

**Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary
Andrews University**

**A STATEMENT ON THE BIBLICAL
DOCTRINE OF CREATION**

Voted by the Seminary Faculty on April 30, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preamble	1
Statement of Purpose	1
Introduction to the Doctrine of Creation	2
The Creation Week	3
The Fall and the Effects of Sin Upon Nature	4
The Natural Sciences, Creation, and Biblical Hermeneutics	5
Scientific Methodologies and Scriptural Interpretation	6
Macro-Evolution, Micro-Evolution, and Creation	7
Geology, Creation, and the Biblical Flood	8
Why Does a Biblical Creation Worldview Matter?	9
Responsible Stewardship of God’s Creation	11
Endnotes	13
Suggested Reading	16

A STATEMENT ON THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF CREATION

Preamble

The year 2009 marked not only the 150th anniversary of the publication of Charles Darwin's epoch-making *Origin of Species* in 1859 but also saw the publication of two significant statements which show that the dialogue over Darwin's theory still continues. The first of these, an open letter by Jan Paulsen, president of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, calls for all Adventist institutions of learning to affirm and teach a recent, historical Creation worldview in harmony with "A Response to an Affirmation of Creation."¹ Second, the Andrews University Board of Trustees affirmed the General Conference "Response" statement of 2004 "as the position of Andrews University on the doctrine of Creation."² In light of these statements, it is fitting that the faculty of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, offer to our constituencies an expression of our understanding of the biblical doctrine of Creation in relation to the natural sciences. We do so, however, with certain cautions.

This product of our discussions has been in process for several years and should not be exploited as an official Adventist position. Our study continues, and we make no claim of finality. This expression is a platform for further study and an invitation for dialogue with friends beyond the Seminary.

Statement of Purpose

First we formulate our understanding of the biblical account of the Creation, Fall, and the New Creation, then turn to issues regarding the interface between science and faith. We do so from the perspective of faith in a personal God as contrasted with more impersonal approaches to the divine nature.³ Our purpose is to facilitate constructive

dialogue regarding differing worldviews such as a recent biblical Creation model contrasted with an ancient life on earth model. The document concludes by focusing on the proper stewardship of Creation.

Introduction to the Doctrine of Creation

The doctrine of God's Creation is foundational in Scripture. Nothing was before Him, and nothing will be after Him. Nothing is greater than He, who is the Cause and Sustainer of all reality (Rev 4:11; Col 1:16, 17). Although the reference to Creation has at times been used in the Old Testament to express ideas of salvation (Isa 65:17, cf. Rev 21:1), Creation remains in the Bible an independent, foundational concept, and a historical event that precedes and stands apart from the experience of salvation.⁴

Moreover, Creation is doxological, serving as the basis of worship and spirituality by exalting the power, greatness, goodness, and love of God. The Creator is worthy of worship because He acts through the power of His spoken word, not through unguided natural life cycle processes over long ages (Ps 33:6). Death is antithetical to God's creative power. "Worthy are You, our Lord and our God, to receive glory and honor and power; for You created all things, and because of Your will they existed, and were created" (Rev 4:11); "Worship Him who made the heaven and the earth and sea and springs of waters" (Rev 14:7, NASB).⁵

Modern understandings of the Hebrew worldview often misrepresent the ancient Hebrew cosmology. Richard Davidson and Randall Younker indicate that the Hebrews did not consider the heavens to be an upside-down metal bowl resting on a flat Earth, but, rather, that such a notion is an invention of the nineteenth century.⁶ In addition, recent biblical scholarship shows that, far from being contradictory, Gen 1 and 2 form complementary accounts of Creation.⁷

We believe that the doctrine of Creation fits into an overarching Creation worldview formulated by the Bible that informs other interrelated doctrines such as, but not limited to, the Sabbath, the Fall, salvation, the Flood, eschatology, and ethics. Above all, and as noted below, a proper understanding of origins preserves the integrity of Scripture, safeguards the loving character of God, and establishes the reality of redemption and the hope of a new Creation. These reasons show why a biblical Creation worldview matters.

