

NAZARENES EXPLORING EVOLUTION, Tom Oord and Sherri Walker, eds.
Boise, ID: SacraSage Press, 2013. ISBN: 978-1937498412

-Thane Hutcherson Ury, PhD

The word “heresy” not only means no longer being wrong; it practically means being clear-headed and courageous. The word “orthodoxy” not only no longer means being right; it practically means being wrong. — G.K. Chesterton

Nazarenes Exploring Evolution (NEE) could be accompanied by a subtitle, “The merger of Neo-Wesleyanism and Biologos.” The work is a compilation of 62 brief chapters by various members of the Church of the Nazarene (COTN). While degrees of conviction vary, the authors all embrace the truth of the neo-Darwinian synthesis. And as such they speak with one voice in endorsing the compatibility of evolution and traditional Christianity in general and Wesleyan-holiness theology in particular.

The verb “embrace” is used here because readers of NEE will soon realize that all contributors have made peace with some form of what we might call “hard Darwinism” or transpeciation; vs “soft Darwinism,” or what is often labeled micro-evolution (e.g. mere variation within finches). The point is there no pretense of *exploring*. In whatever areas the essayists may differ, such are inconsequential to their unified “clear-headed and courageous” apologia for evolutionary creationism. No dissenting voices will be heard in this collection (e.g. Dr. Paul Madtes). In fact, not a single reference is made to scholarly works that seriously challenge the theses of NEE (e.g. *Should Christians Embrace Evolution?*, ed. Norman Nevin, and *Coming to Grips with Genesis*, eds. Mortenson and Ury). Unfortunately, Stephen Meyer’s phenomenal book, *Darwin’s Doubt*, came out just a few months before NEE. Meyer’s work is a sure antidote for anyone over-enamored by NEE. A list of suggested resources will be forthcoming in part two of this review.

I have many close friends in COTN; those who are holding true to holiness, biblical authority, and will unbendingly side with solid exegesis in the face of all the moral wafflings in our world. Having said that, theological trendwatchers of higher education know that in recent years some citadels of COTN have drifted to the left theologically. Some years ago at a global COTN conference, General Superintendent Jerry Porter shared his conviction that the denomination was in “theological crisis.” Such “liberal creep” with its attendant higher critical approach has resulted in a depreciating dismissal of inerrancy, which in turn has steadily led to a handling of the creation and flood narratives that Wesley would scarcely recognize.

One of NEE's editors, Tom Oord, is widely known for his liberal proclivities. While his resume is impressive and his influence wide, to peruse any of his many publications is to encounter an undisguised promotion of things like open theism, theistic evolution, as well as a disparaging of classic inerrancy. Oord believes the original autographs contain many mistakes of fact and irreconcilable contradictions. What separates Oord from others (like the acerbic pen of Karl Giberson) is his gentle tone. He models a love and persona that I wish all combatants on controversial issues would adopt. [NB: On June 26, 2015 NNU trustees terminated Dr. Oord's position, as the bulge under the carpet had become too large to ignore any longer.]

But accommodationism is nothing new. The predictions of Machen, Schaeffer, Lindsell et al are coming truer than they could have imagined. The last decade has seen many prominent Christian thinkers in academia who have pleaded with their constituents to "accommodate emerging scientific conclusions about the origins of man." Alistar McGrath, Denis Alexander, Bruce Waltke, Karl Giberson, Denis Lamoureux, Tremper Longman, Peter Enns, and Tim Keller are just a few.

Writing on the constant leftward pull in academia in general, R.C. Sproul's words warrant inclusion here: "We have seen countless examples of universities, colleges, and seminaries chartered with a strong commitment to orthodox Christianity, only to erode [into apostasy]." Sproul suggests one key factor seducing such thinkers into conformity is a desire to be intellectually recognized in the academic world; and the other side of the coin being a slavish genuflection to the latest trends in academia. This "treason of the intellectuals" (often insecure Christian professors who are desperate to be accepted by their peers) results not just in a personal flight from orthodoxy, but in "dragging the colleges, seminaries, and ultimately the churches with them. It is a weighty price to pay for academic recognition." Where COTN currently fits on the slippery slope—or even if it on it—will be hotly contested. But NEE serves as *exhibit A* that a huge shift has occurred.

