

This is a most helpful compilation, which is designed to make one think very seriously about the whole issue of evolution and the Bible. To those who love the Scriptures, and seek to be faithful to them, this will prove enormously helpful.

*Wallace Benn, Bishop of Leves*

When it comes to the debate about reconciling evolutionary theory to the Christian faith, some theistic evolutionist friends give the impression that, ‘They think it’s all over!’ ‘It *isn’t* now!’ is my response after reading this collection of very accessible essays from a variety of scientists and theologians, who beg to differ from that conclusion. Read, be challenged and be ready to think again.

*Steve Brady, Principal, Moorlands College, Christchurch*

This collection of fine essays makes an essential contribution to the ongoing discussion among Christians about how to relate biblical revelation with ongoing scientific efforts to understand the history of life on earth. Although addressed primarily to Christian believers, the book should be helpful to a wide segment of the public who want to expose their thinking to top-quality cutting-edge arguments for a view of the history of life that gives fuller weight to divine revelation. Here you can find views that are informed in a balanced way by the best current science and biblical revelation. This reviewer believes the book will helpfully focus discussions of a Christian view of neo-Darwinian evolution on the key issues.

*Richard A. Carhart, Professor Emeritus of Physics,  
University of Illinois at Chicago*

Naturalism has infiltrated Christian culture in the West. In assembling such a wide range of relevant high-level scholarship into one volume, and discussing the question biblically, philosophically and scientifically, this work deserves to be studied widely. The volume challenges much of the naturalistic inroads that undermine the biblical message in the year of Darwin’s 200th anniversary. It should encourage the reader to question seriously the clamour to embrace neo-Darwinian theory.

*Gary Habermas, Distinguished Research Professor and Chair,  
Department of Philosophy and Theology, Liberty University*

The title of *Should Christians Embrace Evolution?* poses a question that thoughtful Christians must face, in light of the arguments for theistic evolution being offered by Denis Alexander in England and by Francis Collins in America. To meet the challenge of an evolutionary philosophy that explains life as the product of natural causes alone, we all need help from Christians with expertise in science and theology. Each of us must in the end come to a personal decision about which experts are sufficiently trustworthy that we should accept their guidance in forming our views about which things are real and which are only imaginary. The experts in science and theology who have contributed chapters to *Should Christians Embrace Evolution?* are of the trustworthy kind, and their words of wisdom will be very helpful to Christians who are struggling to sort out conflicting claims and arrive at the truth.

**Phillip E. Johnson**, *Professor of Law Emeritus, University of California, Berkeley, author of Darwin on Trial*

This book is much needed. As a nuclear physicist, I have observed reconciliation between science and theology in numerous areas, not because of modified theology, but because continuing scientific discovery has overturned nineteenth-century perspectives that sought to challenge biblical theology. The current progress in molecular biology is beyond Darwin's wildest imagination, and readers would be well advised to examine the evidence. As one who lived under Communism, I understand too well that the more a society seeks to enforce an idea, the more important it is to question it.

**Dalibor Krupa**, *Research Professor of Theoretical Physics at the Institute of Physics of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava, Slovakia*

Well-informed, up-to-date and powerfully argued, this collection of theological, philosophical and scientific essays by distinguished authors shows that the theistic evolution on offer from Denis Alexander, Francis Collins and Kenneth Miller conflicts not only with the best biblical exegesis, but also with a sober assessment of the scientific data.

The theological contributors show that accommodation to Darwinism undermines orthodox teaching about creation, the fall, and redemption itself. The scientists show that the complex information common to all life could not arise from materialistic processes, and that the popular 'junk DNA' and human chromosomal

fusion arguments for Darwinism dissolve under scrutiny. Evangelical Christians pondering whether they should embrace Darwinism owe it to their integrity to read this book.

*Angus Menuge, Professor of Philosophy, Concordia University Wisconsin,  
author of Agents Under Fire: Materialism and the Rationality of  
Science*

The value of the present volume is that it endeavours to deal with the underlying metaphysical assumptions of evolutionary theory and to analyze their implications for classical Christian theology. The book is therefore a fine antidote to superficiality in philosophy of science and in the thinking of many religious believers today, who naively think that evolutionism can or must be swallowed whole in order for Christianity to survive in the modern world.

*John Warwick Montgomery, Professor Emeritus of Law and Humanities,  
University of Bedfordshire, UK; Distinguished Professor of Philosophy and  
Christian Thought, Patrick Henry College, Virginia, USA; Director,  
International Academy of Apologetics, Evangelism and Human Rights,  
Strasbourg, France*

This excellent collection of essays by theologians and scientists addresses in detail the question of whether Christians have too readily embraced neo-Darwinism and adapted their theology to suit. The scientific rigour and theological clarity of this volume will encourage all those who have not bowed the knee to Darwin and challenge those who have. The arguments it presents are cogent and powerful. It is a much-needed contribution to what has become a one-sided debate.

