY CREATED EVERYTHING.

What's a miracle? A miracle is "An event that appears inexplicable by the laws of nature and so is held to be supernatural in origin or an act of God."⁵⁵ Do BioLogos scholars believe that God's creation by evolution was a miracle in any way?

BioLogos View: It is claimed that "BioLogos accepts the possibility of God-ordained miracles, of course, but looks for situations where no natural explanation could possibly apply, like the resurrection of Jesus Christ. We see no reason to insist that God must miraculously intervene to accomplish things, like the origin of species, [which certainly involves the origin of life in and for every single species] that God could just as well do by working through the laws of nature. BioLogos holds that God's creative activity is executed within the natural [not supernatural] order, working through and respecting the laws of nature."⁵⁶ This incredible claim is made: "BioLogos requires no miraculous events in its account of God's creative process, except for the origins of the natural [not supernatural] laws [involving evolution] guiding the process."⁵⁷ In other words, God's creative process "requires no miraculous events." Is such a statement Biblical?

Instead, BioLogos claims that "once life arose,⁵⁸ [about 4 billion years ago] the process of evolution and natural selection permitted the development of biological diversity and complexity," and "humans are part of this process." Moreover, "once evolution got under way, no special supernatural intervention was required."⁵⁹ Supposedly Life arose only after billions of years of evolution which is claimed to have started with the Big Bang 14 billion years ago. Are we to believe that neither the big bang nor the origin of life involved creative miracles?

Our View: The author of the BOFF series, clearly and correctly wrote to the glory of our Creator God, "The first account in Scripture of God's building work is when He created the heavens and

⁵³ <http://biologos.org/questions/what-is-evolution>

⁵⁴ <http://hubpages.com/hub/The-Fascinating-Truth-about-the-Worlds-Oldest-Pests-Cockroaches>

⁵⁵ From *The American Heritage Dictionary*.

⁵⁶ Giberson and Collins, *LSF*, pp. 71-72.

⁵⁷ <http://biologos.org/questions/evolution-and-divine-action/>

⁵⁸ But this makes no sense, if, as BioLogos claims: The origin of species, which must have involved the origin of life, did NOT occur by any miraculous intervention by God.

⁵⁹ Gingerich, "What role could God have in evolution?" <http://biologos.org/questions/evolution-and-divine-action/>

the earth. ‘By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth... For He spake and it was done; He commanded and it stood fast’ (Psalm 33:6, 9). God was the Creator Builder of all things, seen and unseen. Satan’s lie, the theory of evolution, foisted on foolish, unbelieving man, is contrary to the nature and character of God. Nothing is left to chance with God. He is always in full and complete control of all His works. Everything was created according to His perfect plan, and He declared that it was all good (Genesis 1:31).”⁶⁰

To say “the stars also” at the end of Genesis 1:16, seems like a huge, but glorious, understatement in light of Psalm 19:1: “the heavens declare the glory of God” — NOT the glory of stellar evolution. God simply but miraculously and instantly spoke the innumerable stars and galaxies into existence on the 4th day of creation. And we believe that each of every distinct plant and animal species, male or female, known or unknown, extinct or living, was a glorious MIRACLE OF CREATION by God Himself, who gave to each one its own unique DNA, and claimed it all to be GOOD. And He meant that! Everything we see and know about God’s incredible creation bears obvious witness of His awesome, supernatural, intelligent design — even though we know that all of creation has been devastated to some extent by the curse of Adam’s fall into sin. For instance, though negatively changed by the Fall, even the repugnant cockroach, like all other living creatures, still displays its incredibly complex intelligent design to the glory of our wonderful Lord and Savior (Rom 1:20) and NOT to the glory of 14 billion years of non-miraculous stellar and biological evolution.

5. WE BELIEVE IN CREATION BY DELIBERATE INTELLIGENT DESIGN:

Why does BioLogos despise Intelligent Design as much or more than Young Earth Creationism?