The Creation Week

Motivated freely by unfathomable love and with great joy, God created the first life forms to appear on Earth recently, culminating with creatures bearing His own image, while beings in an already existing universe shouted with joyous approval (Gen 1-2; 5; 11; 1 Chr 1:1-27; Job 38:4-7; Pss 33:5-6, 8-9; 146:5-6; 148:5; Prov 8; Matt 1; Luke 3; John 1:1-18; Col 1:16-17).⁸ God created peacefully by calling life forms into existence over the span of one historical week composed of six ordinary, historical Earth days like our own, followed by one day of rest (Gen 1 and 2; Exod 20:11; 31:17; Heb 4:4; 11:3; Rev 14:7). This method of Creation shows that God is love and worthy of worship (Rev 14:7). Thus, on the one hand, the days of Creation were not mythical, symbolic, metaphorical, functional,⁹ or kairological days.¹⁰ Neither, on the other hand, were the days of Creation so-called divine days in which each of the six days allegedly translates into multi-millions of Earth years totaling approximately 3.8 billion years.¹¹ If true, these long-age approaches to origins involve God in an unseemly means-end approach. According to these lengthy methods, He creates living disposable means (creatures) to reach an end (humans) through trauma (predation), famine, suffering, disease, death,

mass extinctions, geologic catastrophes, and other natural evils. This method of Creation places the character of the God of love into question.

As the climax of the week of Creation, God rested on, blessed, and sanctified the seventh day (Gen 2:1-3), thereby instituting for all humanity (Mark 2:27) the Creation-based, seventh-day Sabbath corresponding to the day called Saturday in our current calendars. The seventh-day Sabbath serves as an unchangeable memorial of a completed Creation in six days and as a sign of the sanctifying relation existing between the Creator and the beings created in His image (Gen 1:26-27; Exod 20:8-11; 31:17; Ezek 20:12). The Sabbath shows that we belong to God, that “it is He who has made us and not we ourselves” (Ps 100:3). The following words of praise are particularly appropriate from worshipers in this present world: “How blessed is he whose . . . hope is in the Lord . . . Who made heaven and earth the sea and all that is in them. . . Who gives food to the hungry, the Lord sets the prisoner free, the Lord opens the eyes of the blind. . . He supports the fatherless and the widow . . . praise the Lord!” (Ps 146:5-10). Unfortunately, the relational joy of the original Creation was not to last.

The Fall and the Effects of Sin Upon Nature

Unambiguously, Scripture states that “sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin” (Rom 5:12). According to Gen 3, Adam and Eve, the first human beings, disobeyed God’s command not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Gen 3:1-19). This resulted in shame, fear, and self-justification when our first parents were called to account by God. This event is known as the Fall.

The consequences of the Fall were severe, not only for Adam and Eve but for the entire world over which God had given them dominion. A curse was pronounced upon the animal and plant world and upon the ground. Access to the tree of life was prohibited.

Pain, suffering, and death came to all living beings. The entire Creation, both animate and inanimate, was subjected to frustration, disease, decay, and death (Rom 8:20-21). No longer was the world “very good,” as God had pronounced it in the beginning (Gen 1:31).

It is evident that antagonistic powers are at work in this world. This is clear from the Book of Job (Job 1-2), but also from other passages in Scripture which reveal that an enemy of God is bringing death and destruction (Isa 14:12, 16-17; Heb 2:14; John 8:44). While God is ultimately in control of this world, persistent transgression of God’s laws and total disregard of His eternal covenant bring the curse upon human beings and upon the whole Earth (Isa 24:4-6). This fact has eschatological implications. The closer we approach to the Second Coming of Christ, the more iniquity and violence will increase and so will natural disasters (Matt 24:7-8; Luke 21:25-27). When the measure of human iniquity is full, the seven last plagues will bring destruction upon the whole Earth and God will destroy the destroyers of His Creation (Rev 11:18).

However, God has given hope to all who trust in Him that the curse, resulting from the Fall, will be reversed. In Scripture He has promised that He will create a new heaven and a new Earth (Isa 65:17; 2 Pet 3:13; Rev 21:1). No longer will there be any curse (Rev 22:3). There will be no more death or mourning or crying or pain, for the old order of things has passed away (Rev 21:4). Nature will be restored to its original beauty and glory; and then the whole creation will be “very good” once again.