*Alastair Noble, former Inspector of Schools and  
Head of Educational Services, Scotland*

The question posed has caused much recent debate. The answer given by these authors is an emphatic 'No!' First, they demonstrate with compelling logic that theistic evolution has serious theological consequences for the gospel. Secondly (and this should make us weep), the theistic evolutionary project is so unnecessary. As the second part of this first-class survey makes clear, there is actually no compelling reason to accept Darwinism anyway. Homological arguments have bitten the dust, junk DNA turns out to be anything but junk, and as for the origin of life itself, biologists haven't got a clue. In terms of

recent discoveries in molecular biology, Darwinism is not only wrong but also irrelevant, a Victorian relic.

*Colin Reeves, Professor of Operational Research in the School of Mathematical and Information Sciences (MIS) at Coventry University*

This book is a formidable challenge to the enterprise of theistic evolution, which necessitates the accommodation of Christian theology and biblical hermeneutics to the essentially atheistic neo-Darwinian paradigm. This means that the authority of science (specifically Darwinian evolutionary theory) is substituted for the authority of Scripture and made normative for biblical interpretation and Christian belief. The result is a contemporary gnostic (to borrow a term from one of the contributors) theology that undermines the authority of Scripture and renders theologically unintelligible the core elements of the Christian gospel and in particular the death of Christ. This exposure of the theological import of theistic evolution is presented in the book with clarity and biblically informed acumen by the relevant contributors.

The book also examines the claimed evidence for Darwinian evolution (specifically the theory of common descent) in homology, the fossil record, chromosomal fusion and the human genome.

The implication of the scientifically orientated contributions is that the subordination of the historic evangelical faith to the passing demands of the neo-Darwinian paradigm by theistic evolutionists has more to do with 'intellectual pacifism' than compelling scientific reasons. The response of the contributors to this theological capitulation is (in their own words) an 'unequivocal no'. That is the right response and this book will enable Christians concerned with safeguarding the integrity of the Christian gospel confidently to make that response.

*Patrick J. Roche, Tutor in Philosophy of Religion, Irish Baptist College*

SHOULD CHRISTIANS  
EMBRACE EVOLUTION?



# SHOULD CHRISTIANS EMBRACE EVOLUTION?

Biblical and Scientific Responses

EDITED BY  
Norman C. Nevin



P U B L I S H I N G

P.O. BOX 817 • PHILLIPSBURG • NEW JERSEY 08865-0817

© 2009 by Inter-Varsity Press

First published in the UK by Inter-Varsity Press 2009  
North American edition issued 2011 by P&R Publishing

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise—except for brief quotations for the purpose of review or comment, without the prior permission of the publisher, P&R Publishing Company, P.O. Box 817, Phillipsburg, New Jersey 08865-0817.

Unless otherwise stated, Scripture quotations are taken from the Holy Bible, New International Version. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of Hodder & Stoughton, a division of Hodder Headline Ltd. All rights reserved. “NIV” is a trademark of International Bible Society. UK trademark number 1448790.

Printed in the United States of America

### **Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Should Christians embrace evolution? : Biblical and scientific responses /  
edited by Norman C. Nevin. -- North American ed.

p. cm.

Originally published: Nottingham, England : Inter-Varsity Press, 2009.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-1-59638-230-5 (pbk.)

1. Bible and evolution. 2. Evolution (Biology)--Religious aspects--Christianity.

I. Nevin, Norman Cummings.

BS659.S525 2011

231.7'652--dc22

2011014890

P&R ISBN: 978-1-59638-230-5



## CONTENTS

Contributors	7
<b>Foreword</b> <i>Wayne Grudem</i>	9
<b>Preface: A twenty-first-century challenge</b> <i>Phil Hills</i>	11
<b>1. Evolution and the Church</b> <i>Alistair Donald</i>	15
<b>2. The language of Genesis</b> <i>Alistair McKitterick</i>	27
<b>3. Adam and Eve</b> <i>Michael Reeves</i>	43
<b>4. The fall and death</b> <i>Greg Haslam</i>	57
<b>5. Creation, redemption and eschatology</b> <i>David Anderson</i>	73
<b>6. The nature and character of God</b> <i>Andrew Sibley</i>	93

<b>7. Faith and creation</b>	108
<i>R. T. Kendall</i>	
<b>8. Towards a science worthy of creatures in <i>imago Dei</i></b>	117
<i>Steve Fuller</i>	
<b>9. Interpretation of scientific evidence</b>	
<b>A. Homology</b>	137
<i>Norman Nevin</i>	
<b>B. The nature of the fossil record</b>	143
<i>Norman Nevin</i>	
<b>C. Chromosomal fusion and common ancestry</b>	151
<i>Geoff Barnard</i>	
<b>D. Information and thermodynamics</b>	158
<i>Andy McIntosh</i>	
<b>10. Does the genome provide evidence for common ancestry?</b>	166
<i>Geoff Barnard</i>	
<b>11. The origin of life: scientists play dice</b>	187
<i>John Walton</i>	
<b>Conclusion: Should Christians embrace evolution?</b>	
<i>Phil Hills and Norman Nevin</i>	210

## CONTRIBUTORS

**David Anderson** has a master's degree in mathematics from the University of Oxford and a bachelor's in theology from the University of Glamorgan (Wales Evangelical School of Theology). He was involved in church planting in the UK before moving to Eldoret, Kenya, where he currently serves as a missionary and a lecturer at a pastors' training college.

