

E. T. Lange  
1901-1987

**THE DOCTRINE OF CREATION  
AND THE  
MODERN THEORIES OF EVOLUTION**

**By PAUL A. ZIMMERMAN, Ph.D.**

President, Concordia Teachers College

Seward, Nebraska

I  
P3508

**THE DOCTRINE OF CREATION  
AND THE  
MODERN THEORIES OF EVOLUTION**

**By PAUL A. ZIMMERMAN, Ph. D.**  
President, Concordia Teachers College  
Seward, Nebraska

Doctrinal Essay Delivered at the District Convention  
of Iowa District West of the  
The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod

Camp Okoboji, Iowa

August 21-26, 1960

## INTRODUCTION

Any essay delivered to a district convention of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod should have relevance for the faith and life of our Church. It is my belief that the topic chosen for the essay which will be delivered to the Iowa District West in these morning hours meets this standard. For a long time going back to the publication of Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species*, November 24, 1859, and even before that, there has been controversy in intellectual circles concerning the origin of living things. Man has a natural curiosity as to himself and as to other living things which he sees on this planet. He is interested also in the origin of the solar system and of the stars that lie beyond our own sun. He finds two sources of information concerning the origin of matter and of living things. One of them he has long had in the word of Holy Scripture. The other is the study of nature, or what we commonly call science. Even the ancient Greeks speculated concerning the origin of things, and some of their ideas were surprisingly modern. However, the last century has seen the keenest and the warmest debate concerning the question as to whence came all living things and whence came the world. During the latter half of the 19th century there was tremendous debate between those who advocated Charles Darwin's idea of evolution, that is, that the forms of life we have today arose by a natural process from earlier and simpler forms of life, and the advocates of the doctrine of creation which states that God created plants and animals in a special creative act.

In our own day, particularly in the last decade, the question as to who is correct in his explanation of the origin of living things and of the world itself has become more lively. Questions concerning the origin of the universe, the solar system, life itself, plants and animals, have been commonly discussed in many books, magazine articles, and conferences. Normally, the Church does not take undue interest in the topics discussed by scientists. Furthermore, the Church is friendly toward science, since it holds that science and the study of nature is simply fulfilling God's command to Adam and Eve in the garden to subdue the earth. However, whenever scientists deal with what they

call cosmogony or the matters concerning the origin of the universe, and with evolution or the theory concerning the origin of living things, they are dealing with a question where Scripture also has had something to say. It is also an area in which some scientists have gone out of their way to state their opinion that the Biblical account of creation is purely mythological, with no basis in fact. As a matter of fact, certain ardent evolutionists have of late gone out of their way to indicate that they feel that Christianity itself is destined to be replaced by a religion based purely on science and on man. A principal advocate for this idea is British biologist Julian Huxley. Evolutionists of the stripe of Huxley hold that everything that we see in the universe can be accounted for without introducing the concept of God. They deny the existence of man's soul and assert that Christianity, as well as other religions, is pure invention without any basis in reality.

The Church cannot be indifferent to such a position taken in the name of science. Actually, many of the defenders of the Christian faith have pointed out time and again that in dealing with the origin of the planets, the origin of life, and the origin of living forms, or what is commonly called the broad theory of evolution, that science stands on a different basis than it does when it deals with everyday problems. For science when it deals with what happened in the past can only speculate on the basis of what it finds and is largely deprived of its chief weapon of research, namely the experiment. Because of this, a tremendous amount of what commonly passes for scientific investigation in the field of dealing with past events is chiefly speculative correlation, without the benefit of the acid test of experimental corroboration. However, modern man has been tremendously impressed by the advance of science in all fields, particularly these days in nuclear energy and rocket propulsion. As a consequence, there is a tendency on the part of our people to believe that when a scientist speaks that he is almost literally inspired, and that if he disagrees with anything spoken by theologians that he must be, by virtue of the fact that he is a scientist, correct. This exaggerated value placed on the opinion of the sci-

entist has impressed many theologians. Many theologians have been content to leave the field of the doctrine of creation to the scientist and interpret the Bible largely in terms of the evolutionary theory. In our own Church we have long taken the position that science and the Bible cannot be in conflict. When science and the Bible seem to disagree, either the Bible is being misunderstood or science is making a statement that is not correct, even though made by scientists. The reason we take this position is that we hold, on the basis of the testimony of Scripture itself, that the Bible is God's verbally inspired and inerrant Word. However, in our Synod today there is very obviously the feeling on the part of some that perhaps we have been too slow to adopt the theories of science in regard to evolution and that perhaps we should say that evolution is God's way of creating and interpret the first chapters of Genesis in the light of the evolutionary theory. There is increasing evidence that some believe that this is a satisfactory way out of the dilemma that faces us.

The question of our attitude over against evolution and our exposition of the doctrine of creation thus becomes a very real and acute one for the theologian and for the Christian teacher. But it is no less a difficult question for the Lutheran layman who has discussions with his neighbors about some of these things and for the boy and girl in grade school or in the high school science classroom or in any university laboratory. There are some very real issues to be faced here and it seems important that we spend a few hours together considering what they may be.

## OLD TESTAMENT REFERENCES TO CREATION

When one discusses the question of the doctrine of creation and its relevance to the theory of evolution with one's fellow Lutherans, one sometimes gains the impression that there are some who feel that we are making a great fuss about something of small consequence. However, this opinion can only be held by those who have not studied how important a place the doctrine of creation occupies in the Bible. Far from being limited to the first three chapters of Genesis, it is basic for the rest of Scripture and is often referred to. Let us turn to just a few of the many passages that deal with creation.

The twentieth chapter of Exodus, the eleventh verse, reads, "For in six days the Lord made Heaven and earth, the sea and all that is in them and rested the seventh day. Therefore, the Lord blessed the sabbath day and hallowed it." Thus we find a reference to the creation in six days in the midst of the ten commandments. Hannah in her prayer in First Samuel chapter two verse eight states that, "The pillars of the earth are the Lord's and on them he has set the world." Thereby she clearly indicates her faith that the world was the product of the creative activity of the Lord and not the product of blind chance. In the book of Nehemiah in the ninth chapter the sixth verse Ezra says, "Thou art the Lord, Thou alone. Thou hast made Heaven, the Heaven of Heavens, with all their host, the earth and all that is on it, the seas and all that is in them, and Thou preservest all of them and the host of heavens worship Thee." It is very clear from this that the total creation is ascribed to the creative act of God. God is also credited with the work of preservation. The book of Job is filled with references to the Creation. In the great 38th chapter of this book the Lord challenges Job saying, "Where were you when I laid the foundation of the earth? Tell me if you have understanding. Who determined its measurements—surely you know! Or who stretched the line upon it? — Or who shut in the sea with doors when it burst forth from the womb;—Have you commanded the morning since your days began, and caused the dawn to know its

place? — Can you bind the chains of the Pleiades, or loose the cords of Orion? Can you lead forth the Mazzaroth in their season? Can you guide the Bear with its children? Do you know the ordinances of the heavens? Can you establish their rule in the earth?" Thus the Lord Himself magnificently points out to Job the creature the glory of the Creator whose power and wisdom are infinitely beyond his ability to understand.

The Psalms contain many references to creation. In Psalm 8 the Psalmist states in the third verse, "When I look at Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars which Thou hast established; what is man that Thou art mindful of him, and the Son of Man that Thou dost care for him?" Psalm 19 begins with the glorious words, "The heavens are telling the glory of God and the firmament proclaims His handiwork." In the 33rd chapter of Psalms the sixth verse, we read, "By the Word of the Lord the heavens were made and all their hosts by the breath of His mouth." This is a clear reference to the words of Genesis 1 in which we read, "And the Lord said—." In the 74th Psalm, verses 16 to 17 we read, "Thine is the day, Thine also the night; Thou hast established the luminaries and the sun. Thou hast fixed all the bounds of the earth: Thou hast made summer and winter." In the 89th Psalm the Psalmist calls attention to the fact that everything belongs to God when he says, "The heavens are Thine and the earth also is Thine; the world and all that is in it, Thou hast founded them. The North and the South, Thou has created them." The magnificent 90th Psalm, the prayer of Moses, has as its second verse the statement, "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hast formed the earth and the world, from everlasting to everlasting Thou art God." In the 5th verse of the 95th Psalm we read, "The sea is His for He made it, for His hands formed the dry land." Then the Psalmist tells us of the consequences of this creative act, "Oh come let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before the Lord, our Maker." Psalm 102, verse 25 we read, "Of old Thou didst lay the foundation of the earth and the heavens are the work of Thy hands. They will perish but Thou dost endure."

There are many other references in the Psalms but we will pass on to other books. In the book of Proverbs, the third chapter, the nineteenth verse states, "The Lord by wisdom founded the earth; by understanding He established the heavens." The book of Ecclesiastes also contains references to the Creator. Famous here is the twelfth chapter, the first verse where it says, "Remember also your creator in the days of your youth." Thus man's responsibility to God, the Creator, is emphasized. Isaiah, said by many to be the greatest of the Old Testament prophets; in his fortieth chapter writes by inspiration, "Have ye not known, have ye not heard? Has it not been told ye from the beginning? Have you not understood from the foundation of the earth? It is He who sits above the circle of the earth and its inhabitants are like grasshoppers; Who stretches out the heavens like a curtain, and spreads them like a tent to dwell in; Who brings princes to nought and makes the rulers of the earth as nothing . . . The Lord is the everlasting God, the Creator of the ends of the earth. He does not faint or grow weary. His understanding is unsearchable." In the 42nd chapter he states, "Thus says God the Lord, Who created the heavens and stretched them out. Who spread forth the earth and what comes from it, Who gives rest to the people upon it and spirit to those who talk in it." Thus the authority of God is emphasized from the viewpoint of His being the creator who not only created all life and all the heavens but who sustains those who live in this our day.

Jeremiah in the tenth chapter of his prophecy in the tenth verse asserts that the Lord is God who is to be distinguished from false gods and he offers the power of the Creator as evidence of this. He says, "But the Lord is the true God; He is the living God and everlasting King. At His wrath the earth quakes, and the nations cannot endure His indignation. Thus shalt thou say to them: The gods who did not make the heavens and the earth shall perish from the earth and from under the heavens. It is He who made the earth by His power Who established the world by His wisdom, and by His understanding stretched



out the heavens." Amos joins the list of prophets who call attention to the fact that the things that are were not the product of happenstance but are to be credited to the creative act of God. In his fifth chapter, the eighth verse, he says, "He who made Pleiades and Orion, (constellations in the sky) and turns deep darkness into the morning and darkens the day into night . . . the Lord is His name." Johah, when he talks to those who are on the ship that is tossed by the mighty storm, identified himself in the first chapter the ninth verse of his prophecy when he says, "I am a Hebrew and I fear the Lord, the God of heaven, Who made the sea and the dry land." Thus he identifies the true God as the One who is the creator. Zechariah in the twelfth chapter of his prophecy begins with the words, "The word of the Lord concerning Israel: Thus says the Lord, who stretched out the heavens and founded the earth and formed the spirit of man in him." Once again the authority of God is based on the fact that He is the creator who has made all things and to whom man is responsible. Malachi in the second chapter of his prophecy in the tenth verse states, "Have we not all one Father? Has not one God created us? Why then are we faithless with one another?"

Thus we find throughout the Old Testament references to God as the mighty creator, the one true God who made heaven and earth and all that in them is. In the entire Old Testament we do not find a single reference that indicates that the things that are in the heavens and the earth are the product of chance or of interaction among the materials themselves, as the theory of evolution teaches. Rather there is clear reference to the guiding and creative hand of God who not only made all things but who still preserves them. Moreover, we see that, time after time, the prophets speak to those who constitute their audience and tell them that they must listen to this God and worship Him because He is the creator. The act of creation is quoted as showing the power and might and sovereignty of the one true God who is the ruler over all and whom all are to worship.