BioLogos View: Both YEC (or Creation Science) and ID are said to be “largely devoid of scientific content.”⁶¹ BioLogos rejects ID as “Science [That] Needs Divine Help” simply because of irreducible complexity. ID scholars (as well as YEC scientists) claim that evolution simply cannot account for the irreducible complexity that exists throughout God’s creation. BioLogos scientists would say, “Intelligent design, which the Discovery Institute promotes, claims evolution alone can’t account for certain complex biological structures. But this theory is bad science and bad theology.”⁶² “Intelligent design has this major fundamental flaw... it has no scientific strategy to demonstrate the correctness of its position because it’s implying divine supernatural intervention, which by definition science isn’t really able to establish.”⁶³ (We understand that some old-earth ID scientists still accept evolution in situations where irreducible complexity does not necessitate its use. This is why they are accused of using a “God of the Gaps” mentality).

[BioLogos scholars] are among those who “simply see overwhelming evidence that irreducibly complex structures and systems have developed gradually through natural, evolutionary processes... By itself, DNA can’t do anything—it just provides the information [“scissors and glue”] the cell needs to make proteins. [Thousands of] Proteins do all the mechanical work in the

⁶⁰ BOFF Vol. 1, p. 2, 3rd printing 1988. See also FFCC, p.3). FFCC 3-60 is from BOFF 1-130.

⁶¹ Giberson, *Saving Darwin...* p. 17.

⁶² Francis Collins, “With All Your Mind,” *Sojourners Magazine*, Aug. 2009

⁶³ Collins and Giberson, Part 4. <http://biologos.org/blog/reading-the-genesis-creation-accounts/>

cell, including interpreting the instructions in DNA,”⁶⁴ They even criticize God’s creation as evidence of poor design. This is illustrated by “the design of the [human] eye”, which is not “completely ideal,” and “similar imperfections of the human spine [which] is (not optimally designed for vertical support), wisdom teeth, and... the human appendix.” All these (and presumably other things) “seem to... defy the existence of truly intelligent planning of the human form.”⁶⁵

Our View: We would agree with ID scholars who claim, “that natural processes are insufficient to produce irreducible complexity.”⁶⁶ But we also believe that everything in God’s creation is incredibly complex and thus bears witness of intelligent design (ID). For many decades all creationists have believed and taught this. But we and most other creationists go farther than many of those scientists identified with the ID movement. We know, love, and worship the Intelligent Designer Himself, our Lord Jesus Christ. (Jn. 1:1-3). He is the Master Designer and Builder of everything created. But He is a whole lot more! He is our triune, infinite, eternal, omnipotent, omniscient, holy, perfect, righteous, loving Redeemer. Our Creator and Lord Jesus, bearing our sin and shame upon Himself, suffered crucifixion, bled, and died for us that we, by faith alone, are saved. Our citizenship is in Heaven. He alone is our only Hope of eternal life.

All scientists realize that in every living cell “Nucleic acids [DNA and RNA] are required to make [thousands of complex] proteins [which are huge, complicated chains of amino acids, all in certain orders and folded in unique ways]; whereas [all the] proteins are needed to make nucleic acids.”⁶⁷ You can’t have nucleic acids without the particular proteins needed to put them together. But you can’t have any of the proteins without the information provided by the nucleic acids. You simply can’t have one without the other! Both the incredibly complex nucleic acids and the incredibly complex proteins would have had to evolve together! But does any BioLogos scholar have any idea what the mathematical probability would be for all this to evolve in even the one “simple” cell of the smallest single-cell bacteria? And what difference would it make anyway? It seems that the “firm foundation” on which BioLogos TE is based is the absolute “truth of evolution” no matter what!

FFCC, p.144 quotes Dr. Michael Denton, who clearly states, “Molecular biology has shown that even the simplest of all living systems on earth today, bacterial cells, are exceedingly complex objects. Although the tiniest bacterial cells are incredibly small, weighing less than 10^{-12} gms, each is in effect a veritable microminiaturized factory containing thousands of exquisitely designed pieces of intricate molecular machinery, made up altogether of one hundred thousand million atoms, far more complicated than any machine built by man and absolutely without parallel in the non-living world.”⁶⁸ From the same book by Denton, (p. 334), we add this bit of information: “The capacity of DNA to store information vastly exceeds that of any other known system; it is so efficient that all the information needed to specify an organism as complex as man weighs less than a few thousand millionths of a gram.”