**Geoff Barnard** was for seven years a Senior Research Scientist in the Department of Veterinary Medicine, University of Cambridge, UK. He has been a Senior Lecturer in Biological Sciences at three other UK universities, and a visiting scientist at the Weizmann Institute in Israel.

**Alistair Donald** is a Church of Scotland (presbyterian) minister and a past chair of its apologetics committee. He has a doctorate in environmental science, and is currently Chaplain at Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh.

**Steve Fuller** is Professor of Sociology at the University of Warwick. Originally trained in history and philosophy of science, he testified on behalf of intelligent design theory in *Kitzmiller v. Dover Area School District* (2005). Among many books, he is the author of *Science vs. Religion?* (2007) and *Dissent over Descent* (2008).

**Greg Haslam** is Senior Pastor at Westminster Chapel, London. He has pastored for thirty years and travels widely as a conference speaker, preacher and lecturer. He is the author of several books including *Preach the Word!*, *A Radical Encounter with God*, *The Man Who Wrestled with God* and *Moving in the Prophetic*.

**Phil Hills** has been in pastoral ministry for the past twenty-three years and has led churches in Coventry, Birmingham and Swansea. He is currently pastor of the Elim Church in Dundonald, Belfast. He has a master's degree in theology from Manchester University.

**R. T. Kendall** is an author, speaker, and teacher, and was pastor of Westminster Chapel, London, for twenty-five years.

**Andy McIntosh** has a PhD in Aeronautics from Cranfield and is Professor of Thermodynamics and Combustion Theory at the University of Leeds (contributing here in a private capacity). He has worked for the Royal Aircraft Establishment and has researched for thirty years in combustion and thermodynamics, and more recently in biomimetics (learning from nature for engineering advantage). He is author of *Genesis for Today* (2001).

**Alistair McKitterick** is lecturer in Biblical and Theological Studies at Moorlands College, a Christian Bible college in Christchurch. He has degrees in both physics and theology.

**Norman C. Nevin OBE** is Emeritus Professor of Medical Genetics at the Queen's University, Belfast and Head of the Northern Regional Genetics Service.

**Michael Reeves** is the Theological Advisor for UCCF. Previously he was an associate minister at All Souls Church, Langham Place, London. He is the author of *The Unquenchable Flame: Introducing the Reformation*. He holds a doctorate in systematic theology from King's College, London.

**Andrew Sibley** is studying towards an MPhil/PhD in theology at a UK-based university examining the relationship between science and faith. He has an MSc in Environmental Decision Making and works as a specialist meteorologist in the environmental arena. He is the author of *Restoring the Ethics of Creation*.

**John C. Walton** is Research Professor of Chemistry at the University of St Andrews.

## FOREWORD

This is a highly significant book because it persuasively argues that Christians cannot accept modern evolutionary theory without also compromising essential teachings of the Bible.

It may at first seem easy to say ‘God simply used evolution to bring about the results he desired’, as some are proposing today. That view is called ‘theistic evolution’. However, the contributors to this volume, both scientists and biblical scholars, show that adopting theistic evolution leads to many positions contrary to the teaching of the Bible, such as these: (1) Adam and Eve were not the first human beings, but they were just two Neolithic farmers among about ten million other human beings on earth at that time, and God just chose to reveal himself to them in a personal way. (2) Those other human beings had already been seeking to worship and serve God or gods in their own ways. (3) Adam was not specially formed by God of ‘dust from the ground’ (Gen. 2:7) but had two human parents. (4) Eve was not directly made by God out of a ‘rib that the Lord God had taken from the man’ (Gen. 2:22), but she also had two human parents. (5) Many human beings both then and now are not descended from Adam and Eve. (6) Adam and Eve’s sin was not the first sin. (7) Human physical death had occurred for thousands of years before Adam and Eve’s sin – it was part of the way living things had always existed. (8) God did not impose any alteration in the natural world when he cursed the ground because of Adam’s sin.

As for the scientific evidence, several chapters in this book show that deeper examination of the evidence actually adds more

weight to the arguments for intelligent design than for Darwinian evolution.

What is at stake? A lot: the truthfulness of the three foundational chapters for the entire Bible (Genesis 1 – 3), belief in the unity of the human race, belief in the ontological uniqueness of human beings among all God’s creatures, belief in the special creation of Adam and Eve in the image of God, belief in the parallel between condemnation through representation by Adam and salvation through representation by Christ, belief in the goodness of God’s original creation, belief that suffering and death today are the result of sin and not part of God’s original creation, and belief that natural disasters today are the result of the fall and not part of God’s original creation. Belief in evolution erodes the foundations.

Evolution is secular culture’s grand explanation, the overriding ‘meta-narrative’ that sinners accept with joy because it allows them to explain life without reference to God, with no accountability to any Creator, no moral standards to restrain their sin, ‘no fear of God before their eyes’ (Rom. 3:18) – and now theistic evolutionists tell us that Christians can just surrender to this massive attack on the Christian faith and safely, inoffensively, tack on God, not as the omnipotent God who in his infinite wisdom directly created all living things, but as the invisible deity who makes absolutely no detectable difference in the nature of living beings as they exist today. It will not take long for unbelievers to dismiss the idea of such a God who makes no difference at all. To put it in terms of an equation, when atheists assure us that *matter + evolution + 0 = all living things*, and then theistic evolutionists answer, no, that *matter + evolution + God = all living things*, it will not take long for unbelievers to conclude that, therefore, *God = 0*.