The Natural Sciences, Creation, and Biblical Hermeneutics

Often in contemporary discussions, science and religion are held to be separate realms which should not attempt to inform one another.¹² However, as developed in the following discussion, we believe strongly in the complementary relation between the

natural sciences and the biblical doctrine of Creation. Our understanding of the relation between the two fields of discourse follows below.

Scientific Methodologies and Scriptural Interpretation

We have deep respect for the natural sciences and the work of our colleagues in these fields. We also appreciate the fact that students in Adventist education are trained how to employ scientific methodologies. At the same time, and along with our other colleagues in academia, we do not restrict our quest for truth to the constraints imposed by scientific methodologies alone. We believe that there are other methods outside scientific methodologies for discerning truth.

We believe that the scientist who is a believing Christian will be open to evidence that points toward possible or even probable non-natural causation. However, we reject metaphysical materialism, which claims that all reality can be explained without reference to the originating and sustaining power and wisdom of God. On the contrary, we believe, for example, that the origin of space, time, energy, matter, the laws and constants of nature, and life itself are not the result of spontaneous generation or self-actualization, but exist due to the originating action of divine design and power and to the continuing sustaining power of God (John 1:1; Col 2:17-18). Thus, as Adventists, we believe in divine reality beyond materialism.

In addition, we do not seek to prove by human reason and science the reality of God. Rather, through the eyes of faith we thank God for revealing the love, wisdom, and power of God through the visible things He has created (Rom 1:18-20).

When conflicting interpretations of scientific data and Scripture arise, we respectfully re-study the claims of both sources, seeking harmony on the assumption that “[s]ince the book of nature and the book of revelation bear the impress of the same

master mind, they cannot but speak in harmony” when both are properly interpreted.¹³ If, after carefully re-investigating the Word of God and the empirical data on any point in question, we determine that an interpretation of the Scripture that harmonizes with a particular claim of conventional science is not possible without changing the clearly intended meaning of Scripture, we willingly defer to the teaching of God’s Word. We do so with the conviction that further research may resolve the apparent conflict (Col 2:8; 1 Tim 6:20; 2 Cor 10:5). We believe that the Scriptures must always be given first preference, because we hold that they are the perfect standard of truth.

Macro-Evolution, Micro-Evolution, and Creation

We believe with the Psalmist that humans are among the wonderful works of God (Ps 139:14) made with divine wisdom (Ps 104:24). Thus, in contrast to attempts to harmonize the biblical narrative with contemporary evolutionary science, the traditional understanding of biblical Creation seems to harmonize most easily with a straightforward reading of the early chapters of Genesis and is more easily consonant with the doctrines of the Fall, redemption, and the Sabbath.

In this connection, we believe that Charles Darwin uncovered the empirically verifiable actuality of micro-evolution, which occurs through mechanisms such as random change and natural selection over time. However, we differ with the evolutionary synthesis regarding the alleged adequacy of macro-evolutionary theory. For example, not only do we believe that life cannot exist apart from God, we also are aware of biological data which prompt us to question the macro-evolutionary claim of the absolute natural origin of life and living forms from non-living matter (spontaneous abiogenesis). For similar reasons, we also question the macro-evolutionary claim of the development of simple life forms ultimately into human beings wholly by random

mutations, natural selection, and descent with modification. Thus, we endorse micro-evolution as an observable fact. However, we believe macro-evolution remains a highly speculative theory.

Geology, Creation, and the Biblical Flood

As implied above, any attempt to bring long ages of life forms on Earth into the account of Creation is, in our understanding, out of harmony with the original intention of the biblical text. This raises the understandable question regarding the fossil-bearing geologic column, interpreted by conventional science as confirming a long-age model of Earth history. In response, and in harmony with a recent Creation, we believe that the fossils in the geologic column, and the column itself, do not predate the week of Creation but are largely associated with deposition during the global Genesis Flood as the Earth's crust was undone and rapidly reformed (Gen 6:13; 7:11; 8:1-5, 21; 9:11).