⁶⁴ <http://biologos.org/blog/behes-b-cell-bravado-part-2-why-irreducible-complexity-fails/>. See also Kathryn Applegate, “Part 2: Why Irreducible Complexity Fails,” posted June 29, 2010

⁶⁵ Collins, *The Language of God*, p. 191.

⁶⁶ <http://biologos.org/blog/behes-b-cell-bravado-part-2-why-irreducible-complexity-fails/>

⁶⁷ Andrew Scott, “Update on Genesis,” *New Scientist*, vol. 106 (5/02/85), p. 31.

⁶⁸ Dr. Michael Denton, *Evolution, a Theory in Crisis*, 1985, p. 250. Dr. Denton is a Senior Research Fellow in Human Genetics in the Biochemistry Department at the University of Otago in New Zealand. He is a non-Christian, molecular biologist.

According to AiG, Dr. Denton recognizes, for two main reasons, that Darwinian natural selection is “completely incapable of accounting for... the complex adaptations required by the tree of life”: First, the “essential bedrock of Darwinism” is the belief that “all the organisms which have existed throughout history were generated by the accumulation of entirely undirected mutations” [And] in Denton’s professional opinion, “that is an entirely unsubstantiated belief for which there is not the slightest evidence whatsoever.” Second, there are “a huge number of highly complex systems in nature which cannot be plausibly accounted for in terms of a gradual build-up of small random mutations. Indeed, he says, ‘in many cases there does not exist in the biological literature even an attempt to explain how these things have come about.’”⁶⁹ He then illustrates this with the example of the incredibly complex design of bird lungs. If BioLogos scholars would take Genesis 3:13-24 literally and seriously, they would understand something of God’s own curse on His “good” creation. We see and feel the effects of this terrible curse in “God’s Book of Nature.” It most certainly is NOT the result of God’s “bad design.” It’s the result of man’s terrible sin.⁷⁰

6. WE BELIEVE IN CREATION WITH AN APPEARANCE OF AGE.

Eggs come from birds and birds come from eggs. But in creation, which came first, birds or eggs? And in either case, would there not be creation with an appearance of age or history?

BioLogos View: BioLogos scholars apparently have trouble with this concept. One writes, “Idiosyncratic ‘theories’—actually hypotheses— such as the appearance of age, however, are not alternate scientific hypotheses but idiosyncratic assertions that are completely foreign to normal scientific explanation.”⁷¹ Whatever that means! Another writer states: “Apparent age is how some square a literal Genesis with scientific evidence. The problem is that creating with age makes God seem to be tricking us into thinking things are older than they are with no clear reason for doing so.”⁷² Dr. Darrel Falk writes that “the [ID] folks over at the Discovery Institute know that we [BioLogos] exist to remove ‘apparent age’ from the lexicon of evangelical Christianity. Such a view makes a mockery of the entire scientific enterprise and its ability to reveal truths about nature.”⁷³

Our View: It matters not to us whether Adam was created with a navel or not. — Or whether the fruit-bearing trees had growth rings or not. But we believe that Adam and everything else, was created with an appearance of age, maturity, and history. The fruit that he and Eve ate came from recently created trees which certainly had an appearance of age. In fact, “creation with no apparent history [or ‘without the appearance of age,’] is impossible.”⁷⁴ God created a mature Adam as though he had grown to manhood from a new-born infant with parents who likewise came from other parents. And in doing so, our infinitely, loving God neither tricked nor deceived anyone. He gloriously displayed “His eternal power and divine nature” so that men are left with

⁶⁹ “Blown Away by design, Michael Denton and Bird’s lungs,” Answers Magazine, AiG, Sept. 1999
<https://www.answersingenesis.org/evidence-for-creation/design-in-nature/blown-away-by-design/>

⁷⁰ We will say more about this so-called “bad design” in God’s creation that He Himself called, “good.” See: “The Rationale for Chronological Teaching in the Context of Evolutionary Worldviews, Part 3.”