I was previously aware that theistic evolution had serious difficulties, but I am now more firmly convinced than ever that it is impossible to believe consistently in both the truthfulness of the Bible and Darwinian evolution. We have to choose one or the other.

Wayne Grudem  
Research Professor of Theology and Biblical Studies  
Phoenix Seminary, Phoenix, Arizona, USA

## PREFACE: A TWENTY-FIRST-CENTURY CHALLENGE

**Phil Hills**

The twenty-first century is witnessing an aggressive attack on the credibility of Christian faith. Daniel Dennett likens people of faith to drunk drivers in that they are not only a danger to themselves and others but are doubly culpable because they have allowed religion to cloud their rationality. He asserts that religion is one of the greatest threats to scientific progress. Christopher Hitchens has written to explain how religion poisons everything and is invested with ignorance and hostile to free inquiry. Richard Dawkins in his best selling book, *The God Delusion*, makes it abundantly clear that, in his opinion, science and faith are completely incompatible. The underlying argument for all of the above is that evolution has made faith utterly redundant and anyone who tries to hold on to religious conviction in the face of scientific enlightenment is significantly lacking in reason.

For many years scientists who were Christians pursued their scientific education and research without the fear of being derided for their lack of credibility. However, the new atheists are being given a good hearing. *The God Delusion* is Dawkins' best-selling book ever, remaining for fifty-one weeks in the *New York Times*

bestseller list. There has been a call that any scientists questioning evolution should be stripped of their academic qualifications. Some are claiming victimization, others are afraid of voicing their real position. In September 2008 Professor Michael Reiss resigned as Director of Education for the Royal Society after some Nobel laureates embarked on a letter-writing campaign calling for his resignation. They believed that his role within the Royal Society was at odds with his calling as an Anglican priest because of his suggestion that questions about creation should be discussed in school. Even Dawkins admitted this to be like a witch hunt.

In the past Christians have held various views that they believed reconciled their theology with scientific understanding and were accorded respect. However, confronted by attack from the new atheists, any view that doesn't fully accept evolution is now being denigrated by evolutionary creationists. Those Christians within the scientific community who wholly embrace evolution appear to be embarrassed by those who don't. *Third Way, Christianity*, and *IDEA* have recently included calls for Christians to celebrate Darwin. The Bible Society has dedicated a whole issue of *The Bible in TransMission* to theistic evolution and distributed copies of *Rescuing Darwin* to 20,000 church leaders in England and Wales. The Theos think tank and the Faraday Institute have commissioned research entitled 'Rescuing Darwin', and though they had not yet completed their research Theos wrote to *The Times* to explain that their response to the new atheists and to those Christians unwilling to accept evolution would be 'a plague on both your houses'. The Anglican Church has recently published an official apology to Charles Darwin for the way they challenged his theory following the publication of *On the Origin of Species*, and Charles Foster has declared in *The Selfless Gene*, that 'Creationism has inoculated a whole generation against Christianity'.

This is a very important time for the Christian Church and our response to this twenty-first-century challenge is critical. It is not sufficient to come up with a response that appears intellectually credible to the scientific establishment if it is not theologically accurate. If the authority of Scripture is to be observed then any theological model must begin with an exegesis of the relevant biblical texts and not a scientific paradigm. Theological rigour must



not be sacrificed on the altar of scientific consensus, and it is high time to unravel the empirically-based scientific information from the metaphysical perspectives imposed on it. It is not enough to make vague assertions about the literary genre of Genesis without engaging in the hard and detailed questions that this gives rise to.

Some are engaging those wider questions. Professors Malcolm Jeeves and R. J. Berry sought to address them in *Science, Life and Christian Belief* (Apollos, 1998), and more recently Denis Alexander has published *Creation or Evolution: Do We Have to Choose?* (Monarch, 2008), in which he seeks to reconcile a commitment to the authority of Scripture with Darwinian evolution. J. I. Packer regards this work as the ‘clearest and most judicious’ to be found on the subject, yet this of itself should give rise to concern as Alexander explicitly states that evolution is ‘incontrovertible’ and he therefore seeks a theological model that will fit with the science. However, Alexander, although not a theologian, does seek to address the significant theological questions that arise from embracing evolution. His theology might be described as novel but it could certainly not be described as mainstream. It must not be assumed though, that there is anything easy about this exercise. Evolution, as intended by the title of this book, specifically refers to the Darwinian mechanisms of mutations and natural selection and the commitment to common ancestry that are central to the ruling scientific paradigm.

As recently as summer 2007 the Faraday Institute (of which Alexander is the Director) invited Professor Michael Ruse to address the question, ‘Can a Christian be a Darwinian?’ Ruse concludes there are two major obstacles in providing a positive answer. First, the special nature that Christian theology ascribes to humanity is in direct contradiction to a Darwinian understanding that makes no distinction between any organisms, each one being necessarily best adapted for their particular environment. The second obstacle is reconciling the concept of a benevolent God with one who purposefully chooses to use suffering and death as the means of evolving life. These are not inconsequential questions and any Christian who embraces evolution must be able to posit intelligent answers if their position is to be considered credible. It is not acceptable to say, ‘Evolution is true, we just haven’t

got a theology that fits with it yet', because that would demonstrate that commitment to the authority of Scripture is secondary!