## NEW TESTAMENT REFERENCES TO CREATION

The New Testament also lays heavy emphasis upon the doctrine of creation. John begins his gospel with the immortal words, "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things were made through Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made. And in Him was life and the life was the light of men. The light shines in the darkness and the darkness has not overcome it . . ." Verse ten, "He was in the world and the world was made through Him yet the world knew Him not." John then goes on to identify this word with the Christ the only begotten Son of the Father. The reference to the Word is a clear connection with Genesis 1 where we find continual reference to God creating by speaking. The Word, of course, is also a clear reference to Christ who is the word of the Father and brings the message of salvation and of the Father's plan for lost mankind. It is highly important that Christ's divinity is tied up with the act of creation in which he as the second person of the Godhead participated.

It is interesting that Jesus Himself quotes from the book of Genesis and the creation story. In reply to a question of the Pharisees, he answers in Matthew 19, verse four, "Have you not read that He who made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, 'For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife and the two shall become one? So they are no longer two but one.' " This is a direct quotation from Genesis 2:24, the story of the creation of Eve and the subsequent marriage of Adam and Eve. Thus the relationship between man and woman is pointed out as having been established at the time of creation when God established the institution of marriage.

Probably the strongest reference to the creation account is found in the letters of Paul. In the book of Romans Paul makes much of the analogy between Adam, the first man who fell and who plunged mankind into perdition, and Christ, the new man, who redeemed all mankind. In studying Paul's let-

ter, we see very clearly that he does not think of Adam as a primeval prototype of man who arose from the depths of the animal, but as the perfect man who fell and in his falling plunged the race into sin. He takes the story of the fall of Adam and Eve as we find it in the creation account literally and seriously. Paul says, Romans 5, verse 12 and following, "Therefore as sin came into the world through one man and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all men sinned—sin indeed was in the world before the law was given but sin is not counted where there is no law. Yet death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam who was a type of the one who was to come." In verse 17 he says, "If because of one man's trespass, death reigned through that one man, much more will those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness reign in life through the one man Jesus Christ." It is very clear that the Apostle regards Adam as being as real as Christ and the fall as a natural historical event.

In Second Corinthians 11:3 we have another reference to the fall where Paul says, "But I am afraid that as the serpent deceived Eve by his cunning, your thoughts will be led astray from a sincere and pure devotion to Christ." Here again a reference to the Genesis account and to the fall of Eve as a result of the deception by the devil through the serpent.

In I Corinthians chapter 11 Paul deals with the state of woman and mentions her subordinate position in certain respects to man. In verse seven he says, "But woman is the glory of man, for man was not made from woman, but woman from man. Neither was man created for woman but woman for the man." This is a clear and undisputable reference to Genesis chapter 2 and to the creation of Eve from the rib of man by God's creative Power. Far from regarding it as a side issue, Paul sees in it an explanation of the basic relationship between men and women in God's plan for things. Paul takes up the same topic in his first letter to Timothy where in the second chapter the twelfth verse we read, "I permit no woman to teach

or to have authority over men; she is to keep silent. For Adam was formed first, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor." Here Paul again refers to the fact that Adam was created first and that Eve was created afterwards. He also refers to the order of the Fall. This particular passage makes very clear that Paul could not possibly be thinking of evolutionary development since in evolution you certainly would not have a male human being developed first and then a female later. Both sexes would have been developed long before this at the very bottom of the evolutionary ladder. Paul's statement cannot be taken with an evolutionary connotation.

It is extremely interesting that Paul in his dealings with the Gentiles indicates that the God he is talking about is the living God who is the creator. He does not preach Christ in some sort of vacuum, but he ties him up immediately with his Father who is the creator and Lord over all. In Acts 14 we are told Paul's experience in Lystra where he and Barnabas were taken to be gods by the people who then attempted to worship them. Paul replies in the fifteenth verse of the fourteenth chapter of Acts, "Men, why are you doing this? We are also men, of like nature with you and bring you good news, that you should turn from these vain things to a living God who made the heaven and the earth and the sea and all that is in them." In Acts 17 we are told that when Paul preached in the very intellectual center of the Greek world of Athens that he said this in his sermon: (Acts 17:22) "Men of Athens, I perceive that in every way you are very religious. For as I passed along and observed the objects of your worship I found also an altar with this inscription, 'To an unknown God.' What you therefore worship as unknown, this I proclaim to you. The God who made the world and everything in it, being the Lord of Heaven and earth, does not live in shrines made by man, nor is he served by human hands, as though he needed anything, since He himself gives to all men life and breath and everything: And He made *from one* every nation of men to live on all the face of the earth, having

determined allotted periods and the boundaries of their habitation, that they should seek God in the hope that they might feel after him and find him." Note specifically that Paul not only refers to God the creator, but God who created from one man every nation of men. Here again the reference to Adam as the father of us all.

It is Paul, too, to whom we are indebted under the guidance of God for giving us the first chapter of Romans in which he talks of the natural knowledge of God. In verse 19 he writes, "For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it unto them. Ever since the creation of the world, His invisible nature, namely His eternal power and deity, has been clearly perceived in the things that have been made. So they are without excuse." Thus he indicates that natural man even in his fallen condition should be able to perceive the eternal power and deity of the God who has made all things. He speaks of their forsaking this worship of the true God and exchanging the glory of God for the image of idols and he condemns them, stating in verse 25, "They exchange the truth about God for a lie and worshipped and served the creature rather than the creator, who is blessed forever."

We could not complete this brief survey of the New Testament passages dealing with the doctrine of creation without reference to the book of Hebrews. In Hebrews chapter one, verse two, we read, "In these last days He has spoken to us by a Son, whom He appointed the heir of all things, through whom also he created the world." In verse 10 he adds, "And Thou Lord didst found the earth in the beginning and the heavens are the work of Thy hands." This is a quotation from Psalm 45. In chapter 3, verse 4, the writer of Hebrews says, "For every house is built by someone, but the builder of all things is God." In the great faith chapter, chapter 11 of Hebrews, we read in the opening verses, "Now faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen. For by it the men of old received divine approval. By faith we understand that the

world was created by the Word of God, so that what is seen is made out of things which do not appear." Here we are indebted to the inspired writer for the statement that the acceptance of creation is in the final analysis an act of faith. We cannot understand, in this life, the immensity of the doctrine of creation with all of its implications or the many mysteries concerning the brigin of the universe and the things that are in it. It is a matter of faith. What we are to believe is that it was created by God, that it was created by His word, in the manner related in Genesis. It is interesting also that the writer of Hebrews here makes reference to things which exist as having been made out of things which do not appear. This is a reference to what is sometimes called the creation out of nothing. In modern times, as we know more of nature, we speak on the basis of Einstein's theory of the equivalence of matter and energy. We know that matter can be converted into energy. This we do in the atom bomb. We know also that we can convert, if we have enough energy, energy into matter. Energy is, by definition, the ability to do work. God with His almighty power, harnessing His almighty power, with His limitless energy, created the matter that is in the universe with the incalculable tons of material that are in it. Thus the inspired writer of Hebrews is correct when he says, "The things that are seen were made out of things which do not appear."

The last book of the Bible, the book of Revelation, also refers to God as creator. In the triumphant chapter four, verse eleven, we read the song of the creatures that surrounded the throne of God: "Worthy art Thou, our Lord and God, to receive glory and honor and power, for Thou didst create all things and by Thy will they existed and were created." Chapter ten, verse six, speaks and tells us that the angel, "Swore by Him who lives forever and ever, Who created heaven and what is in it, the earth and what is in it, and the sea and what is in it, that there should be no more delay." Finally, in the fourteenth chapter of Revelation, the seventh verse, we read, "And He said with a loud voice, "Fear God and give Him glory, for the hour

of His judgement has come; and worship Him who made heaven and earth, the sea and the fountains of water."

Thus we see that the doctrine of creation is by no means limited to the opening chapters of Genesis. We find it in the Old Testament and we find it in the New. It refers not only to God as creator, but to certain specific parts of the creation story and to the specific story of the fall of Adam and Eve and its grave consequences. The doctrine of creation is a basic doctrine. It tells us of God's sovereignty, of God's bringing us into existence, of God's preserving us, and of the necessity of worshipping Him Who has given us all things. Let no one say that the doctrine of creation is a side issue and those who are jealous to preserve it in its truth and purity are emphasizing an insignificant point. Throughout the Bible we find the inspired prophets and apostles coming back again and again to the fact that all that exists is the result of the creative power and Word of our mighty God.

#### REFERENCES TO CREATION IN THE LUTHERAN CONFESSIONS

The Lutheran Church accepts as its doctrinal position the so-called Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church. These are: the Apostles Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed, the unaltered Augsburg Confession, the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles, the Small and Large Catechisms of Luther, and the Formula of Concord of 1580. The fathers of our Lutheran Church wrote the Augsburg Confession and the documents that followed it in order to establish their position on matters of controversy with the Catholic Church and with other groups with which they were not in agreement in that day. One of the issues which they did not have to combat was the theory of evolution. It is a modern development and in that day was not in controversy. For this reason we do not find specific treatment of this subject in the Confessions. However, Luther in his Large Catechism has a beautiful statement concerning the doctrine of creation. He says, "What is the force of this or what do you mean by these words: I believe

in God, the Father, Almighty Maker, etc.? Answer: This is what I mean and believe, that I am a creature of God; that is, that he has given and constantly preserves to me my body, soul and life, members great and small, all my senses, reason and understanding, and so on, food and drink, clothing and support, wife and children, domestics, house and home, etc. Besides he causes all creatures to serve for the uses and necessities of life—sun, moon and stars, firmament, day and light, air, fire, water, earth, and whatever it bears and produces, birds and fishes, beasts, grain and all kinds of produce, and whatever else there is of bodily and temporal goods, good government, peace and security. Thus we learn from this article that none of us has of himself, nor can preserve his life or anything that is here enumerated or can be enumerated, however small and unimportant a thing it might be, for all is comprehended in the word creator." Luther also says in this same article on the Creed in his Large Catechism, "If you were to ask a little child: My dear, what sort of God have you? What do you know of him? He would say, This is my God: First, the Father who created heaven and earth, besides this only one I regard nothing else as God: For there is no one else who could create heaven and earth." It is evident from this that Luther lays primary emphasis on the fact that we are to realize that God brought all things into existence and still preserves them for our good and for our blessing today, that we have nothing of ourselves, and that we can take no credit for it. Although Luther made no reference to the theory of evolution, his words are certainly appropriate to those who in espousing the doctrine of evolution today so often would rule out God and the workings of God completely and ascribe everything to chance. Luther certainly would describe as blasphemous any attempt on the part of anyone to say that all the things that have come into existence, the things which are today, are not the product of the blessing hand of God.

There is little reference otherwise to the doctrine of creation except in a very general way. However, the Confessions deal specifically with the question of the fall of man, of Adam and Eve, and of the doctrine of original sin. This is highly im-



portant. The philosophy of evolution is that man has risen from a lower form of life and hence originally had animal instincts. Thus, he originally was no better than an animal in his moral judgment. His conscience, his moral judgment, and his religion are alleged to have developed gradually. That is, man is said by the evolutionary theory to have arisen from the depths and to have gradually climbed to the heights which he now occupies in his moral standards. On the other hand, Scripture says that man was created in God's image (Genesis 1:26). Man was created perfect and then fell. Because of this, man needs a Savior. The evolutionary theory says that man is achieving his own salvation and does not need a Savior since God ought to congratulate him for rising from the animal depths.