As noted earlier, the historical reality and extent of the Genesis Flood are important elements within the broader Christian teachings of Creation, judgment, and redemption. The *mabbûl* (a technical Hebrew term used only for the Genesis Flood) was reluctantly initiated by God and was divinely superintended by Him (Ps 29:10) as a destructive judgment upon universal human wickedness and animal violence. The effect of this judgment was the undoing of the entire Creation—a point supported by the literary structure of Gen 6-9, which reverses the Creation sequence of Gen 1-2. The global nature of this judgment is further supported by the broader thematic context of Gen 1-11, which clearly pursues the universal themes of Creation, the Fall, the universal spread of sin, and the plan of redemption not only for humanity but also for the lower creatures and the entire planet (Rom 8:20-21).

Our belief that major portions of the fossil-filled geologic column were deposited during the global Flood shows that the geologic column does not argue against a recent six-day Creation. This consequence underscores the importance of formulating a robust historical account of the planet-wide Flood in connection with any current historical exposition of the biblical narrative of Creation.

We recognize the numerous geological challenges raised concerning such a worldview presented above, for example, by radiometric dating, heat-generating consequences of a global Flood, and so on.¹⁴ We do not claim to have the answers to all the questions. However, we also continue to investigate the geological record for suggestive data consistent with what would be expected in a global aquatic catastrophe such as the event outlined in Gen 6-9. For instance, the ubiquitous global presence of bedded layers throughout the geologic column would not be expected if the strata were deposited slowly over long ages. Many other examples exist which question the conventional interpretation of Earth and biological history.¹⁵

Why Does a Biblical Creation Worldview Matter?

Among the many biblical lines of evidence that could be noted, we uplift five basic reasons which show why belief in a recent historical Creation (protology), the Fall, and the Flood is important.

1. *Biblical Hermeneutics.* According to both historical-critical scholars and conservative evangelicals, the best exegetical interpretation of the Hebrew text supports a recent historical, six-day Creation, Fall, and a global Flood.¹⁶

2. *The Character of God.* The Lord God who creates by His word is “merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abounding in goodness and truth” (Exod 34:6).

However, the alternative model of origins known as theistic evolution, which combines

Gen 1 and 2 with evolutionary theory, creates intractable problems of theodicy regarding the loving character of the Creator who, allegedly, creates through the warring of nature, famine, and death.¹⁷ Philosopher of science, David Hull, explains how this worldview impacts fatally upon the character of God: “The process [of evolution] is rife with happenstance, contingency, incredible waste, death, pain and horror. . . . The god implied by evolutionary theory and the data of natural history . . . is not a loving God who cares about His productions. He is . . . careless, indifferent, almost diabolical. He is certainly not the sort of God to whom anyone would be inclined to pray.”¹⁸ These telling remarks can deepen the conviction that surely the infinitely loving Creator would not create by means of a phenomenon which He abhors, and that He died on the cross to eradicate, namely, death, which is the last enemy (2 Tim 1:10; 1 Cor 15:26). Such considerations show how a correct understanding of the biblical teaching about origins safeguards the truth about the goodness and love of God, which we believe is the foundational truth of all Scripture (Deut 32:3-4; 1 John 4:8).

3. *Salvation through Christ.* Faith in the blood of Jesus is the heart of the gospel (Rom 3:25). In opposition to this, the evolutionary worldview affirms death before sin by rejecting a historical, literal Fall, a global Flood, and a historical Adam and Eve through whom sin and its consequences passed to Creation, including the lower creatures. This consequence undermines the biblical truth that sin causes death, thereby ultimately denying the need for Jesus to redeem humanity through His historical life and His death on the cross (Gen 2:9, 17; Rom 5:12, 14; 6:23; 8:20-21; 1 Cor 15:26). Thus, the true biblical doctrines of Creation and a global Flood safeguard the doctrine of the substitutionary atonement.¹⁹

4. *The Sabbath.* The Sabbath was made for humans (Mark 2:27). When and for what reason? As indicated in this document, the first chapter of Genesis teaches that during the week of Creation, the seventh day was established as the Sabbath as a perpetual memorial of the completion of God’s creative work (Gen 1; Exod 20:11). If life forms have emerged slowly on Earth over millions of years, clearly this foundational biblical reason for the establishment of the Sabbath is fatally compromised.