In the face of the new atheists' claim that evolution has rendered faith utterly redundant there is a flood tide arising that demands that Christians must embrace evolution or acknowledge that they are opposed to science. This book believes that this is a false premise. It is written to set out a clear theological framework on the relevant issues and to confront the questions that arise from it. It is written with a compelling conviction that science and faith are not in opposition. It is written by theologians who are committed to the authority of Scripture and to the exercise of careful exegesis. It is written by scientists who are fully persuaded of the importance of rigorous scientific investigation but who are dissatisfied with the arbitrary exclusion of possible conclusions and the failure to follow the evidence wherever it leads. This is not written for a select readership that already has expert knowledge of the subjects. It is written for ordinary men and women, who have the capacity to weigh the information, seek further clarification and draw their own conclusions.

## 1. EVOLUTION AND THE CHURCH

**Alistair Donald**

The relationship between Darwin's theory and the Church has been by no means straightforward, nor, despite claims to the contrary, is the matter finally settled. Given that the scientific evidence is in significant ways at variance with Darwinism, as outlined elsewhere in this book, Christians need certainly not feel compelled to subsume their theology to the theory of evolution. The implications of doing so are considerable, as will be made clear later in this chapter, but first it will be helpful to look at the historical context.

### **The relationship between evolution and the Church**

Since first publication of *On the Origin of Species* in 1859 the Church has been divided in its view of Darwin's evolutionary theory. It is true that Rev. Charles Kingsley gave a fulsome endorsement some days before publication, having received an advance copy. As an Anglican clergyman he is often referred to in an attempt to demonstrate that the Church of England had no difficulty

accepting Darwin's thesis. However, when Rev. Dr Malcolm Brown, Director of Mission and Public Affairs for the Church of England recently wrote, 'the Church of England owes you an apology for misunderstanding you and, by getting our first reaction wrong, encouraging others to misunderstand you still', then it is clear that Kingsley's enthusiasm was not universally shared.

Even those whom Darwin counted among his friends and mentors did not wholly support his views, due to their Christian convictions. Charles Lyell struggled to accept natural selection as the primary mechanism driving evolution and could not agree that man was descended from brute beasts. When he eventually accepted natural selection it was in an equivocal way. At the same time Asa Gray, described by Darwin as his best advocate, was challenging the utter randomness he saw in the theory and could not accept the absence of divine purpose and design in the process. He corresponded at length with Darwin while also writing articles and essays to persuade others of Darwin's essential thesis. In 1876 Gray, aware of growing religious opposition to evolution, published *Darwiniana*, to try to reconcile it with Protestant Christianity.

From a Catholic perspective, St George Mivart was endeavouring to demonstrate that there was no conflict between evolution and the teaching of the Church. In 1871, he wrote *On the Genesis of Species* and addressed, in chapter 12, the perceived theological objections. In spite of his own view that these could be reconciled, he acknowledged that there were others, such as atheists Carl Vogt and Ludwig Büchner, who did not agree. Mivart eventually lost his friendship with Darwin and Huxley and was later excommunicated from the Roman Catholic Church. However, in 1950 a papal encyclical from Pope Pious XII stated that biological evolution was compatible with Christian faith, though declaring that divine intervention was necessary for the creation of the human soul.

In 1865, the Victoria Institute was founded in recognition that Darwin's theory impinged on matters well beyond science. Its stated first object is telling: 'To investigate fully and impartially the most important questions of Philosophy and Science, but more especially those that bear upon the great truths revealed in Holy Scripture, with the view of defending these truths against

the oppositions of Science, falsely so called.' The Institute was not officially opposed to evolution but perusing their *Journal of Transactions* illustrates the fact that many were challenging it. These challenges were often scientific but the objects make it clear that the motive of these challenges was the defence of Scripture.

Among Presbyterians on both sides of the Atlantic there was an ambivalent approach to Darwinism. Hugh Miller, the highly influential naturalist and Scottish Free Churchman, was no friend to young-earth views of geology, arguing against the 'anti-geologists of the Church of England', but although he died three years before Darwin's *Origins* was published we know that he was opposed to existing theories of transmutation in biology and would surely have been sceptical of Darwin. In due course many Scottish churchmen did embrace the new theory with enthusiasm. By the early twentieth century B. B. Warfield, Principal of Princeton Seminary, did so as well, although the 'Darwinism' that was endorsed by him emphatically ruled out the purely chance element that is arguably intrinsic to the theory. Warfield's predecessor at Princeton, Charles Hodge, had written specifically on the issue in 1874, bluntly branding Darwinism as 'atheism'. Arnold Guyot, a Swiss-American geologist and evangelical Presbyterian, also challenged the theory, most notably in his 1884 work *Creation, or the Biblical Cosmogony in the Light of Modern Science*. In 1886, Augustus H. Strong of the American Baptists weighed into the fray. In his *Systematics* he argued that evolution could have been the mechanism that God used to create. Philip Gosse of the Plymouth Brethren was opposed to Darwin.