The Formula of Concord is particularly thorough in its statement on original sin. In the Epitome, section 1 of Original Sin (Triglotta, page 778) we read, "We believe, teach, and confess that there is a distinction between man's nature, not only as was originally created by God, pure and holy without sin, but also as we have it (that nature) now after the fall, namely between the nature (itself), which even after the fall is and remains a creature of God and original sin, and that this distinction is as great as the distinction between a work of God and a work of the devil." In the Formula of Concord, Section I of Original Sin (page 867 of the Triglotta) states, "For although in Adam and Eve the nature was originally created pure, good, and holy, nevertheless, sin did not enter their nature through the way fanatically taught by the Maniceans, as though Satan had created or made some evil substance and mingled it with their nature. But since man, by the seduction of Satan through the fall has lost his created hereditary righteousness according to God's judgment and sentence, as a punishment, human nature, as has been said before, is so perverted and corrupted by this deprivation or deficiency, want, and injury, which has been caused by Satan, that at present the nature is transmitted, together with this defect and corruption (propagated in a hereditary way), to all men who are conceived and born in an actual way from father and mother." In the Smalcald Articles, part three, article

one, (Triglotta, page 477), we read, "Here we must confess, as Paul says in Romans 5:12, that sin originated and entered the world from one man Adam, by whose disobedience all men were made sinners and subject to death and the devil. This is called original or capital sin." Thus, consistently, the Confessions regard the fall of Adam and Eve from their holy state of created righteousness as a real historical fall even as it is taught in Scripture. Nowhere in the Confessions is there any leeway for interpreting the origin of man from an evolutionary point of view, that is, from the point of view that he arose from the animal and was not originally perfect and holy. Rather, it is quite the reverse. In harmony with Scripture, the Confessions point out that man was created in true righteousness and then fell into sin in the manner described in Genesis 3.

## LUTHER ON CREATION

Luther in his commentary on Genesis treats the doctrine of creation much more exhaustively than do the Lutheran Confessions, this quite naturally because of his purpose of expounding the content of Genesis. He does not deal with any evolutionary theories, since they were not current in his day. But his exegesis (interpretation) of the opening chapters of Genesis is none-the-less pertinent.

In the preface to the first chapter of Genesis Luther states: "But in the Christian Church no one has yet appeared who has been able to expound all things in this book properly and rightly, for invariably the Church teachers mingled many strange notions into the matters taught in this chapter. From this it is clear that God has reserved this majestic wisdom and its true meaning to Himself, and that He wanted us merely to know in general that the world had a beginning and that it was created by Him out of nothing. This general knowledge the text teaches very clearly. But so far as the details are concerned, there is much about which we can never become sure so that again and again innumerable questions are being raised concerning what this or that means."<sup>1</sup>

This warning of Luther is most valuable for your day. We must continually bear in mind that God has not given us a detailed and precise account of creation, nor would we understand it if He had. But it is also true that scientific research is likewise hampered in trying to unravel the mysteries of creation. For this reason we cannot expect to achieve the clear answers that our curiosity desires.

It is interesting that Luther believed the earth to be about six thousand years old. He writes: "Now, we know from Moses (the author of Genesis) that about six thousand years ago the world was not yet in existence, though of this fact no philosopher (scientist) can be convinced. Aristotle, for example, refuses to listen to anyone speaking about a first and last man. Although he leaves open the question whether or not the world is eternal, he nevertheless inclines to the opinion that it is everlasting."<sup>2</sup> Note that Luther's concern is to oppose the philosophical idea that the world had no beginning.

The fact that there was such speculation in the Church then is brought out by Luther's observation: "Besides the common thought that the world was made out of nothing, there is here hardly a single thing on which all theologians agree."<sup>3</sup>

The controversial six days of creation are treated by the Reformer also. He quotes the old church fathers Hilary and Augustine as being of the opinion that the creation had been instantaneous and "not successively in the course of six days."<sup>4</sup> Augustine had speculated that the six days had something to do with the knowledge of the angels and were not natural days.

Luther's reply to these ideas sets a standard for us even today: "Though these speculations are very subtle, yet they are of no value. Why speak of a twofold knowledge; and what good does it do to conceive of allegories and mysteries at the very beginning of (the book of) Moses? What he wants to teach us is nothing about allegorical creatures, or an allegorical world, but something about real creatures and about a visible world, which we can see, feel and handle. Therefore he calls

each creature according to its (right) name, day and evening, just as we do, without any allegories. The evangelist Matthew speaks in the same way when in chapter 28:1 (of his gospel) he tells us that Christ arose "in the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week." But since we cannot understand the details of these days, especially why God wanted to have this time distinction, let us confess our ignorance and not needlessly regard and interpret these words in a figurative sense. So far as the opinion of St. Augustine is concerned, I hold that Moses spoke literally and not figuratively or allegorically, telling us that the world with all its creatures was made within six days, just as the words read. Since therefore we cannot by our own reason and intelligence perceive or understand the (divine) cause (for the six days in the first chapter of Genesis) let us remain pupils and regard the holy Spirit (who inspired the sacred text) as our Master."<sup>5</sup> Note particularly that Luther is unwilling to allegorize or look on the text in a figurative way even though he must confess he does not understand it all. Instead of interpreting the text as human reason dictates, he cautions, "Let us remain pupils and regard the Holy Spirit who inspired the sacred text as our master."

Luther, as usual, continues to amaze us with his insight. In dealing with the question of how there could be light on the first day when the sun was not created until the fourth day, Luther says that's simply the way it was and that "Moses wrote for simple and unlearned people in order that they might have a clear explanation about the creation."<sup>6</sup> In other words Moses did not attempt to explain how God did it. In dealing with the fourth day of creation Luther adds: "Here let me add that we must accustom ourselves to the language of the Holy Spirit, just as we cannot study other arts with profit unless we acquaint ourselves with their peculiar terminology. The Holy Spirit employs His own mode of speech. He says that God has created by speaking or that He has worked through the Word or that all His works are divine words. As a philosopher uses his own specific terms, so also the Holy Spirit. The astronomer, too, has his technical terms. These the Holy Spirit does

not use, but He speaks of the celestial structure above us as the heaven. This (terminology) the astronomer should not criticize. Let him keep his own nomenclature, but let Scripture speak as it pleases."<sup>7</sup>

Here the Reformer teaches us a great lesson. The inspired author of Genesis did not couch the language of the creation story in the science of his day or of our day. He wrote simply in a manner understandable to people of all ages. He described what God did, without explaining how He did it. Moses wrote without involving a system of cosmology or a particular astronomical world view. He was preserved by the Holy Ghost from including any of the erroneous science of his day. What Moses wrote is true. But it is not and could not be in terms of the scientific technology of our age or any other.

Much more could be said concerning Luther's excellent commentary on Genesis 1-3, but the limits of time dictate that we move on to a more direct consideration to the opening chapters of Genesis themselves. We have time only to note the salient features of this magnificent account of the beginning of matter and of life.

## THE INTERPRETATION OF GENESIS CHAPTER ONE

Genesis 1:1—"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." The reference to beginning indicates the beginning of time, space, matter, and of all things, except God Himself. The heavens and the earth is a comprehensive expression that includes this earth, the solar system, and the great universe itself. This is clear from verse 16 and the rest of Scripture. This first verse is a summary statement of God's activity. Some feel that it refers to the creation of matter, since in verse two we read that the "earth was without form and void." Stoeckhardt said it was the creation of "Der Stoff aller Dinge," i.e., the material out of which all was made in subsequent acts during the six days. It is interesting that many scientists today agree with the concept that the creation of the chemical elements was an instantaneous event. They hold that in the beginning there was

a great ball of elemental particles which began to expand. As it expanded it cooled and the elements were formed. However, following this event they postulated the passage of great periods of time.

Genesis 1:3—The first three days of creation form a unit and the second three days form a second unit. There is an interesting parallelism between the two units. On the first day God created light. On the fourth day, the first of the second unit, God set lights in the heavens and makes specific reference to sun, moon, and stars. On the second day God separated the waters on the earth from the waters in the atmosphere or firmament. On the fifth day, the second of the second unit, God created the creatures that swim in the waters on the earth and also the birds flying across the firmament of the heavens. On the third day, the last of the first cycle, God separated the dry land from the waters and created vegetation. On the corresponding sixth day, the last of the second cycle, God created the land animals and man who live on the earth and feed on the vegetation. Thus there is a definite plan and structure to the creation process.

A number of items demand special attention. First is the continuous repetition of the formula, "And God said." As we saw earlier the rest of Scripture notes that God created by the power of His almighty decree. Here God is manifestly portrayed as working directly. This in itself indicates that creation is a special act and rules out the ordinary laws of nature or science that operate today. This was an extraordinary, once-in-an-eternity event. Thus it is not in the realm of scientific investigation any more than was the water and wine in Jesus' miracle at Cana.

Note also that God decrees that the "earth is to put forth vegetation" (Gen. 1:11). The waters are to "bring forth living creatures." (Gen. 1:24) How this took place is not said. But there is here no hint that all living things developed from primeval lower forms of life. There is no idea here of an evolutionary process.

There is a definite order too in the living things created. On the third day three kinds of plant life: Vegetation; Plants yielding seed, and fruit trees: On the fifth day three kinds of animal life: Great sea monsters, swarms of living creatures (of the waters), and birds. On the sixth day, three kinds: Cattle (or domestic animals), creeping things, and beasts of the earth (wild animals).

The terms are not zoological or botanical. They list only the largest groups. There is no detail given. All that we are told is that in each case they reproduced "after their kind."

The word "kind" in the English Bible is a translation of the Hebrew word "Min." Many creationists in the past have equated this with the modern biological term of "species." Now the modern term "species" is very narrow in its application. Two birds identical except for small differences may be classified today as being in different species. Larger terms embracing larger groups are: the genus, the family, the order, the class, the sub-phylum, and the phylum. Thus, a dog belongs to the species "familiaris" meaning common. He belongs to the genus "canis" which contains near relatives. He is a member of the "canidae" or dog-like group. He is then a member of the order "Carnivora," the meat-eaters. He is in the still larger group of the class "Mammalia," animals which nurse their young. Finally he belongs to the Phylum "Chordata," animals with backbones, and to the Kingdom "Animalia."

It is impossible to equate the Hebrew word "Min" which we translate as "kind" with any of these modern terms. It certainly is incorrect to equate it with "species." Rather Scripture itself gives us every reason to believe that "kind" is a much broader term and includes more categories than the biologists species. In Leviticus 11:16 reference is made to the "owl . . . after his kind." But owls form a complete order, "Strigiformes." So, in this case, "kind" obviously includes all species of owls as well as genera, and even beyond. In Leviticus 11 mention is also made of the hawk, as a "kind." In modern science the hawk is listed as a "superfamily" which contains many species.

The word "kind" is also used in Genesis 7:13-16. Then in Genesis 8:19, 20 Noah is reported to have sacrificed "one" of every clean beast and of every clean fowl. Scientists today list approximately 8,500 species of birds and 14,500 species of mammals. There are 12 species of caribou in North America alone. If "kind" is equivalent to species then Noah would have sacrificed thousands of animals. Scripture certainly doesn't indicate this. Kind then means "division" or "group." "After its kind" then means that Jehovah made plants and animals according to their various divisions. It means that there are definite limits beyond which plants and animals may not vary. Thus it rules out the development of man from lower forms of life. But it allows for variation within the circle of the "min." Thus God created a creature of the general group or kind of cattle, but the specific species of cows we have today may be considerably different from the original created kind of cattle. Consider man and the great variety of races we have today. Yet they all are descendants of one set of parents, Adam and Eve. Thus the creation account does not obligate us to say that there can be no change or that species may not vary, or that new species may not arise. Thus the believer in creation may look at the so-called evidence for evolution and recognize that it merely represents changes or variations within the circle of the kind, and not as it is claimed, evidence that man arose from animal ancestors.