5. *Eschatology.* The same Creator who said “For in six days the Lord made heaven and the earth” (Exod 20:11) also said “Let not your heart be troubled . . . I will come again.” (John 14:1-3). The Christian’s hope is grounded in these latter words of Jesus. However, if science falsifies Christ’s protological statement, what confidence can the believer place in His eschatological promise of a glorious second coming (2 Pet 3)? This shows the importance of the historical truth of the biblical doctrine of Creation.

In summary, these five reasons join together to form powerful evidence showing why a recent, six-day Creation worldview matters so deeply to the Christian message.

Because Adventists concur that God’s Creation still reveals His glory, though imperfectly, and needs to be cared for, we conclude with a reflection about the stewardship of Creation.

Responsible Stewardship of God’s Creation

Creationists, even more than evolutionists, should be concerned about the environment because the former recognize nature as God’s Creation. Indeed, environmentalism and classical Darwinism are antithetical. Environmentalism seeks the preservation of species, but Darwinism is indifferent to the extinction of species.²⁰ Thus, if spotted owls and polar bears disappear, it is merely natural selection at work. In this sense, the God of theistic evolution is no conservationist at all.

However, in spite of human sin, our Earth is a resource that must be treasured by us who are its stewards. As Christians, we have a thrilling cause or mission, which is to restore, to the extent possible, the glory of God in all His creation, here and now. Caring for and preserving the environment calls for submission to the Creator and suggests that our economic goals should be subservient to a responsible use of the resources God has provided. For example, the Sabbath doctrine (Exod 20:8-11; Deut 5:12-15) teaches conservation by requiring restraint in the exploitation of resources. This was made dramatically clear in the biblical teaching regarding the Sabbatical and the Jubilee years when the land was left fallow. The observance was called the “rest of the land” (Lev 25:1-7).

It is the privilege of the Christian to celebrate and enjoy the beauty and the goodness of the Earth, to find relationship with our God through His Creation, and to love the crowning work of His hands, our human brothers and sisters in this Creation.

ENDNOTES

¹ Jan Paulsen, “An Appeal,” first published in “Adventist News Network” (June 9, 2009). In the Annual Council of 2004, the General Conference Executive Committee voted “A Response to an Affirmation of Creation,” which was published in the *Adventist Review* (August 2005 [NAD edition]), 11.

² On Tuesday, October 27, 2009, the Andrews University Board of Trustees took the following action: “ANNUAL COUNCIL 2004 CREATION STATEMENT 09-38, *VOTED*: To record that the Andrews University Board of Trustees has reviewed the document ‘Response to an Affirmation of Creation’ voted by the General Conference Executive Committee at the Annual Council of 2004 and affirms the statement as the position of Andrews University on the doctrine of Creation. The board requests the administration to circulate the statement and Board action to the faculty and staff and that the statement be shared with future candidates for faculty appointments.”

³ For a helpful essay identifying and discussing three approaches to God, see Wesley J. Wildman, “Incongruous Goodness, Perilous Beauty, Disconcerting Truth: Ultimate Reality and Suffering in Nature,” in *Physics and Cosmology: Scientific Perspectives on the Problem of Natural Evil*, vol. 1, ed. Nancey Murphy, Robert John Russell, and William R. Stoeger (Berkeley, CA: Center for Theology and the Natural Sciences, 2007), 267-294.

⁴ The unbiblical prioritization of salvation in relation to Creation had been suggested notably by Marcion; was adopted in the critical post-exilic dating of the Creation story; was later embraced by Bultmann, Barth, and Von Rad; and still dominates the contemporary theological scene.

⁵ NASB is used in these passages and hereafter unless otherwise specified.

⁶ Richard Davidson and Randall Younker, “Myth of the Vaulted Dome,” forthcoming essay to be published by the Faith and Science Council of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

⁷ See Randall Younker, “Genesis 2: A Second Creation Account?,” in *Creation, Catastrophe & Calvary*, ed. John T. Baldwin (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Pub. Association, 2000), 69-78; and Jacques B. Doukhan, *The Genesis Creation Story* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1978).