The Baptist Union in Great Britain was to feel the impact of the controversy in 1887. Charles Haddon Spurgeon was their best known minister and regarded as 'the Prince of Preachers'. In the Surrey Music Hall he commanded crowds of 10,000 and at the Crystal Palace he preached to 23,654 people. In 1861, his congregation had moved to the Metropolitan Tabernacle, which seated 5,000 with room for a further 1,000 standing. He published a monthly magazine, *The Sword and the Trowel*, and in 1887 this was used to highlight the *Down Grade Controversy*. This was concerned with higher criticism, the authority of Scripture and the impact of Darwinism. Initially, two articles were published anonymously in

March and April. These were actually written by Robert Shindler, Spurgeon's friend. In the first one he spoke of the *Down Grade* being responsible for spawning the theory of evolution.

The response to these articles was enormous and Spurgeon himself wrote further on this perceived malaise, citing Darwin's theory as part of the problem. The consequences were far-reaching, with many lining up on either side of the divide. Spurgeon withdrew from the Baptist Union and the Union censured Spurgeon. Baptist Associations from various parts of Canada and America sent resolutions unanimously supporting the stand that Spurgeon had taken. Just one of those, the Baptist Association of the State of Kentucky, represented 960 ministers. It is evident from this that, at that time, there were thousands of ministers who had problems with evolution.

In response to the liberal theology of the latter part of the nineteenth century, *The Fundamentals* were written between 1910 and 1915. This was a series of ninety essays intended to set out essential Christian doctrine. These included an attack on evolution by George F. Wright, a geologist and Congregational minister. As a friend of Asa Gray he had been at one time something of a leader among Christian Darwinists, but in later life he revised his position completely, asserting that special creation was wholly responsible for biological variation. Many believe *The Fundamentals* gave rise to the fundamentalist movement within Christianity. This is interesting because some of those who wrote *The Fundamentals*, like B. B. Warfield, in fact subscribed to a form of theistic evolution.

George McCready Price, a Seventh-Day Adventist and avowed creationist, regularly attended the meetings of the Victoria Institute held between 1924 and 1928. He produced numerous anti-evolutionary works, including *The New Geology*. During this time Sir Ambrose Fleming was appointed President of the Institute (1927), but the influence of those sceptical of Darwinism was waning and some were looking for an opportunity more effectively to gather and organize opponents of evolution. In 1932, Sir Ambrose Fleming, Douglas Dewar and Captain Bernard Acworth, all leading members of the Victoria Institute, founded the Evolution Protest Movement. At its first public meeting in 1935, with 600 in attendance, the scientific credibility of evolution was challenged

and some religious implications identified. Since that time it has changed its name to the Creation Science Movement and continues to pursue its original objectives.

In 1946 Henry Morris wrote a short book seeking to attack evolution. In 1961 he co-authored *The Genesis Flood* with John Whitcomb and cited George McCready Price as a key influence. This book went through thirty-nine reprints and sold over 200,000 copies, making a significant impact on American evangelicals. It sought to interpret geology in light of a global flood. Morris subsequently was involved in founding the *Creation Research Society* and then the *Institute for Creation Research*. He is regarded by some as responsible for the rise of the modern creation science movement. The Presbyterian Church of the United States (now the PCUSA) revisited its own position in 1969. They officially declared that there is no contradiction between the theory of evolution and the Bible and overturned their previous statements of 1886, 1888, 1889 and 1924.

In the early 1990s the Intelligent Design (ID) movement emerged, from roots in the previous decade. It is often incorrectly maintained that ID was an offshoot of biblical creationism, but in fact the movement originated among scientists who were formerly Darwinists but had come to be sceptical of the theory because recent advances in science, particularly biochemistry and information science, seemed to be incompatible with Darwinism.

This short overview demonstrates two primary points. First, the Church has been divided over its view on Darwinism since 1859 to the present time. Secondly, the division over evolutionary theory has not come from one particular wing of the Church but from a wide variety of denominational perspectives.

### **The implications of embracing evolution**

As highlighted in the Preface, there is currently a call for the Church to embrace evolution, and it is asserted that there is no contradiction between Christian faith and Darwinism. In order to consider this claim carefully we need to identify the implications for the Church of embracing evolutionary theory. There are obviously many who believe that evolution is the mechanism that God

used to create the variety of life on this planet. However, for those who are serious about the supremacy of Scripture, it is essential that any apparent theological tensions that arise from this are rigorously reviewed. It would be premature to say the least to commit to a scientific position without having a clearly worked out theology that accords with it, particularly when so much of the scientific evidence does not necessitate a Darwinian explanation.

One significant difficulty in trying to reconcile evolution and the Bible is that Darwinian evolution does not allow that there is a hierarchy of life within the natural world. Natural selection ensures that each species is best adapted to survive and thrive within its own environment but it cannot ascribe a special significance to humanity. The Bible on the other hand describes man and woman as the pinnacle of God's creative work. Humankind is seen as both special and different to the other life forms and is given dominion over them. The greatest demonstration of this special nature is seen in Christ taking on himself human flesh and laying down his life at Calvary as Redeemer.