When we come to the account of man's creation we have reached the spot where Genesis and the rest of Scripture differ most from evolution in theory and philosophy. In the case of vegetation and animal life God simply says, "Let there be" and then the earth and waters brought them forth in answer to God's word. But in the case of man there are striking and fundamental differences: 1) God consults within the Trinity — "Let us make man"; 2) Man is to be made in the image of God, after His likeness; 3) Instead of merely speaking, God formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." 4) Adam is made first, then Eve is made from Adam's rib.



Note that this special description of man's creation completely segregates man from the animal creation. There isn't the slightest hint that man may have been derived from the animals. Moreover, man is created in God's image which Ephesians 4:24 defines as righteousness and true holiness and Colossians 3:10 refers to as "knowledge after the image of Him that created him." The concept of a man perfect in his knowledge of God's will and completely holy in attitude and life is in sharp contrast to the evolutionist's idea of an ape-man standing just a little straighter, gripping a newly made club, and dimly beginning to think a few elementary thoughts, savage and predatory, merely a new and slightly superior animal.

Finally, Genesis Chapter 1 is famous for its inclusion of all of creation in six days. This didn't bother ancient and medieval man. They rightly figured that if God could create, then six days was more than enough time. But with the coming of the evolutionary theory with its idea of the long, slow process of development of plants and animals from lower forms of life, the idea of millions and billions of years were introduced as essential. The creationist can be happy with a young earth or an old earth. It is not a question of what God could do. It is simply a question of what He did do. But the evolutionist must have a long time. So science has been proclaiming now for a century that the earth is immensely old. In an effort to "reconcile" these two ideas many have asked if Moses' six days might not be aeons or long ages during which God carried on the creative process at a leisurely pace. Now this idea is admittedly attractive. But it must be borne in mind that the answer must come from the Bible itself and not from something we read into it. As Luther says, "The Holy Spirit is our teacher." If we take the doctrine of verbal inspiration seriously, then the answer must come from the Word of God.

The following points bear on the problem. (For a more detailed account read Dr. R. Surburg's chapter two in the volume: *Darwin, Evolution and Creation*, (CPH, 1959).

1. The Hebrew word translated as "Day" is Yom.

"Yom" occurs many times in the Old Testament. It is properly translated by over 50 different words, including "day," "time," "life," "today," "age," "forever," and "continuously." Hence, we must determine its meaning by studying its use in Genesis Chapter 1.

2. In the Old Testament whenever "yom" is associated with a number, solar days are always meant (Gen. 7:11; 8:14; 7:12; Ex. 12:6).

3. The word "yom" (day) first occurs in verse 5 of Genesis 1 immediately after God has separated light from darkness. God then names the light "Day" and the darkness "Night." Then follow the words and there was evening and there was morning, one day. This association with light and darkness, day and night makes it clear that yom means a natural day and not a long period of time.

4. The entire wording of Genesis Chapter 1 indicates immediate action. There is no indication of a long drawn-out process.

5. Exodus 20:11 explains that the seventh day of the week, the Jewish sabbath, is to be observed because "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day."

6. The interpretation of "yom" as aeon or long period of time does not affect the hoped-for reconciliation of Genesis with evolutionary theory. Genesis would then place the origin of the plant kingdom aeons ahead of the animal. For the plants came on the third day, and animals the fifth and sixth. Science teaches that both plants and animals developed apace.

7. Hebrew dictionaries and commentaries on Genesis say that day is the proper translation of "yom." Marcus Dods in the *Expositor's Bible* writes that, "If the word 'day' in these chapters does not mean a period of 24 hours, the interpretation of Scripture is hopeless."<sup>3</sup>

The modern and liberal *Interpreter's Bible* states, "There

ers, in presenting the Scriptural witness about man, are, "At fault in every word, and have been at fault in every word and yet according to the same Scriptural witness being justified and sanctified by grace alone, they still have spoken the Word of God in their fallible and erring human word."<sup>11</sup> Thus, Barth at one and the same time admits freely that there may be errors in the Bible and likewise holds that the Bible presents divine truth. Thus he would feel free to say that the Biblical account is not at all scientific, and yet the Biblical account of creation is true because it does say that God is creator and that man is creature. However, there are tragic consequences to such an approach. Barth rejects the term original sin and substitutes the idea of a different kind of sin. He says, "The idea of a hereditary sin which has come to man by propagation is an unfortunate and a mistaken one."<sup>12</sup> In this connection, Barth believes that the reformers had no right to speak of the image of God which man lost through sin.

Reinhold Niebuhr, another of the neo-orthodox school, although in many respects far different from Karl Barth, speaks of the Bible expressing its truth in terms of what he calls a myth. He refers to the myth as "supra-scientific." By this he means that it deals with certain aspects of reality which are beyond the reach of things that science analyzes, charts and records. The myth is capable, according to Niebuhr, of saying things that have a general truth, without being concerned as to whether or not the things that are said agree with what scientists call the world of reality. Perhaps we can best make clear what Niebuhr means by this from a recent article in which he speaks concerning Christ's life, death and resurrection: "Incidentally, most modern Biblical scholars take it for granted that Christ's resurrection was not a public event in the same sense as the crucifixion, but rather a spiritual experience of His disciples, a symbol of the early Christian faith that Christ's death represented the climax of a historical drama in which both the divine mystery and human situation were definitively clarified. The resurrection stories, however dubious as records of public historical events, are witness to the fact that the Church, which was

can be no question but that by 'day' the author meant just what we mean — the time required for one revolution of the earth on its axis. Had he meant an aeon he would certainly, in view of his fondness for great numbers, have stated the number of millennium each period embraced."<sup>9</sup>

The essayist can only conclude that the evidence for translating "Yom" as "day" is extremely strong. Let us again remind ourselves that God is without limit and without bounds. It is not a question of what He could do, but of what He did do.

### MODERNISTIC AND NEO-ORTHODOX IDEAS ABOUT CREATION

We come now to various ways in which theologians have dealt with the controversial doctrine of creation. It is extremely interesting to note that a man's basic evaluation of Scripture, his ideas of divine revelation and inspiration, and his basic orientation toward Christian doctrine in general are often made by his treatment of the opening chapters of Genesis.

To the liberal or modernistic theologian the creation account poses no difficulty. He regards the Bible as being a human product mixed with certain divine truths. He simply states that the author of Genesis (who probably was not Moses) and the various editors who worked on the book simply recounted a revised version of the creation myths told by the ancient Babylonians. All that was done was to purify them of their polytheism. The Genesis account merely represents the cosmology or world view of the ancients of that day. It has no correspondence with fact. As a matter of fact many liberals viewed Darwin's theory of evolution with delight. It was regarded as scientific evidence that man was on his way to inevitable progress, growing better and better year after year. It also rendered obsolete the doctrine of the atonement through Christ. Man was inherently good and Christ, whose deity was also denied, was merely a good example.

World War I dashed the optimistic hopes of the modernists. A great gloom and pessimism swept over the world, one

which empty liberalism with its prating of man's inherent goodness could not dispel. A new theological movement arose that claimed many disillusioned liberals. Many say it started with the publication in 1919 of Karl Barth's commentary on "The Epistle to the Romans." The new theology is best known as neo-orthodoxy. It was called "orthodoxy" since the Bible as God's Word, man's guilt, and God's grace were once again taken seriously. It was called "neo" or "new" orthodoxy since its leaders still did not want to swing back to the evangelical and traditional apostolic Christian faith which our own Lutheran Church has preserved.

It is said that the European theologian Soren Kierkegaard laid the existential foundation for this new theology. He emphasized the theme that man must be passionately concerned with his own guilt. This phase of existentialism is good. Man must confront his own guilt and God's grace in an active and most concerned fashion. But too often existentialism becomes subjective. However, that is another story.

Three names are among the most famous in the school of neo-orthodoxy. They are Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, and Reinhold Niebuhr. Many have hailed them as new reformers. However, our opinion ought to be far less enthusiastic. Karl Barth tells us that in the person of Jesus Christ God is disclosed to us as the creator. He indicates that this emphasizes the fact that man and the world are creatures. They are the objects of the divine creative act. It is highly important then for man to recognize his relationship to God as that of the creature to the creator. This is well and good. However, Barth goes on to say that the account of creation, as literature, is a saga. By saga, he means an unhistoriographical conception of history. He holds that by way of poetry and poetic expression the creation account indicates to us things that cannot be expressed in human terms. Barth will not go so far as to say that the history of creation is a myth, as others have said. However, at the same time he is not willing to look upon it as an actual historical account.<sup>10</sup> Dr. Robert Preuss of our St. Louis Seminary recently pointed out that Barth takes the position that the Biblical writ-

ers, in presenting the Scriptural witness about man, are, "At fault in every word, and have been at fault in every word and yet according to the same Scriptural witness being justified and sanctified by grace alone, they still have spoken the Word of God in their fallible and erring human word."<sup>11</sup> Thus, Barth at one and the same time admits freely that there may be errors in the Bible and likewise holds that the Bible presents divine truth. Thus he would feel free to say that the Biblical account is not at all scientific, and yet the Biblical account of creation is true because it does say that God is creator and that man is creature. However, there are tragic consequences to such an approach. Barth rejects the term original sin and substitutes the idea of a different kind of sin. He says, "The idea of a hereditary sin which has come to man by propagation is an unfortunate and a mistaken one."<sup>12</sup> In this connection, Barth believes that the reformers had no right to speak of the image of God which man lost through sin.

Reinhold Niebuhr, another of the neo-orthodox school, although in many respects far different from Karl Barth, speaks of the Bible expressing its truth in terms of what he calls a myth. He refers to the myth as "supra-scientific." By this he means that it deals with certain aspects of reality which are beyond the reach of things that science analyzes, charts and records. The myth is capable, according to Niebuhr, of saying things that have a general truth, without being concerned as to whether or not the things that are said agree with what scientists call the world of reality. Perhaps we can best make clear what Niebuhr means by this from a recent article in which he speaks concerning Christ's life, death and resurrection: "Incidentally, most modern Biblical scholars take it for granted that Christ's resurrection was not a public event in the same sense as the crucifixion, but rather a spiritual experience of His disciples, a symbol of the early Christian faith that Christ's death represented the climax of a historical drama in which both the divine mystery and human situation were definitively clarified. The resurrection stories, however dubious as records of public historical events, are witness to the fact that the Church, which was

formed by the inspiration of the life and death of the man, Jesus of Nazareth, did not regard his death as merely the martyrdom of a noble man, but as a drama in which the ultimate mysteries about God and man were clarified. The divine mystery involved the paradoxical relation between the ultimate judgment and divine mercy."<sup>13</sup> It is perfectly clear that what Niebuhr means to say is that the early Church expressed in the story of the resurrection something that never took place but merely expressed their lofty ideals and the lifting of their spirits and the hope they had that Christ really would have arisen. This is a polite way of saying that they believe something which was a fable and never really happened. It is not surprising then that Niebuhr is led to deny that Jesus was literally God in the flesh. He also concedes the idea of Kierkegaard that a man could not be tempted if he had not already sinned. Thus he denies the doctrine of the sinlessness of Christ and of course departs completely from Christianity in so doing."<sup>14</sup> In Niebuhr we have demonstrated the tremendous danger of taking any part of the Bible and indicating that it may be a mythological presentation of some sort of spiritual truth. The tremendous danger is that the man who says that the creation story is not a historical account in any sense of the word may very quickly go on to deny other doctrines involving the nature and work of Jesus Christ Himself.