⁷¹ Peter Enns, “Creating Adam” April 6, 2010, <http://biologos.org/blog/pauls-adam-part-4/>

⁷² D. Falk, “Rational Belief.” 5/19/2009. <http://blog.beliefnet.com/scienceandthesacred/2009/05/a-rational-belief.htm>

⁷³ D. Falk, “On Living in the Middle,” <http://biologos.org/blog/on-living-in-the-middle>

⁷⁴ John Morris, “Creation with the Appearance of Age.” <http://www.icr.org/article/5717/>

no excuse for their rejection of Him (Rom. 1:20). God simply created a “grown” chicken with the appearance of age, as though it had come from an egg which came from generations of previous chickens. God created grapes (probably hanging from grape vines) with an appearance of age as though they had come from previous generations of grape vines. Our all-mighty God created every living thing with an appearance of age. And Jesus showed us how He did it when he instantly changed the water to [aged] wine (Jn. 2), when he fed the five thousand with aged and cooked grain (Jn. 6) and when he raised from the dead the stinking body of Lazarus — with all its dead cells (Jn. 11)!

We believe that much of what we see in the heavens (such as exploding stars) and on the earth (such as dead fossils found in world-wide layers of soft material hardened into sedimentary stone) is NOT the result of creation with an appearance of age. For instance, the present earth marvelously displays the devastating and world-changing effects of three catastrophic events — all of which took place AFTER the creation week: First, the curse on all of creation for Lucifer and Adam’s rebellion and sin (Gen. 3:14-19; Rom. 8:18-25) lead to sickness, decay, disease and death; Second, a universal worldwide flood of Noah’s day (Gen 6-9) has resulted in the worldwide layers of sedimentary stone and soils containing billions of fossilized forms of plant and animal life (that display obvious catastrophic and instant death and burial)⁷⁵ and Third, the rebellion at the tower of Babel (Gen. 11:1-9) has led to the world-wide multi-lingual situation which in turn has led to multi-cultural distinctions, which led to obvious social, political, economic and military upheaval. And, of course, none of this was deceptively designed by God to prove that the earth was created with an appearance of age.

SUMMARY — PART 1

BioLogos scholars are convinced that God has written two books: one on science, the other on Scripture. Since God has written both books there is harmony between them. BioLogos is convinced that ignorance of this harmony has hindered evangelicals in their ecumenical pursuits. But the problem that many evangelicals have with BioLogos goals is their definition of “science.” In BioLogos language, “science” is often equated with “evolution.” A major purpose for the existence of the BioLogos Foundation is their firm conviction that evangelicals, particularly those who embrace a YEC position, must embrace evolution as legitimate and proven “science.”

We have highlighted only six major areas where BioLogos scholars share evolutionistic views that drastically differ with our views. They are these: 1) We are a Young Earth Creation (YEC) mission organization; 2) We believe in a miraculous creation of all things in earth and heaven; 3) We understand that evolution is an unproven theory, not a scientific fact; 4) We accept microevolution and reject macroevolution; 5) We accept an Intelligent Designer (Our Lord Jesus Christ) as the Creator of all things, knowing that evolution could never account for the irreducible complexity found in nature; and 6) We believe in a creation of all things with an appearance of age.

However, there are other differences that we will highlight in Part 2 (Re. the Bible in general) and Part 3 (Re. Genesis in particular). Part 2: All the differences we have with BioLogos doctrine are the result of Biblical issues like trustworthiness, inspiration, inerrancy, literality, authorship, and progressive revelation. Part 3 involves differences re. the historicity of Genesis, the big bang,

⁷⁵ We understand that 90% of all fossils are marine fossils. But dead fish don’t just lie around in the water waiting to be fossilized. They had to have been victims of a devastating, extremely rapid catastrophe like a flood or tsunami that caused their rapid burial before being consumed by other carnivores.

the origin of life, Adam and Eve, the Fall and the curse, the universal flood and linguistic confusion. We recognize dispensational distinctives because of God’s progressive revelation of Truth. We approach the Scripture literally because we believe the Biblical authors were inspired in their original writings by God the Holy Spirit. And we believe in Biblical inerrancy. So, it is no wonder that there is no real harmony between us and evolution... and between us and BioLogos!