⁸ We believe that the best biblical scholarship supports a short chronology measured generally in several thousands of years, not tens of thousands of years. For an exhaustive, exegetical treatment by an Old Testament scholar establishing a recent creation along the lines indicated in this statement, see Michael Hasel, “Time and Biblical Chronology: A Comparative Study,” a paper presented at the NAD Faith and Science Conference, August 13-20, 2003, Glacier View Ranch, Colorado.

The placement of the week of Creation in the above basic time frame stands in general parallel with the expression used by the Southern Adventist University School of Religion in its “A Reaffirmation of Creation,” September 8, 2004, which reads, “5. We affirm that the six day Creation of life on earth took place recently, a few thousand years ago (Gen 5, 11; 1 Chron 1:1-27).”

⁹ John H. Walton, Old Testament scholar, presents a recent analysis of the days of Creation as relating only to function and not to material creation. See John H. Walton, *The Lost World of Genesis One* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2009).

¹⁰ William A Dembski, Intelligent Design theorist, recently interprets the days of Gen 1 as kairological days. As such, these days are said to record only God's ideal or original plan for Creation or what He would have liked to create, but did not create because of His foreknowledge of human sin. On this view and on the basis of God's foreknowledge of human sin, God creates retroactively a world filled with natural evil for 3.8 billion years expressing retroactively the results of human sin upon nature resulting from the future Fall. See William A. Dembski, *The End of Christianity* (Nashville, TN: B & H Publishing Group, 2009), particularly, "A Kairological Reading of Genesis 1-3," 142-255.

¹¹ Gerald L. Schroeder, *The Science of God: The Convergence of Scientific and Biblical Wisdom* (New York: Free Press, 1997).

¹² For a leading case against the complementary relation between science and theology, see Stephen Jay Gould, *Rocks of Ages: Science and Religion in the Fullness of Life* (New York: Ballantine Pub. Group, 1999).

¹³ Ellen G. White, *Education* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Pub. Association, 1939), 128.

¹⁴ We do not ignore the criticisms of a global flood but place them on the table for honest discussion, along with the theological implications of accepting these challenges as reflecting actual Earth history in contrast to the biblical account of Creation and the Flood. A sampling of some of the major challenges to Flood geology is presented in the following leading sources: Donald U. Wise, "Creationism's Geologic Time Scale," *American Scientist* 86 (March-April 1998): 160-173; Davis A. Young, *The Biblical Flood* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995); Ronald L. Numbers, *The Creationists* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992); Robert W. Hanson, ed., *Science and Creation: Geological, Theological, and Educational Perspectives*, American Association of the Advancement of Science: Issues in Science and Technology Series (New York: MacMillan Pub. Company, 1986); and Brent Dalrymple, *Radiometric Dating, Geologic Time, and the Age of the Earth*, reprint, 1981, available from the U.S. Geological Survey, Menlo Park, California.

¹⁵ For a sample of such studies see: E. G. Kennedy, R. Kablano, and A. V. Chadwick, "A Reassessment of the Shallow Water Depositional Model for the Tapeats Sandstone, Grand Canyon, Arizona: Evidence for Deep Water Deposition," *Geological Society of America Abstracts With Programs* 28, no. 7 (1996): A-407; Arthur V. Chadwick, "Megatrends in North American Paleocurrents," *Society of Economic Paleontologists and Mineralogists Meetings Abstracts* 8 (1993): 58; idem, "Megatrends in North American Paleocurrents" (2007), <http://origins.swau.edu/papers/global/paleocurrents/eng/>; H. Paul Buchheim, "Paleoenvironments, Lithofacies, and Varves of the Fossil Butte Member of the Eocene Green River Formation, Southwestern Wyoming," *Contributions to Geology* 30, no. 1 (Spring 1994): 3-14. Buchheim has discovered that the near-shore so-called varves are not true varves or annual deposits (p. 3). See also Andrew A. Snelling, *Earth's Catastrophic Past: Geology, Creation & the Flood*, 2 vols. (Dallas, TX: Institute for Creation Research, 2009); Derek Victor Ayer, *The New Catastrophism: The Importance of the Rare Event in Geological History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Todd Charles Wood and Paul A. Garner, *Genesis Kinds: Creationism and the Origin of Species*, Issues in Creation Series, No. 5 (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009); Sir Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Why Neo-Darwinism Does Not Work* (Cardiff, Wales: University College Cardiff Press, 1982).