Emil Brunner, another of the neo-orthodox school, has a great deal to say about the doctrine of creation. Brunner very properly says that to know the creator means to know first and foremost that God, because he is sovereign Lord, is creator. Brunner asserts that man is to understand that the Lord comes to him and says, "I am the Lord, thy God, thy Creator. This means you are my property."<sup>15</sup> He goes on to say, "For the fact that man belongs to God implies the whole truth of responsibility and of all moral obligation. In Jesus Christ we meet him who addresses us as absolute Lord, and therefore is the creator of all things: I Thy Lord, the Creator." Brunner also indicates that God created the world because He wished to communicate Himself, because He wishes to have something over against Himself. As the Holy God He willed to glorify Himself. As the loving God He willed to give Himself to others and to bless



them. All of this is, of course, good and proper. Brunner also indicates that the doctrine of creation is opposed to the old Greek philosophy which did not have any real doctrine of creation, because it did not think that there was a beginning of the world. However, Brunner is worried about the alleged contradictions of the creation story with science. For instance, he feels that the view of space, great and extensive as it is in modern science, was not shared by the writer of Genesis whom, he thinks, had a very limited idea of the world's space as being a bowl inverted over the earth. Here I feel that Brunner misinterprets the writer of Genesis. The writer of Genesis it seems to me had no such narrow concept of the world view. Moreover other portions of Scripture indicate that the Jews had a very exalted idea of the immensity of space. Brunner, however, is also concerned about the question of the age of the earth. He believes that the Bible presents the picture of a six thousand year-old world as opposed to the millions and billions of years of the scientific theory. The fact that neither of these positions is completely correct I shall deal with later in the essay. However, Brunner, not because of exegetical reasons or for reasons of Biblical interpretation, but primarily because he is overly impressed by the claims of the cosmogonists, then takes the position that although the Mosaic story of creation is a wonderful testimony of divine revelation, it is also the product of a very limited view of the world. He says, "It tells the story of creation with the aid of conceptions which, without ceasing to be vessels of divine revelations, are such that their intellectual outlook is in conflict with modern knowledge. The Biblical story of creation is bound up with the picture of the world current in antiquity which no longer exists for us."<sup>16</sup> It is interesting that in a different section of this same chapter Brunner indicates that he thinks that theologians will never be able to persuade the scientist to accept them as respectable thinkers until the doctrine of verbal inspiration is abandoned.<sup>17</sup>

Brunner goes on to say that evolution is the mechanism of creation and that creation is the spiritual source and final cause of evolution. He thus adopts a viewpoint that is quite common among many theologians. Being overawed with science and not



able to deal with scientific theories and scientists, they adopt the point of view that evolution must be the way in which God created. They insist only that the scientists remember that somewhere behind the evolutionary process there is, of course, a divine being. Brunner goes on to indicate that one should no longer attempt to hold to the historicity of the story of Adam. In other words he does not believe that an actual Adam ever existed. However, he hastes to add that man cannot surrender the idea of a fall. Brunner believes rightly that if one were to surrender the idea of the fall that one "would shatter the foundations of the whole Biblical doctrine of man and indeed of the whole doctrine of revelation and salvation."<sup>18</sup> Brunner continues, "Over against a theory of evolution which sweeps away all ideas of creation and of sin, fundamentalism, in spite of its curious aberrations of thought, is absolutely right." Thus we find Brunner confronted in his theology with a very difficult position. He is not willing to concede that there was a historical Adam and yet he recognizes that if Christian theology is to remain consistent or indeed to exist at all, that there must be a doctrine of the fall. Here again we have highlighted the great problems in connection with the doctrine of creation. The doctrine of the fall of man, of his original sin and original guilt, and of the atonement by Christ the second Adam are tied up so closely that one can scarcely touch the doctrine of creation without imperiling the doctrine of man.

In evaluating the position of the neo-orthodox that the creation account is to be dismissed as merely a saga or a myth, let us remember the serious way in which the rest of the Bible takes the creation story. Let us remember particularly the treatment of St. Paul. The great apostle makes special reference to the fact that Adam is created before Eve, that Eve is taken out of Adam, and that Adam the first man to sin plunged all the world into sin and that Christ, the second Adam, has redeemed the world. There is every evidence that he takes it as a real historical event. As a matter of fact, the neo-orthodox, I believe, will generally concede this and simply take the point of view that the Apostle Paul was not correct when he regarded this as a

historical event and that he should have regarded it as a mythological event.

Moreover, the neo-orthodox approach to creation, I believe, is a consequence of their being overawed by the claims of science. As we shall see later, the claims of evolutionists are not nearly as well grounded as the proponents of the theory would have us believe. As a matter of fact, they require more faith than the doctrine of creation. Nonetheless, in our modern age theologians often have been impressed by them. This is particularly true where their doctrine of inspiration has been weak or in error.

Are the much-disputed chapters in Genesis to be taken as historical or are they merely poetical or mythical expressions of the general truth of creation? The following paragraph by Edward J. Young presents very fairly reasons for believing that it is not correct to interpret the opening chapters of Genesis as myth: "Let us examine again the much-disputed early chapters of Genesis. Did the human author of those chapters believe that he was recounting something that was true? If he were simply relating something the truthfulness of which did not at all concern him, we may well ask why he took such pains to make it appear to his readers that he was recounting historical fact. Why, for example, did he bother to tell his readers the names of the rivers which flowed from the Garden of Eden? Might not some unsophisticated reader, who did not have the advantage of the idea that the writer was not interested in the truth of what he was recording, simply come to the conclusion that the writer, by mentioning the rivers of the garden, was trying to locate the garden? Why, too, did he speak of the gold of the land of Havilah as being good, and why did he note the fact that there, in the land of Havilah, there was also bdellium and onyx stone? What was the point of mentioning such things unless it were that the writer wished his readers to know where the garden actually was situated? It would seem that the writer of Genesis was indeed interested in the truthfulness of that which he recounted. This fact is further illustrated in the manner in which he relates the tragic consequences that resulted from the disobedience recorded in the third chapter.

"When we turn to the New Testament we find that the Apostle Paul was quite interested in the truthfulness of this particular narrative of the fall. Paul contrasts the work of Adam with that of Christ. He furthermore does this in such a way as to make it clear that he believed in the accuracy of what was recorded about Adam. The very work of Christ, according to Paul, depends upon the truthfulness of what is stated concerning Adam. If what is stated concerning Adam is not true, we have every reason for denying the truthfulness of what is said concerning Christ. Paul, it would seem, was very concerned about the truthfulness of the Genesis account of the fall. A careful study of the Bible will make it clear that this modern assertion that the Hebrews were not interested in the truthfulness of a story has no foundation whatever in fact."<sup>19</sup>

It is still true in theology, as it has always been, that the Bible is to be interpreted in its own light. We are to go to the Scripture itself and from the Scripture to gain the truths that are there. As Luther has said, it is the Holy Spirit who is our instructor. It is a mistake to attempt to interpret the Bible in the light of science or of any other dominant field of human thought and endeavor. The statement on Scripture adopted at the San Francisco Convention of our Synod last summer, a statement printed in the Lutheran Witness in advance of the Convention, in section 4 rightly states, "Scripture alone is to interpret Scripture. The hermeneutical rule that Scripture must be interpreted according to the rule, or the analogy of faith means that the clear passages of Scripture, not any theological system or dogmatical summary of Biblical doctrine are to determine the interpretation. Seemingly obscure passages must not be interpreted so as to pervert or contradict clear passages. This means that every statement of Scripture must be understood in its native sense, according to grammar, context, and linguistic usage of time. When Scripture speaks historically as for example in Genesis 1-3, it is to be understood as speaking of literal, historical facts. Where Scripture speaks symbolically, metaphorically, or metonymically, as for example in Revelations 20, it must be interpreted on its own terms. Furthermore, since God spoke in the common language of man, expression such as sun-

rise and sunset, the corners of the earth, etc., must not be viewed as intending to convey scientific information."

The statement also includes these words, "We reject and condemn demythologizing as a denial of the Word of God. Where Scripture records as historical facts those events and deeds which far surpass the ordinary experience of men, that record must be understood literally as a record of facts. The miraculous and mysterious may not be dismissed as having only a metaphorical or symbolic meaning." This latter paragraph particularly has reference not only to the doctrine of creation but to the doctrine of Christ and to the doctrine of the atonement.

By way of contrast, we turn now to the stand of certain groups known as "fundamentalists," a name derived originally from their interest in preserving the fundamentals of apostolic Christianity. Today, since the name fundamentalist is sometimes criticized, these groups prefer the name "evangelical." Evangelicals usually accept the doctrine of verbal inspiration. They include many fine scholars and some have organized a group known as the American Scientific Affiliation, a group composed of Christians who are competent scientists and who are concerned with the matters with which we have been dealing in this essay.

Evangelicals very correctly hold that the first chapters of Genesis are correct and also are not to be dismissed as myth or vague poetry. They take the Mosaic account of the six days of creation as accurate and true. They rightly hold that if we had all the facts we would see that the Bible and nature's story do not conflict. However, in order to account for some of the apparent contradictions between the Genesis account and the findings and theories of geological science some evangelicals have proposed various schemes for the explanation of the Genesis account. We now turn to a brief survey of these proposed solutions.

1. *The Day-revelation Idea*: Some evangelicals believe that the six days of creation are days on which God revealed to

Moses what He had done at creation time. In other words it was a story that took six days to tell. But the text gives no support at all for this idea. Other prophets on occasion related how God made his revelation. Their approach is entirely different.

2. *The Gap Theory*: This interpretation of Genesis is well summarized and analyzed by Dr. Raymond Surburg in our recent book, *Darwin, Evolution and Creation*. Dr. Surburg writes: "In the 19th century George H. Pember, in his book *Earth's Earliest Ages*, set forth the interpretation that a long period or gap was to be reckoned with after Genesis 1:1. Pember is thus sometimes credited with the formulation of the gap or restitution theory. The possibility of a gap or a long period of time after Genesis 1:1 has been held by a number of 19th century theologians, among them Hengstenberg (1802-69), famous Lutheran theologian at the University of Berlin; Franz Delitzsch (1813-90), professor of Old Testament at Erlangen, and by Boehme, Oetinger, F. von Meyer, Stier, Keerl, Kurtz, and others.

"Today this theory is very popular among many fundamentalists and evangelical Christians because it has been sponsored by the Scofield Reference Bible, used by many Bible institutes in the United States. The Scofield Bible says:

'Jer. 4:23-26; Is. 24:1 and 45:18 clearly indicate that the earth had undergone a cataclysmic change as a result of a divine judgement. The face of the earth bears everywhere the marks of such a catastrophe. There are not wanting intimations which connect it with a previous testing and fall of angels. See Ezek. 28:12-15 and Is. 14:9-14, which certainly go beyond the kings of Tyre and Babylon.