Of course, we still have other related questions. Is BioLogos TE the sort of “insight” one gets by simply reading the Word of God? For instance: What did the original Big Bang and the later Origin of Life have to do with God’s non-miraculous creation using only natural laws? Since “humans are part of this evolutionary process” of BioLogos wisdom, what sort of creature was Adam? Was he a real person? And if not, how could Moses (Gen. 2:15ff), Luke (Lk. 3:18) and Paul (Rom. 5:14) be so deceived as to think that he was? Who wrote the Pentateuch, particularly Genesis? And when? And what about Adam’s parents, grandparents, great-grandparents, and great-great grandparents — etc.? Were they pre-Adamic Homos — (i.e. Homo-Neanderthal? Homo-erectus? Homo-sapiens?) Or, maybe, even Homo-divinus?⁷⁶ Who, if any among them, bore the image of God? And/or had souls? Which of Adam and Eve’s ancestors, if any, were saved? If not, will they be in Hell? Which ones had a free will? Were they accountable for anything? On what basis? And, even if the population on planet earth only doubled every thousand years or so, how many of these so-called hominids were living back in the days of the mythical or real “Adam”? Or in Noah’s time? And how many would be living today, particularly if, as BioLogos insists, there was never any universal flood in world history?

ADDENDUM #1—BIOLOGOS AUTHORS CITED IN THE QUOTES

(All listed authors are committed to BioLogos TE)

Dr. Kathryn Applegate — She received her PhD in computational cell biology” in 2010. Since February 2010, she has served The BioLogos Foundation as Program director and Web Site Development. She is a prolific writer of fiction for the younger generation.

Dr. Francis Collins is a physician and geneticist who served as Director of the International Human Genome Sequencing Consortium. In 2006 he wrote a best-seller entitled, *The Language of God: A Scientist Presents Evidence for Belief*. In November, ’07 he founded The BioLogos Foundation and served as its first President until he was nominated by President Obama to head the National Institutes of Health. With Dr. Karl Giberson as the main author, Collins co-authored the first BioLogos book, *The Language of Science and Faith*, 2011.

Dr. Gregg Davidson is a Professor in the Department of Geology and Geological Engineering at the University of Mississippi. Author of *When Faith and Science Collide: A Biblical Approach to Evaluating Evolution and the Age of the Earth*.

Dr. Peter Enns is currently Senior Fellow of Biblical Studies for The BioLogos Foundation and seems to be doing much of their writing. He served on the teaching staff at Westminster

⁷⁶ Homo divinus is a term used by Peter Enns but first coined in 1999 by Dr. John Stott who believed in ‘several forms of “pre-Adamic ‘homos’ [that] may have existed for thousands of years previously [to Adam, who] was the first homo divinus... made in the image of God.’

<https://biologos.org/common-questions/did-death-occur-before-the-fall>

<http://biologos.org/blog/saturday-sermon-genesis-1-called-to-full-humanity>

Theological Seminary from 1994 until his dismissal.⁷⁷ The publication of his liberal views expressed in his 2005 book, *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament*, led to his dismissal.⁷⁸

Dr. Darrel Falk, a biology professor at Point Loma Nazarene University in San Diego (since 1988), currently serves as President of The BioLogos Foundation. He is the author of *Coming to Peace with Science: Bridging the Worlds Between Faith and Biology*.

Dr. Karl Giberson served as a science professor at the Eastern Nazarene College. From early 2009 to May 2011 he served as Executive Vice President of The BioLogos Foundation. He has co-authored (with Dr. Collins) the “BioLogos” 2011, IVP book, *The Language of Science and Faith*.⁷⁹ He is also author of the book, *Saving Darwin, How to be a Christian and Believe in Evolution*. Most of his writings quoted in this paper were done as a BioLogos leader. Since May 2011 presumably He has been devoting his time primarily to writing. In fact, he has been serving as director of “the new science & religion writing program at Gordon College in Boston.”⁸⁰

Dr. Daniel M. Harrell is “Senior Minister of Colonial Church [Edina, Minn.] and author of *Nature’s Witness: How Evolution Can Inspire Faith*.”⁸¹ *Nature’s Witness* supposedly makes “the connection between faith and evolution comprehensible, authentic and less fearful.”