¹⁶ For a well-documented discussion showing that the authors of Gen 1 and 2 intended to articulate a factual, historical account of God’s creative action during the week of Creation, see Alvin Plantinga, “Evolution, Neutrality, and Antecedent Probability: A Reply to McMullin and Van Till,” in *Intelligent Design Creationism and Its Critics: Philosophical, Theological, and Scientific Perspectives*, ed. Robert T. Pennock (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001), 215-217.

¹⁷ Charles Darwin writes that the most exalted living forms imaginable such as the higher animals are produced “from the war of nature, from famine and death” (Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of Species* [facsimile of the first edition with introduction by Ernst Mayr, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981], 490).

¹⁸ David Hull, “The God of Galapagos,” *Nature* 352 (August 1991): 486. Hull writes from the perspective of a non-theist.

With similar theological implications in mind, Jacques Monod observes: “The struggle for life and elimination of the weakest is a horrible process, against which our whole modern ethics revolts. An ideal society is a non-selective society, one where the weak is protected, which is exactly the reverse of the so-called natural law. I am surprised that a Christian would defend the idea that this is the process which God more or less set up in order to have evolution” (Jacques Monod, “The Secret of Life,” interview with Laurie John, Australian Broadcasting Co., June 20, 1976 [just before Monod’s death]. Monod’s statement is cited from: Henry M. Morris, *That Their Words May Be Used Against Them* [Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 1997], 417). Like Hull, Monod stands within a non-theist tradition.

¹⁹ Nigel S. Cameron has also explored the notion of death before sin in relation to its negative impact upon the gospel. He argues that were Adam from the beginning under the effects of the curse of physical death as implied in evolutionary theory and in theistic evolution, “this overthrows the sin-death causality, and in so doing pulls the rug from under the feet of the evangelical understanding of the atonement” (Nigel M. de S. Cameron, *Evolution and the Authority of the Bible* [Greenwood, SD: Attic Press, 1985], 66).

²⁰ According to Darwin, extinctions form a stark, central feature of the evolutionary process: “The greater number of species of each genus, and all the species of many genera, have left no descendants, but have become utterly extinct” (*Origins*, 489).

SUGGESTED READING

- Austin, Steven A. *Catastrophes in Earth History*. El Cajon, CA: Institute for Creation Research, 1984.
- _____. “Did Noah’s Flood Cover the Entire World? YES.” In *The Genesis Debate: Persistent Questions about Creation and the Flood*, 210-229. Edited by Ronald F. Youngblood. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1990.
- Baldwin, John T., ed. *Creation, Catastrophe & Calvary: Why a Global Flood Is Vital to the Doctrine of the Atonement*. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2000.
- Behe, Michael. *The Edge of Evolution: The Search for the Limits of Darwinism*. New York: Free Press, 2007.
- Behe, Michael, William Dembski, and Stephen C. Meyer. *Science and Evidence for Design in the Universe*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000.
- Booth, Walter M. “Days of Genesis 1: Literal or Nonliteral?” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 14, no. 1 (Spring 2003): 101–120.
- Brand, Leonard. *Faith, Reason and Earth History: A Paradigm of Earth and Biological Origins by Intelligent Design*. Rev. ed. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2009.
- Brown, William P., and S. Dean McBride, eds. *The God Who Creates: Essays in Honor of W. Sibley Towner*. Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans, 2000.
- Coffin, Harold G., with Robert H. Brown and R. James Gibson, eds. *Origin by Design*. Rev. ed. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2005.
- Davis, Percival, and Dean H. Kenyon. *Of Pandas and People: The Central Question of Biological Origins*. Dallas, TX: Haughton Pub. Company, 1993.
- Davidson, Jo Ann. *Toward a Theology of Beauty*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2008.
- Davidson, Richard M. “The Biblical Account of Origins.” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 14, no. 1 (Spring 2003): 4–43.
- _____. “The Genesis Flood Narrative: Crucial Issues in the Current Debate.” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 42, no. 1 (2004): 49–77.
- Davidson, Richard M., and Randall W. Younker. “Myth of the Vaulted Dome.” Forthcoming.
- Denton, Michael. *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*. Bethesda, MD: Adler & Adler Publishers, 1986.
- Doukhan, Jacques B. *The Genesis Creation Story*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1978.
- Duncan, J. Ligon, III, and David W. Hall. “The 24-Hour View.” In *The G3n3sis Debate: Three Views on the Days of Creation*, 21-66. Edited by David G. Hagopian. Mission Viejo, CA: Crux Press, 2001.