"Although held by many Christians today, this theory cannot be substantiated from the Bible. It attempts to give some explanation for the different strata which, geologists say, make up the surface of the earth. But the gap theory gives no explana-

tion for the fossils in the rock unless, as Berkhof says, 'it is assumed that there were also successive creations of animals followed by mass destruction.' The Hebrew text does not say the earth became, but the earth was, waste and void. Even if it were feasible to render 'hayetha' by 'became,' the words 'waste and void' indicate an unformed state, and not one resulting from a destruction. In *A Survey of Old Testament Teaching* (I, 16) Watts asserts: 'In Genesis 1:2a the verb is a perfect. It indicates a fixed and completed state. In other words, original matter was in a state of chaos when created; it came into being in that way.' Delitzsch thought that the original earth had angels as inhabitants and that it was their fall which caused God to turn the world into chaos. Many dispensationalists have propounded this theory. However, an accurate examination of the contests of passages like Is. 24:1; Jer. 4:23-26; Job 9:5; Ezek. 28:12-15 will reveal to the student the inapplicability of those verses as prooftexts for the reconstitution theory."<sup>20</sup>

3. *Progressive Creation*: One of the more popular of the theories of the evangelicals is the theory explained by Bernard Ramm in his book *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*. Progressive-Creationism holds that the days of Genesis are periods. This idea is subject to the criticisms made when we treated the subject of the creation day earlier in the essay. However, the theory holds that the order of creation as told in Genesis was part chronological and part logical. Over a period of millions of years by a series of *creative, not evolutionary* acts, God prepared the earth for man's inhabitation. As the time came for it, each new type of life was created by God, as opposed to the chance development of evolution. Finally when all was ready God created man, even as Genesis relates. Ramm writes: "Putting together our picture we have something like this: Almighty God is Creator . . . In His mind the entire plan of creation was formed with man as the climax. Over the millions of years of geologic history the earth is prepared for man's dwelling . . . The great forests grew and decayed for his coal, that coal might appear a natural product and not an artificial insertion in Nature. The millions of sea life were born and perished for his oil. The surface of the earth was weathered for his forests and

valleys. From time to time the great creative acts, *de novo*, took place. The complexity of animal forms increased. Finally, when every river had cut its intended course, when every mountain was in its purposed place, when every animal was on the earth according to blueprint, then he whom all creation anticipated is made, MAN, in whom alone is the breath of God."<sup>21</sup>

One can easily lose himself in these many speculations. They vary immensely. They often stretch the Biblical account. None really satisfy. Neither science nor the Bible give the detailed information our curiosity demands. But it should be noted that many feel they should interpret "day" as a long period of time, this without any necessary evolutionary connotation. But all agree that Christian theology must hold to the special creation of Adam and in God's image, and to the story of the fall.

## THE ROMAN CATHOLIC VIEW OF CREATION

The attitude of the Roman Catholic Church is surprisingly flexible on many controversial questions in view of its extremely strict attitude on other points e.g. birth control. The matter of evolution and creation is one of those where latitude is given. In a recent pamphlet bearing the "imprimatur" (stamp of approval) of Archbishop Ritter of St. Louis, we read, "There was certainly a special intervention of God required to explain the existence of man. Blind evolution alone would not and could not explain it. But the believer in God's creation can hold, if he wishes, that this creation could have been worked through the evolutionary process."<sup>22</sup> Dr. J. F. Ewing defined the Catholic position in the Catholic "Anthropological Quarterly" saying, "God may indeed have used a body prepared for the soul as far as possible by evolution" and . . . "the possibility that there were true men before Adam and Eve, men whose line became extinct is allowable."<sup>23</sup> The truly official position is given in the papal encyclical "Humani Generis" which states: "No Catholic can hold that after Adam there existed on this earth true men who did not take their origin through natural generation from him as from the first parents of all, or that Adam is mere-

ly a symbol for a number of first parents. For it is unintelligible how such an opinion can be squared with what the sources of revealed truth and the documents of the Magisterium of the Church teaching on original sin, which proceeds from sin actually committed by an individual Adam, and which, passed on to all by way of generation, is in everyone as his own."<sup>24</sup>

Thus, the Catholics allow evolution but insist that God gave man a soul, that Adam was a real historical character, and the parent of us all. Thus they attempt to protect the doctrine of the fall of man and original sin.

### EVOLUTION: FACT OR THEORY

My own evaluation is that all of the variant interpretations of Genesis are due, not from a lack of clarity in the creation account or in the rest of Scripture, but from a desire to accommodate modern scientific theories. The big question in my mind, speaking now as a scientist, is whether the case for evolution is so well proved as to justify this undignified retreat on the part of so many theologians. I suppose that if truth were decided by a majority vote there would be reason for accepting evolution. For it is the ruling in biology and geology today. To express doubt concerning its truth is to expose one's self to criticism as being stupid and scientifically illiterate. However, if one does enough reading he discovers not only that the case for evolution is far from proved, but also that many competent scientists are brave enough to openly express their doubts concerning its correctness.

Volume 5 of the French Encyclopedia which is devoted to natural history contains considerable information on evolution. It has a concluding article by Director Paul Lemoine who is professor at the French museum. Dr. Lemoine, a geologist, closes the volume with an article entitled "How Valid are the Theories of Evolution." Lemoine refers to the theories of evolution as those which have "deceived our young students" and as constituting "a dogma which all the world continues to teach but which each person in his speciality has reason to doubt."<sup>25</sup>



Lemoine mentions quite emphatically that natural selection, so dear to the heart of the Darwinist, simply does not work. He quotes the French scientist Guyenot to the effect that, "Natural selection, contrary to that which Darwin thought, has the effect of conserving the limits of variability of species. Sexual selection is under the shadow of ridicule." He quote Guyenot to the effect that, "Each great animal or vegetable group is diversified and stabilized in its own time independently of others." Lemoine concludes, "The results of this consideration is that the theory of evolution is impossible." He mentions that evolution is a theory that at least in France few believed but which they kept up because it was conventional language and was almost obligatory in the scientific world. He states quite candidly, "Evolution is a sort of dogma which the priests no longer believe, but which they maintain for the people." Lemoine adds, "It is necessary to have courage to say this in order that men of a future generation may orient their research in a different manner."

To my knowledge this 1937 estimate of the French biologist never received any publicity in America.

In more recent times Dr. C. P. Martin, of McGill University of Canada, criticized American biologists as devoid of self-criticism in dealing with evolutionary theory. After having pointed out many basic difficulties facing the present theory of Neo-Darwinism, McGill went on to criticize present day evolutionists, particularly American evolutionists for, "The almost total lack of scientific caution and self-criticism current in genetical circles in regard to the accepted theory of evolution by mutation."<sup>26</sup> He quotes several authors who are prominent in evolutionary circles and calls them, "Frank partisans of the accepted theory and almost completely devoid of a critical attitude." He goes on to say, "Consequently, by far the greater number of students that come my way — and they are drawn from many American and Canadian Universities — are completely indoctrinated with the idea that the theory of evolution by mutation is a closed issue and unquestionably established fact. It is not that they are aware of the difficulties which I have mentioned

above and esteem them of little weight or importance; they never heard of them and were amazed at the bare possibility of the accepted theory criticized." Here a scientist who himself believes in a different theory of evolution quite frankly criticizes the modern biologist and evolutionist for accepting all too blandly the theory and assuming that there can be no other explanation.

Last year the Everyman's Library Edition of books republished Darwin's *Origin of Species*. They included a modern introduction by Dr. W. R. Thompson, director of the Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control of Ottawa, Canada. Dr. Thompson is refreshingly frank in his introduction in which he reviews the situation in evolution since Darwin wrote his book 100 years ago. After he has shown that research has not supported the Darwinian theory, he includes this very interesting paragraph. "As we know, there is great divergence of opinion among biologists not only about the causes of evolution, but even about the actual process. This divergence exists because the evidence is unsatisfactory and does not permit any certain conclusion. It is therefore right and proper to draw the attention of the non-scientific public to the disagreements about evolution. This situation where scientific men rallied to the defense of a doctrine they are unable to defend scientifically, much less demonstrate with scientific rigor, attempting to maintain its credit with the public by the suppression of criticism and elimination of difficulties, is abnormal and undesirable in science."<sup>27</sup> It is interesting that Thompson also talks about, "Fragile towers of hypotheses based upon hypotheses, where fact and fiction intermingle in an inextricable confusion."<sup>28</sup> Thompson concludes, "I am not satisfied that Darwin proved his point or that his influence in scientific and public thinking has been beneficial." We are deeply indebted to this Canadian scientist for giving us this frank appraisal of Darwinism in a year when much literary work and most lectures about Darwin had nothing but praise and have little to say about the inadequacies of the theory and the tremendous problems which it faces.

Another modern scientist who has fought vigorously against evolution is the British ornithologist, Douglas Dewar.

Douglas Dewar has written several books the most important of which are *Is Evolution Proved?* (London, Hollis and Carter, 1947) and *The Transformist Illusion*. In both volumes this British scientist brings telling evidence to bear against the evolutionary theory and demonstrates in effective fashion that it is an illusion. In the latter book Dewar concludes, "It is submitted that the facts set forth in this book show that it is illusion to believe that blind natural forces have caused life to emerge from inert matter and then gradually to assume the varied forms of living organisms. We are therefore justified in speaking of the transformist illusion."<sup>20</sup> Anyone who is interested in reading a scholarly treatment in defense of creation and against evolution would be richly rewarded by reading these two books by the British author. The volume, *Is Evolution Proved?* is particularly interesting because it is in the form of a debate between Douglas Dewar and the British evolutionist H. S. Shelton.

Coming down to 1960, the University of Chicago Press recently published two volumes consisting of papers delivered at the University of Chicago centennial celebration of the 100th anniversary of Darwin's publication of the *Origin of the Species*. The first volume is entitled, *Evolution After Darwin—the Evolution of Life*. (University of Chicago Press, Sol Tax, Editor, 1960) This volume contains a chapter on *Morphology, Paleontology, and Evolution* by Everett C. Olson, professor of geology at the University of Chicago. This chapter has attracted attention since Professor Olson is distinctive in a volume filled with praise of Darwin in being frank enough to point out that all is not as rosy as the enthusiastic advocates of evolution would have the non-scientific public believe. Professor Olson says quite frankly that there are, "still among some of the biologists those who feel that much of the fabric of theory accepted by the majority today is actually false and who say so." He adds, however, and this is highly significant, "For the most part, the opinions of the dissenters have been given little credence. This group has formed a vocal but little heard minority. There exists, as well, a generally silent group of students engaged in biological pursuits who tend to disagree with much of the current thought but say or write little because they are not particularly

interested, do not see the controversy of evolution is of any particular importance, or are so strongly in disagreement that it seems futile to undertake the monumental task of converting the immense body of information and theory that exists in the formulation of modern thinking. It is, of course, difficult to judge the size and composition of this silent segment, but there is no doubt that the numbers are not inconsiderable. Right or wrong as such opinion may be, its existence is important and cannot be ignored or eliminated as a force in the study of evolution."<sup>30</sup> This statement by Everett Olson, himself an evolutionist, is highly significant because we are often told that theologians must accept evolution because it is a completely closed issue as far as science is concerned and is proved as completely and definitively as are the theorems of plain geometry. Here again we have evidence that this is not the case and that there are many who disagree.