Dr. Jeff Schloss is the Distinguished Professor of Biology and director of the Center for Faith, Ethics, and the Life Sciences at Westmont College in Santa Barbara, CA. Dr. Schloss has been at Westmont since 1981. In 2006, he published *Wars and Rumors of Wars: Biological Science, Biblical Faith, and an Evolving Creation*.

Dr. Kenton Sparks “is professor of Biblical Studies at Eastern University and author of several books, including his latest: *God’s Word in Human Words: An Evangelical Appropriation of Critical Biblical Scholarship*, in which he argues that evangelical biblical scholarship has largely failed in not appropriating critical scholarship as it should. He often writes and lectures on “the perennial conflict between faith and science,” particularly as it relates to “the theological problems raised by evolution.”

Dr. Ken Wohlgenut is an Adjunct Professor at the University of Tulsa and a Petroleum Consultant teaching short courses on Petroleum Geology and ‘Geology for the Non-Geologist.’ He shares “the geology of God’s Creation with Christians in churches and seminaries.”⁸²

⁷⁷ It may be helpful to read Dr. Wayne Grudem’s 2008 letter to WTS leadership.

<http://greenbaggins.wordpress.com/2009/04/27/wayne-grudem-s-letter-regarding-pete-enns/>

⁷⁸ Even so, Collins and Giberson *LSF*, p. 224 give Enn’s book a “Good” rating and commendation,

⁷⁹ Dr. Giberson wrote “Our target audience is the evangelical church—the tens of millions of Bible-believing Christians who are prepared to engage contemporary science, rather than simply reject it. We were thus quite thrilled when... [a popular, evangelical Pastor] gave us this endorsement for the cover of the book: "... “This book is at the top of my recommendations both as an evaluation of theories of creation and as a devotional that prompts us to revere the Creator.” <http://biologos.org/blog/the-language-of-faith-and-science-a-brief-history>

⁸⁰ <http://biologos.org/blog/jerry-coynes-insufferable-argument>

⁸¹ <http://biologos.org/blog/the-biologos-foundations-theology-of-celebration-ii-workshop/CP2/>

⁸² <http://biologos.org/blog/author/wolgemuth-ken>

ADDENDUM #2 RECOMMENDED READING IN SUPPORT OF YEC

We readily acknowledge that we are neither theologians nor scientists. Yet we have strong convictions concerning YEC based on our views of Scripture and science. We are convinced that there are hundreds, if not thousands, of scientists who are fellow believers who share our convictions both 1) on the inerrancy of Scripture and 2) on the scientific support for a YEC position. And because of their view of Scripture we more readily trust their views on scientific matters. It's as simple as that! Therefore, we highly recommend that you contact AiG, ICR or some other similar organization for the scientific arguments used by well-qualified scientists supporting a YEC position. Hundreds, if not thousands, of excellent articles and books have been written by such men. And their writings are readily available on the Web. It's a good way to keep up with a more Biblical response to the latest "scientific discoveries" supposedly supporting evolutionary theories. We will list here a few websites, articles, or books that we highly recommend for your 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](#)"

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/>
-

END NOTES

ⁱ Most old earth creationists who oppose biological evolution believe in the gap-theory because they accept the geological evolution of a millions-of-years, old-earth, time-table. And obviously the fossil record of dead animals (including dead people), in the old-earth geological evolution involves millions of years of DEATH (human, and animal) prior to Adam’s fall (after the 6 days of creation). And yet the Bible clearly teaches that “through one man [Adam] sin entered the world and death through sin” (Rom. 5:12). And “death reigned from Adam until Moses” (5:14) and “sin reigned in death” (5:21). Again, Romans speaks of “sin resulting in death” (6:16) and death as “the wages of sin” (6:23), and “the law of sin and of death” (8:2). “For since by a man [Adam] came death, by a man [Christ] also came the resurrection of the dead’ (1 Cor. 15:1). “The sting of death is sin” (15:56). These papers are not intended to judge those who believe the gap theory but do express a teaching direction contrary to the assumptions within the gap theory.