- Flew, Antony, with Roy Abraham Varghese. *There Is a God: How the World's Most Notorious Atheist Changed His Mind*. New York: HarperOne, 2007.
- Fretheim, Terence E. "Were the Days of Creation Twenty-Four Hours Long? YES." In *The Genesis Debate: Persistent Questions about Creation and the Flood*, 12–35. Edited by Ronald F. Youngblood. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1990.
- Garner, Paul. *The New Creationism*. Webster, NY: Evangelical Press USA, 2009.
- Greene, John C. *Debating Darwin*. Claremont, CA: Regina Books, 1999.
- Greene, Marjorie. *The Knower and the Known*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1974.
- Hasel, Michael. "Time and Biblical Chronology: A Comparative Study." A paper presented at the NAD Faith and Science Conference, August 13-20, 2003. Glacier View Ranch, Colorado.
- Himmelfarb, Gertrude. *Darwin and the Dawinian Revolution*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1962.
- Hoyle, Fred, and Chandra Wickramasinghe. *Why Neo-Darwinism Does Not Work*. Cardiff, Wales: University College Cardiff Press, 1982.
- Ivey, Robert, Jr., ed. *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Creationism*. Held August 4-9, 2003, Technical Symposium Sessions. Pittsburgh, PA: Creation Science Fellowship, 2003.
- McCabe, Robert V. "A Defense of Literal Days in the Creation Week." *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 5 (2000): 97–123.
- Meyer, Stephen C. *Signature in the Cell*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2009.
- Mortenson, Terry, and Thane H. Ury, eds. *Coming to Grips with Genesis*. Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2008.
- Nelson, Dwight K. *Creation and Evolution*. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2009.
- Oard, Michael J. *Flood by Design: Receding Water Shapes the Earth's Surface*. Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2008.
- Pipa, Joseph A., Jr. "From Chaos to Cosmos: A Critique of the Non-Literal Interpretations of Genesis 1:1–2:3." In *Did God Create in Six Days?* 153-198. Edited by Joseph A. Pipa, Jr., and David W. Hall. Taylors, SC: Southern Presbyterian Press, 1999.
- Polkinghorne, John. *Theology in the Context of Science*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Read, David C. *Dinosaurs: An Adventist View*. Keene, TX: Clarion Call Books, 2009.
- ReMine, Walter. *The Biotic Message: Evolution Versus Message Theory*. St. Paul, MN: St. Paul Science, 1993.

- Shaw, Benjamin. "The Literal Day Interpretation." In *Did God Create in Six Days?* 199-220. Edited by Joseph A. Pipa, Jr., and David W. Hall. Taylors, SC: Southern Presbyterian Press, 1999.
- Snelling, Andrew A. *Earth's Catastrophic Past: Geology, Creation & the Flood*. 2 vols. Dallas, TX: Institute for Creation Research, 2009.
- Stambaugh, James. "The Days of Creation: A Semantic Approach." *CEN Technical J.* 5, no. 1 (1999): 70–78.
- Tonstad, Sigve K. *The Lost Meaning of the Seventh Day*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2009.
- Wilder-Smith, A.E. *The Scientific Alternative to Neo-Darwinian Evolutionary Theory: Information Sources & Structures*. Costa Mesa, CA: TWFT Publishers, 1987.
- Wood, Todd Charles, and Paul A. Garner, eds. *Genesis Kinds: Creationism and the Origin of Species*. Center for Origins Research, Issues in Creation Series 5. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009.
- White, Ellen G. *Patriarchs and Prophets*. Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1970. See particularly chapters 1-6.