#### MUTATIONS: MECHANISM FOR EVOLUTION?

Neither time nor circumstance will permit us to enter into all of the so-called evidence which is offered by evolutionists. However, it is possible to discuss a few principal points. First of all, modern biologists agree that any change in living things is brought about by what is known as a mutation. A mutation is a change in the genetic structure, that part of an organism's physical mechanism that controls heredity. There are several possible reasons for these mutations. However, they seem to occur at random and in all forms of life. The mutation may result in the change in the shape of a limb. It may produce a change in coloration. It may be something affecting the body chemistry. It is the theory of modern evolutionists that a one-celled creature as a result of mutation developed finally to a multi-celled creature and that these creatures finally branched off and turned into the various kinds of life which we have today both plants and animal. Thus by a series of mutations and as a result of interaction with the environment over many millions of years the highest form of life, man, was finally developed. Now, there can be no doubt that mutations do effect changes. The big question is, do these mutations cause changes that are large enough to make possible development of not only new spe-

ciés, but of new genera, new families, new classes, etc. In a book published last year, Conway Zirkle of the University of Pennsylvania describes the present situation in biology. Zirkle mentions a number of drawbacks which tend to present difficulties in believing that mutations produce the necessary evolutionary changes. First, nearly all mutations discovered by geneticists have turned out to be recessive. Dominant mutations are extremely rare. By a recessive mutation it is meant that two mutations must be matched together in a male and female before the changed characteristic can appear. Since Darwinism depends on the changed characteristic being superior, it is, as Zirkle points out, extremely hard to see how the recessive mutation can be of much use since it will appear in actual form very infrequently. Second, nearly all the mutations which have been investigated have turned out to be destructive or disadvantageous — real instances of degeneration. As Zirkle says, "Mutations consequently could explain very easily how a species could deteriorate or even become extinct, but how could they explain constructive evolution?"<sup>31</sup> Third, the frequency of mutations has found to be on a quantitative basis extremely low and makes it difficult to see how a mutation could survive if it did not occur frequently. Fourth, mutations can be produced artificially by such things as ultraviolet light, X-ray and nitrogen mustard gas. However, all of these mutagenic agents are destructive. Zirkle points out that there have been, in latter days, evidence accumulating that confirms the existence of beneficial mutations. However, he nonetheless concludes, "The net effect of all mutations, both large and small, is deleterious. Mutation pressure, by itself, cannot cause evolution."<sup>31</sup> Zirkle, as so many other zoologists, believes in evolution. However, he is frank to point out that the mutation theory faces tremendous obstacles in terms of convincing anyone that it can produce evolution. The point to remember here is that evolutionists depend for the creative process upon a mechanism which is essentially destructive and lethal. It is hard, despite all arguments to the contrary, to see that mutations can be looked upon as the mechanism responsible for all of the living things which we see in the marvelous world that surrounds us.

## THE STORY OF THE FOSSILS

We should say something about what are known as fossils. A fossil is a record of life from the past. Under certain circumstances, when plants and animals die, if they are covered with the proper amount of moisture and with mud so that they are protected from disintegration, the shape of their bodies is filled in faithfully by minerals so that finally they are preserved in a rock-like form. In some cases part of the body itself is preserved. This we call a fossil. Fossils have been found all over the world and at various depths in the earth. There can be no doubt that fossils indicate to us that there were once living forms far different in outward appearance from those which are living today. Fossils also show that living forms have experienced changes of one kind or another. However, this is not a disturbing factor to the creationist who realizes that Genesis says that living things reproduce after their kind, but does not say that species cannot vary, and does not say that within the realm of the kind there cannot be variation and change. The evolutionist, however, has the responsibility of showing that the fossil record indicates that the higher forms of life that we have today, both plant and animal, developed from simple, lower forms of life and that life itself developed from non-living material. This is a tremendous task and the net result of the research of many scientists is that the fossil record does not provide the proof which the evolutionist desires, namely the proof of evolution from one-celled creature to man. It is striking that the fossil record opens with what is known as the Cambrian period. The Cambrian rocks are supposed to be very ancient, 500 million years old. Below these rocks are supposedly older rocks which contain no fossils. However, as soon as the fossils appear, we find a majority of the phyla or principal forms of life already in existence. Dewar writes, "Many of the pre-Cambrian rocks which immediately precede the Cambrian rocks and underly them are rocks in which fossils could equally well have been deposited, but not a single undisputed fossil has been found in them." Suddenly in the Cambrian period we find a sea full of highly organized types. We find nothing which suggests slow evolution. We find no experiments in the pro-

duction of new types, no experiments, for example in shell making. The first shells are fully developed. We find these earliest animals as sharply differentiated into species, genera, families, orders and phyla as they are today."<sup>32</sup> In other words, the first record of fossils shows us many basic forms of life well organized and in existence with every indication that they were created rather than that they slowly evolved. It has further been pointed out and is agreed upon by both evolutionists and creationists that every new type of animal appears suddenly in the geological record endowed with all the attributes by which it is characterized. There are changes that happen to the animal later, but they have been called comparatively insignificant. One finds species frequently tied together and genera less frequently. Simpson states, "Gaps among known species are sporadic and often small. Gaps among known orders, classes and phyla are systematic and almost always large."<sup>33</sup> This sudden appearance of a higher category of life without any evidence that it has been derived from another form of life is again a problem for the evolutionist. The fossil records simply do not show that these major categories were developed from one another. In order to explain these gaps the evolutionist generally assumes that the intermediate forms either were small in number or that they migrated from another place. The creationist, on the other hand, assumes, likewise, that the sudden appearance merely means that these animals which were not found in the older rocks were living somewhere else, particularly in the highlands where their fossils were not preserved. A geologist, Cordelia Barber says, "Fossils do not prove evolution. Neither do they disprove it. They strongly suggest that a considerable amount of descent with modification has transpired. They also exhibit a lack of transitional forms which may or may not be insignificant of limits of relationship."<sup>34</sup>

So far as the evolution of man is concerned, the fossil record indicates that man has always been man, although there have been different varieties of man today. We do not have time in this essay to discuss the evidence brought forth by the evolutionist for the so-called evolution of man. Suffice it to say that many of the so-called ancestors of man were apes and

nothing more. Nor is there any proof that they ever developed into man. Some of the other early forms that have been found were no doubt simple varieties of man. For instance, the Neanderthal man, which is often presented in museums and in text books as being an ape-like stooped creature, now is believed to have had a cranial capacity or a brain size somewhat more than modern man, from 1300 to 1600 cubic centimeters. The German anatomist, Franz Weidenreich went so far as to claim that all of the living forms of mankind that have ever been found were not enough different to be grouped in even more than one species. Others feel that it is best to speak of a genus of man rather than just a species. It has also been shown that modern man was in existence contemporaneous with the so-called Neanderthal man. Douglas Dewar in his book, *The Transformist Illusion* cites several instances of human remains found in what were regarded to be extremely old fossil beds, much older than any evolutionist would admit man can conceivably be. He points out that in each case the evolutionists have said that since the human remains were found in strata older than the theory ascribed to modern man, they must have been buried there and did not really belong there. Here Dewar introduces evidence that oftentimes evolutionists are led to interpret the evidence in the light of the theory rather than to view it objectively.<sup>35</sup> Dewar concludes, "The foregoing facts render it almost certain that man did not evolve from some lower animal. As the fossils give no help whatsoever to the evolutionary theory, so it is not surprising that evolutionists, although agreed that man did so evolve, are by no means agreed as to the kind of creature from which man has descended."<sup>36</sup>

## THE ORIGIN OF LIFE

In recent years evolutionary thought has devoted a great deal of attention to the question, "How did life begin?" In 1957 a great international symposium on the origin of life was held in Moscow. As a result of reading the popular reports concerning the origin of life one might easily conclude that evolutionists had all but proved that it was a simple thing for inorganic chemicals on the earth in the primeval days to organize



themselves into a living cell and then to proceed to develop into the higher forms of life. One finds very impressive chemical formulas and equations in many articles. However, most of this is sheer speculation and should be recognized as such. One of the greatest obstacles to the acceptance of the evolutionary theory is the development of the living cell itself. For a long time men working in modern laboratories with the finest equipment have been attempting to synthesize life and have been unable to do so. Yet the evolutionist would have us believe that this took place as a result of blind chance on some primeval plain millions of years ago. One of the few active researchers in this field is Sydney Fox, of the chemistry department of the Florida State University, Tallahassee. In a recent article Sydney Fox gives his idea as to the chemistry involved in the beginning of life. He admits that he certainly doesn't have the final answer, although he believes that he has made some progress. However, I believe one of the opening paragraphs of his article is highly significant. He says, "One consequence of such widespread concern is a large amount of writing on the origin of life. The total number who have done little or no experimentation but who have conjectured in print about this problem is remarkably large. The number who are currently active in putting ideas to experimental tests is, however, remarkably small."<sup>37</sup> In other words, most of the work on the so-called origin of life by evolutionary chance is pure speculation and should be recognized as such. Concerning the origin of life, a noted Norwegian scientist, Dr. A. E. Wilder Smith recently criticized speculations by Dr. G. G. Simpson of Harvard University. Dr. Smith points out that even if chemists do succeed in the fantastical difficult feat of synthesizing chemicals or systems of chemicals that can be termed alive, this does not prove that the inert chemical ingredients could have carried this out themselves guided only by good luck. Neither does it prove that God did not create life in a special act. "It is plain scientific nihilism to attempt to replace the carefully planned scientific experiment by the soup stock pot and say that billions of years will do what the planned experiment can do but with the greatest difficulty, effort, and planning. . . Dare we, as scientists, maintain that delicate reactions 'happened' in the past, when we know that the present

scientific experience has never given the slightest basis for hope of success, unless reaction conditions are meticulously, progressively, and sometimes rapidly adjusted, often in a way chance will not take care of except by undue statistical weighting.”<sup>38</sup>

## THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE EVOLUTIONARY THEORY

Some folks would like to keep the affairs of science and of theology in two neat logic-tight compartments with each keeping his nose out of the other fellow's business. This ideal would be lovely if it could be accomplished. But the fact remains that science and theology touch when they deal with man's origin and inevitably with man's nature.

Moreover, some theologians feel that all evolutionists are earnest fellows simply doing their job in science and not influenced by their own philosophical and religious or anti-religious bias. This simply is not so. Evolution has a philosophy that accompanies it and it leads many an evolutionist to speak in areas of theology.

Now it is true that many evolutionists believe in a God whom they visualize as having directed the process of evolution. But it is equally true that many leaders of evolutionary thought are naturalists and basically atheistic. The recent Darwin centennial celebration was an occasion for them to indulge in an orgy of ridicule against those who still are backward enough to believe in God.

Writing in *Science* magazine George Simpson, professor at Harvard University, recently described "The World into Which Darwin Led Us." He refers to church services as "higher superstitions celebrated weekly in every hamlet of the United States."<sup>39</sup> He terms it unthinkable that the world was created for man as a higher being. He sneers at competent biologists who reject evolution and implies that evidently their university training did not soak in. He denies that there is any purpose or pattern in life and evolution. He emphasizes that man is responsible only to himself and that his hope lies alone in himself. He regrets that after 100 years of Darwinism more people have

not abandoned Christianity, which he equates with a belief in Santa Claus.

In the August 1, 1960 issue of *Time* magazine, the British evolutionist Julian Huxley is quoted as saying that "God is unnecessary."<sup>40</sup> Huxley denies not only God, but the soul. He says that everything in the universe is the result of blind chance, the interaction of materials and natural law.

The blindness of these men is shown in Simpson's admission that the evolutionary theory "casts no light on the ultimate mystery — the origin of the universe and the source of the laws or physical properties of matter, energy, space, and time."<sup>41</sup> Simpson cannot evade the ultimate question — where did the matter that makes up the universe come from? Who endowed the chemical elements with their essential properties? What keeps natural law working today? The obvious answer is "God." But Simpson has shut God out of his heart. Holy Scripture rightly says, "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God." (Psalm 53:1)

By way of contrast many leading scientists freely confess their religious beliefs. America's foremost rocket expert, Dr. Werner von Braun, once stated, "Any real scientist ends up a religious man. The more he learns about natural science, the more he sees that the words that sound deep are really poorly contrived disguises for ignorance. Energy, matter? We use them, but we don't really know what they are."<sup>42</sup> Dr. W. M. Smart, leading English astronomer, concluded his book, *The Origin of the Earth*, with the confession, "When we study the universe and appreciate its grandeur and orderliness, it seems to me that we are led to the recognition of a Creative Power and Cosmic Purpose that transcends all that our limited minds can comprehend . . . to one astronomer, at least, the heavens are telling the glory of God and the wonders of His works."<sup>43</sup>

The communist party has fully exploited the atheistic philosophy associated with evolution. In East Germany they have attempted to stamp out the church rite of confirmation and substitute for it the heathen ceremony of Jugendweihe. In a speech on September 29, 1957, Walter Ulbricht, a communist leader,

sneered: "We ask, is that what you call education of youth for free, independent thought, when the young people are required in confirmation instruction to believe that they have been created by supernatural beings? We want youth to have the opportunity to become familiar with the discoveries of advanced science."<sup>44</sup> In the communist periodical "Geschichte in der Schule" (History in the School, No. 10, 1958) we read, "In dealing with the evolution of man from the animal world, the false doctrine of the creation of man by a higher power must be gone into and the pupils shown the harm of this story of creation has caused in people's minds. In the emergence of religion we deal with the roots of religion in detail and show that God did not create men, but man created — invented God."<sup>45</sup>

It is crystal clear that evolution and communism with its denial of God and of fundamental human rights make good companions. Let us beware of both.