Humankind is identified in the Scriptures as being created in the image of God. Theologians wrestle with this concept, attempting to understand exactly what this means, and there are several different views normally posited. However, there is no dissent from the view that the Bible declares humanity as unique within creation. This was not the position of Charles Darwin. His friend and mentor, Charles Lyell, debated the issue with him. Lyell could not accept that humans were descended from beasts in the same way that other organisms had evolved, though he supported much of Darwin's theory.

If Christians are to embrace evolution they must have an evolutionary theory that ascribes a special significance to humanity and recognizes the primacy of humankind within the evolutionary framework or else they must impose this special nature onto humanity apart from evolution. In his recent book, Denis Alexander, Director of the Faraday Institute for Science and Religion, St Edmund's College Cambridge, finds the special nature of humanity not in the evolutionary process but in the intervention of God. He argues that the image of God is not imparted to *Homo sapiens* through evolution but by a special revelation to a



particular couple, Adam and Eve, and this revelation makes them *Homo divinus*.<sup>1</sup>

In his suggested model, Adam and Eve were living among up to 10,000,000 other *Homo sapiens*, so how was the image of God imparted to them or their progeny? Obviously, the vast majority of the earth's future population would not be descended from Adam and Eve. How then, are they created in the image of God? If one's reading of the biblical text allows a global flood that destroys all the living, then it could be argued that those who followed the flood were direct descendants of Adam, through Noah, and they could be said to bear the image of God in that way. However, if one's reading of the biblical text excludes a global flood, there must be some other explanation for how humanity as a whole is created in the image of God. As mentioned earlier, the Catholic Church adopted a position that necessitates divine intervention for the creation of the human soul and in this way God's direct intervention sets man apart as unique.

The issue of humanity's special position before God also requires that those embracing evolution explain why humans will not evolve into a different species. The alternative is to explain how this new species fits into the eternal purposes of God that are identified in the Bible. While there are wide-ranging eschatological interpretations, they all concern themselves with the eternity of humanity not its extinction.

When Christians embrace evolution it is usually with a conviction that this is the vehicle God has used to bring about the variety of life on our planet. It seems perfectly plausible to them that God set natural laws in place and chose this process for the development of life. However, this scenario raises numerous problems. Darwinian evolution does not allow any external direction. Natural selection working on random mutations is what gives force to the evolutionary process. Although the mutation mechanism was not known in Darwin's day, the chance element was clearly emphasized and it was this that Asa Gray found so objectionable about

---

1. Denis Alexander, *Creation or Evolution: Do We Have to Choose?* (Oxford: Monarch Books, 2008), p. 237.

Darwin's position. He urged Darwin to acknowledge design and refuted the randomness that Darwin championed.

If God is immanent in his creation then to what degree is he directing the process of evolution? Darwin withstood any notion of divine direction, not least because of the pain and death in nature he had observed. He could not attribute such activity or design to a benevolent God. Theists believe in the immanence of God. They do not subscribe to the concept of a deity who started a process of creation that he is now uninvolved in. This is a concept that Darwin would not dismiss, but he totally refused to accept the immanence of God in the process of evolution. This was his great idea – natural selection not God explained the development of all life on earth!

Alexander repeatedly asserts the immanence of God in every aspect of life and this, of course, is in line with orthodox evangelical theology but it is in direct contradiction to Darwin's theory of evolution. To embrace evolution and Christianity one must reconcile natural selection with the immanence of God. It is not sufficient to simply assert that both are true. The originator of natural selection believed them to be mutually exclusive. Stephen Jay Gould held to the view (widely supported by the scientific community) that if the whole process of evolution was to start again it is highly improbable that it would result in the same endpoint. Alexander is challenging that view because it cannot be reconciled to his theology. Any theology that embraces evolution must explain, at some level, how God is directing the process of natural selection and this explanation must make clear how natural selection can then still be considered to be natural selection.

Those who believe that God has indeed chosen evolution must address the issue of pain, suffering and death that evolution necessitates in order for life to develop. Often the debate focuses on whether it is more or less glorious that God should create instantly or design an intricate process that creates different species over billions of years. However, that seems entirely secondary to explaining how God is glorified by a process that demands agony, disease, death and extinction as necessary to the evolution of life. To conclude that God deliberately designed this process makes God directly responsible for suffering and death and runs completely counter to the view of God's goodness expressed in the

Bible. Alexander will not concede that God may deliberately hide himself or his purposes because he argues that to do so would be deceitful and God is not a liar! Yet he can conceive of a God who deliberately designed a process of disease and death for the development of life.<sup>2</sup>

Traditionally, Christian theology holds that the fall is responsible for the entrance of sin and death into the world. It acknowledges that pain and suffering are part and parcel of this life but anticipates that they will be completely overthrown in the coming kingdom. It views death as an enemy that will ultimately be destroyed. Evolution, on the other hand, accepts death as essential to the development of new life forms. Death is not an enemy if it is part of a created order that God considers to be very good. How is the place given to death in evolutionary theory in any way compatible with the place given to death in the Bible? These questions do not go away by an appeal to the genre of Genesis, but are central to the key themes of Christianity.