### THE AGE OF THE EARTH

We have not had the opportunity in the essay thus far to deal with that controversial question, the age of the earth. Actually the age of the earth is a question fundamentally separate from creation and evolution. An old earth does not rule out creation. However, a young earth does destroy any possibility of evolution. In itself the age of the earth is a subject for not only an essay, but a volume of books. Perhaps the following will suffice for this occasion. A more complete treatment may be found in the book, *Darwin, Evolution and Creation*, published by C. P. H. last year, and authored by professors Rusch, Klotz, Surburg, and the essayist.

Present methods of dating the age of the earth depend upon the principle of radioactivity. Old rocks contain chemical elements which slowly decay by radioactive processes into other elements. Thus uranium of atomic weight 238 decays into about a dozen different chemical elements and ultimately yields lead of weight 206 and helium gas. Thorium 232 forms lead 208 and helium gas. Potassium 40 forms calcium 40 and argon 40. Rubidium 87 forms strontium 87. One can measure

the rate of decay by counting the radioactive particles given off. One can also analyze the amount of parent and daughter elements present in a given rock sample. For example, consider a rock containing one pound of uranium 238. Because of the decay of uranium, the same rock, after one billion years, will contain 0.86 pounds of uranium 238, and in addition 0.12 pounds of lead 206 together with 0.02 pounds of helium gas. After four billion years the uranium will be reduced to 0.55 pounds and the lead will have increased to 0.39 pounds. The helium content, unless some gas had escaped from the rock, would be 0.06 pounds.

From these measurements one can figure back and compute the age required for a given amount of, say, uranium to form a given amount of lead. Estimate on the earth's age are quoted at 4.5 to 5 billion years.

The appraisal of these methods requires considerable knowledge of chemistry and physics. The following points are indicative, however, of points that cast doubt on the reliability of methods based on radioactivity.

1. One must assume that no daughter elements existed at time zero. For example, one must assume that a uranium-bearing rock contained no lead of radioactive origin.

2. One must assume that none of the short-lived intermediate daughter elements were in the rock at time zero. Radium, for example, has a half-life of only 1612 years. It is formed from uranium and goes on to decay ultimately to lead. If much radium were in the rock when it was formed, it would give deceptively high readings.

3. One must assume the rock formation was not disturbed or influenced over great ages. For example, removal of the parent uranium by a leaching process (washing out) would give a spuriously high age.

There is evidence in the literature that one may rightly challenge the radioactivity methods on these and other points. In a recent article dealing with analysis of lead in meteorites, Dr. Harrison Brown called attention to certain problems and con-

cluded, "If the discrepancy is real, we shall have to conclude that either there is something wrong with the lead data or that we are dealing with a situation that is far more complicated than we have suspected."<sup>46</sup>

A highly significant judgement was given by Dr. James B. Conant in his book, *Science and Common Sense*, "More than one physicist has expressed grave doubts as to whether over such enormous intervals of time one can assume uniformity as to the behavior of matter. What does the concept of time mean when we appeal to thousands of millions of years? Just as the physicists found it necessary to rewrite some ideas about space and time when very high velocities and very small distances came in view, so it is possible that common-sense notions of them cannot be carried into cosmology."<sup>47</sup>

There are other facts that indicate a younger earth. The atmosphere contains only a small amount of helium (1.4 parts per million) which is formed by radioactive elements. An old world should contain much more. Certain stars, based on their size and brightness, cannot possibly have been shining for more than ten million years, this in sharp contrast to 4.5 billion years.

A modern short-range method of age determination is based on radioactive Carbon-14 which is found in living organisms. The half life of C-14 is 5,568 years. This means that in a sea shell which has been preserved for 5,568 years half of its C-14 will have vanished.

Carbon-14 determinations have been found to be accurate in Egyptology where dates are known by other methods. Dates by radio carbon run as high as 29,700 years, this for a burned elephant bone found in California.<sup>48</sup>

It is important to notice that radio-carbon has actually reduced many age estimates. For example, the Mankato Ice Age has been reduced from 25,000 years ago to 10,000. However, the carbon-14 method is also suspect due to basic difficulties and uncertainties. Its accuracy depends upon two assumptions. (1) Cosmic rays have been forming neutrons and consequently C-14

at the same rate through the years. (2) The carbon 14 in the dead animal or plant has neither been enriched nor reduced by chemical exchange. In other words the sample has not been contaminated by chemical exchange with ordinary non-radioactive carbon.

However, the C-14 method is essentially short range and does not enter seriously into the theory of evolution.

On the other hand, does the Bible tell us the age of the earth? The best answer, in my opinion, is, No.

1. The 4004 B. C. date often quoted as the date for creation is based on the genealogical lists of Scripture especially in Genesis 5 and 11. But Biblical practice often allows for omissions in genealogies, which may be only representative. For example, Matthew's genealogy of Christ omits four names. It is doubtful if the genealogical lists may be used as chronologies.

2. One may ask concerning the latter part of verse two of Genesis 1 whether the moving of the Spirit of God over the face of the waters is included in the first day. It is mentioned before the creation of light. The term "moving" refers to a brooding activity. If this is outside the limits of the first day, then certainly a great amount of time may be included in this verse. However, this interpretation is weakened by Exodus 20:11 — "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth and all that in them is." This passage certainly seems to include all of the creative activity in the six days that is, both the original creation of matter and the subsequent organization.

3. If the controversial six days of creation were long periods of time, then millions of years could easily be encompassed in Genesis 1. However, as indicated previously, the natural interpretation of Genesis 1 points to solar days and not long periods.

Hence, it is clear that Scripture does not give an age for the earth. Certainly it does not tell us how long it was from Adam to Abraham. But it does certainly give the impression of a

young earth. Certainly it is true that if the days of Genesis are days of normal length, then man is about as old as the earth. It is also to be remembered that God created an adult earth. It was not a billiard ball, bare and barren. It was stocked and complete. This alone vitiates theories based on computing age and assuming an unorganized mass of material at time zero.

### *Conclusion*

What may we then conclude concerning the great puzzle of the origin of the universe and of life?

1. There are many mysteries both in nature and in Scripture. We need to curb our speculation and distinguish fact from fancy. We must learn not to expect in this life to ever have all the answers.

2. Science has not "proved" evolution. It has shown that living forms vary considerably, but has not shown that man arose from animal ancestors. What has been shown is not in conflict with the Bible and the doctrine of creation. The creationist need not hesitate to admit the possibility of variation within the circle of the kind. He does need, however, to abide by the Genesis account of the created kinds. This is clearly taught.

3. The study of nature truly shows the marvelous handiwork of our Almighty God. Scripture tells us that this God is our Creator who is our sovereign Lord whom we are to worship and serve.

4. The New Testament makes clear the necessity of maintaining a correct view of man. He was created holy. He fell into sin and was promised a Savior. Christ the second Adam came to undo the destruction wrought by the first Adam whose fall plunged the world into sin. We dare never abandon this central truth and vital doctrine.

5. Let us preserve the same confidence in Holy Scripture that our Savior had, lest He tell us, as He did the Sadducees, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scripture, nor the power of God." (Matthew 22, 29)



## REFERENCES

1. Luther, Martin, *Commentary on Genesis*. Translated by J. W. Mueller, Vol. 1, Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1958, Preface
2. Ibid, p. 3
3. Ibid, p. 4
4. Ibid
5. Ibid, p. 4-5
6. Ibid, p. 14
7. Ibid, p. 24
8. Dods, Marcus, *Expositor's Bible*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1948, I. p. 4
9. *The Interpreter's Bible*, Abington Cokesbury Press, New York, 1952. Volume I, p. 471
10. Barth, Karl, *Church Dogmatics*, Translated by Arthur C. Cochrane, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia 1953, p. 121
11. Preuss, Robert, *Concordia Theological Monthly*, February, 1960, p. 112
12. Ibid, p. 239
13. *Saturday Evening Post*, July 23, 1960, p. 27
14. Carnell, Edward, *The Theology of Reinhold Niebuhr*, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1951, p. 154-155
15. Brunner, Emil, *Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption*, Translated by Olive Wyon, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1952, p. 8
16. Ibid, p. 28
17. Ibid, p. 39
18. Ibid, 50
19. Young, Edward J., *Thy Word Is Truth*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1957, p. 260-262
20. Zimmerman, Paul, *Darwin, Evolution and Creation*, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1959, p. 52-54
21. Ramm, Bernard, *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1954, p. 227
22. *God's Story of Creation*, Knights of Columbus, St. Louis, Missouri, p. 22
23. Ewing, J. F., *Anthropological Quarterly*, XXIX, 134, p. 138
24. Cotter, A. C., *The Encyclical "Human Genes" with a Commentary*, Weston College Press, 1951, p. 43
25. Tome V, *Encyclopedie Francaise*, Societe de Gestion del Enclopedie Francaise, 13 Rue de Four, Paris 6, Copyright 1937, *Les Etres Vivants*, Directeurs Paul Lemoine, Rene Jeannel—Pierre Allarge, Professeurs au Museum, *Conclusions Generales*—p. 5.82-3 by Paul Lemoine
26. Martin, C. P., *American Scientist*, January, 1953, p. 100
27. Darwin, Charles, *The Origin of the Species*, Introduction by W. R. Thompson, New York, E. P. Dutton and Company, Indiana, page XXII
28. Ibid, p. XXIV
29. Dewar, Douglas, *The Transformist Illusion*, Dehoff Publications, Murfreesboro, Tennessee, 1957, p. 261
30. Sol Tax, Editor, *Evolution After Darwin—The Evolution of Life*, chapter on *Morphology, Paleontology, and Evolution* by Everett C. Olson, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1960, p. 523
31. Zirkle, Conway, *Evolution, Marxian Biology and the Social Scene*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Pennsylvania, 1959, p. 239
32. Dewar, Douglas, *Is Evolution Proved?*, Hollis and Carter, London, 1957, p. 20
33. Sol Tax, Editor, *Evolution After Darwin—the Evolution of Life*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1960, p. 149
34. Mixter, O., *Evolution of Christian Thought, Today*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1959, p. 51
35. Dewar, *The Transformist Illusion*, op. cit. p. 117 ff.
36. Ibid, p. 139
37. Fox, Sidney, *Science*, July 22, 1960, p. 200
38. Simpson, G. G., *Christianity Today*, June 2, 1960, p. 1
39. Simpson, George, *Science*, April 1, 1960, p. 966
40. Huxley, Julian, *Time*, August 1, 1960, p. 45
41. Simpson, op. cit., p. 972
42. Lang, Daniel *The Man in the Thick Lead Suit*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1954
43. Smart, W. M., *The Origin of the Earth*, Cambridge University Press, 1951, p. 235
44. *The Evangelical Church in Berlin and the Soviet Zone of Germany*, Translated by Patrick Lynch, A. W. Hayn's Erben, Berlin West, 1959, p. 15
45. Ibid, p. 18
46. Brown, Harrison, *Scientific American*, April, 1957, p. 81
47. Conant, James B., *Science and Common Sense*, Yale University Press, New Haven
48. Braeder & Kulp, *Science*, CXXVI, p. 1324