Another key issue that must be resolved is how all humanity is reckoned to be 'in Adam'. The cross is unquestionably central to Christian theology and the great hope that it affords is that 'one man' has atoned for the sins of all. The parallelism of New Testament teaching is between Adam and Christ as federal representatives of humanity. In the theology being expounded by Alexander it is very difficult to understand how one among several millions and who had been predated by others could properly be said to represent the whole. This is not secondary, it is central to our understanding of Christian faith. The New Testament argues that we can have confidence that we are included in the atoning work of Christ because it is evident that we are included in Adam.

### **Synthesizing contradictory worldviews**

Christianity is not a set of unrelated assertions about truth. It is a narrative, beginning with a creation that is good, the story of

---

2. Alexander, *Creation or Evolution*, pp. 244–247.

its fall and an account of the redemptive activity of God that will lead to the perfect order of God for life finally being established. In this narrative, something of the character and nature of God is revealed. In the person and work of Christ the truth of this worldview is intended to be established. If, therefore, some aspects of biblical interpretation or traditional theological perspectives are to be challenged, consideration needs to be given to the impact on the whole Christian story.

Christianity reveals Christ as a saviour. It explains humanity's need to be saved from their sin and their inability to save themselves. Evolutionary theory is trying to understand humanity's propensity for good or evil. In the early 1970s, George R. Price suggested a mathematical formula to explain altruism in humanity as part of the process of natural selection. Subsequently Richard Dawkins argued strongly that the selfish gene determines the behaviour of humanity and consequently he struggles to ascribe responsibility to people. These scientists were and are following the natural course of questioning that is suggested by the evolutionary worldview. How will we reconcile their explanations with our gospel? This line of argument is not from fear of what might be uncovered by science but to illustrate a point. What is the minimum we will accept as essential to hold to Christianity?

If my genetic make up is responsible for my moral conduct, in what way can God hold me accountable and why do I need a saviour? Already Denis Alexander is positing a 'fall' that is no big deal and suggests that traditional Christian theology is more of a reflection of Milton's *Paradise Lost* than of the Bible (although it may be wondered where Milton got the concept from!). Death becomes then not a result of the fall but a natural part of life's evolutionary advance. It seems a very postmodern approach that allows the individual to pick various parts of opposing worldviews and to seek to synthesize them into 'my' truth.

A naturalistic definition of science rules out any consideration of a Christian worldview from the data that science uncovers. Did the fall have any impact on the natural world? Is there a bondage to decay in the creation that was not part of God's original created order? Many would argue that the answer to both of these questions is yes, but such matters can never be considered in the light

of methodological naturalism. If either of the above questions is answered in the affirmative then that would have important implications for all origins research. If theism is true, then insisting on naturalistic processes for the origin and development of life is based on a false premise. That is part of the problem of seeking to synthesize opposing worldviews. The evolutionary worldview does not allow any consideration of the biblical worldview.

However, if Christians choose to embrace aspects of evolution then what is inviolable in our faith needs to be established. Is God controlling and directing the development of life? Are humans the special creation of God? Is humanity responsible for suffering, sickness and pain in the world? Will God hold humanity accountable for their wrongdoing and punish sin? Is death the enemy of humankind or is it responsible for our evolution? Is God a just and loving deity who is seeking to redeem and restore the world to his original intention or did God deliberately create a world full of sickness, pain and death with the intention of creating a world without them at some future point in time? Is Jesus Christ a Saviour or a good example of the sort of lifestyle that it is preferable for people to choose? Embracing evolution has implications for each of these questions that are crucial to Christianity.

### **The pastoral implications**

The Church seeks not only to declare the gospel to a lost world but also to offer support, comfort and insight to people dealing with the issues of life. Pastors spend a great deal of time in hospitals, in the homes of the bereaved, at funeral services and with people in crises, seeking to apply the truth of God's loving care in difficult times. However, if Christianity is to embrace evolution we must consider what the most appropriate way forward will be in offering help and counsel to those who are hurting.

Traditionally, counsel and comfort have been expressed in the context of a fallen world that was not God's design and where death is our enemy which Jesus Christ came into the world to confront and overcome in order that it might ultimately be destroyed. If, however, the fall had no impact on the natural order,

and sickness, suffering and death are the chosen order of God to develop life, our pastoral message needs to change significantly. It should therefore be clear that it is also highly questionable whether or not Church ministers are best placed to give this support. Surely scientists, who properly understand evolutionary theory, would be better equipped to explain to grieving relatives the reason for the demise of their six-year-old. As elderly parents lie dying in agony from wasting diseases, should we be explaining the evolutionary advance that may one day come from the deleterious mutations that their body is now suffering?

Evil in the world is understood very differently by evolutionary theorists than it is by those committed to the supremacy of Scripture. The Bible teaches that Christ came into the world to destroy the works of the evil one. This is demonstrated in the ministry of Jesus as he healed those who are afflicted by disease and sickness, showing his power and the nature of a kingdom that is to come. According to Jesus the thief comes 'to kill and destroy' (John 10:10) but according to Darwin it is evolution that kills and destroys. According to those urging Christians to embrace evolution this killing and destruction is the design of God for the development of life.

There is much more to embracing evolution than suggesting different ways of interpreting the creation passages of Scripture. A clear understanding of the theory is essential in order to fully appreciate its implications, and a commitment to the supremacy of Scripture will not allow the embracing of any aspect of evolution that compromises the key themes of the biblical text.