Readers who plough through NEE, will agree that a standard review would be quiet challenging; each segment of the 373-page tome bearing enough concerns and fallacies to merit individual critique. And since only a full book-length response could suffice, my comments must remain of a very general nature and limited to ten brief points.

1. It is no minor point that the book (which is actually just the tail of a larger project) was funded by the prominent Templeton-funded organization, Biologos, whose *raison d'être* is to promote the view that God-directed evolution. If you

haven't heard of Biologos please see <http://biologos.org/about> and peruse the organization's credo. Keen discernment will be needed to detect the structured ambiguity in Biologos' creed. As with all aberrant teaching through Church history, Biologos exhibits masterful dexterity in sounding and appearing orthodox. Listen carefully, and you'll hear echoes of the Wistar Institute, Spong, Borg, and Crossan. Note tenets #9 and #10 of Biologos in particular. These perfectly capture the viewpoint which NEE authors hold; namely, believing that a god-ordained process of evolution best explains the diversity and interrelation of all life; the creator providentially achieving his purposes via a Darwinian means, with humans on the same biological continuum with all life — sharing a common ancestry with beasts.

2. The book carries an almost “dear diary” flavor, with most participants recounting a chrysalis-like shedding of their cloistered fundamentalist past; breaking free to see the light with acceptance of hard Darwinism. The getaway was usually and allegedly brought on by higher education, mostly at COTN institutions, where the likes of Drs. Michael Lohdahl, Darrel Falk, and Karl Giberson helped so many to see that the assured results of Science and higher criticism trumps a natural reading of the creation and flood accounts. And thus, as we've come to expect time and time again, NEE collectively equates *science* with evolutionary theory, meaning de facto that all those who tend to take the creation narrative at face value must reject contemporary science.

3. We are told that the fundamentalist view of origins allegedly sets up an “either/or scenario;” it's either the Bible and a childlike faith, or science. This (false) dichotomy is reinforced throughout NEE. The Bible, we are told, is fine to learn of God's nature and plan of salvation, but not for understanding the physical world (143); the Christian part of my world doesn't find a seamless concord with the biological part of my world (147). We are implored to move away from a crass literalism and submit to a scientifically informed exegesis; piety must conform to the dictates of academic integrity or the current hemorrhaging of church membership will continue.

Non-conformists are depicted as fearful, suspicious, resistant while theistic evolutionists in COTN are seen as brave, and have joined “the agents of light and truth (233-34). Such is the condescending flavor throughout NEE. Creationists explanations are seen as outdated, convoluted and contrived . . . grasping for straws while strong evidence in support evolution is rapidly mounting (250). Those who continue to side with a face-value reading of the first 11 chapters of Genesis are

demeaned for believing that finished products popped into existence. NEE contributors however, are thrilled with a Creator who “interacts” with His creation.

4. NEE laments that many young people have left the denomination/Church because the later is perceived as out of touch with science. Thus, a key motive behind NEE is to remove needless barriers to the Gospel. At face value this goal is admirable, and I too want to show how science and a robust Christian faith are compatible. But to the extent that NEE has spawned additions hurdles, any victory is Pyrrhic at best. For example, when exegesis becomes meaningless, preaching suffers, compromise sets in, and the new face of God is little different than that of the Deist.

And where would the process stop? Apologists for homosexuality, for example, employ a hermeneutical method that mirrors that of the theistic evolutionist’s. The real irony here is that many people have left the Nazarene church because of its compromise on Genesis and related areas. The current reader of course would relish hearing NEE specify exactly at what point they would not follow academic consensus?

Again, we’re told numerous times that it’s a wooden-headed, stifling crass literalism of Genesis that’s off-putting; so many eventually leaving to breathe the fresh air of Darwinian truth. But NEE’s assertions here only sway those who aren’t aware of conflicting data. Esteemed theologian, Colin Brown, for example writes, “By far the most potent single factor to undermine popular belief in the existence of God in modern times is the evolutionary theory of Charles Darwin.”

English journalist, Newman Watts, in compiling he volume, *Britain Without God*, was impressed by two things; “One was the tremendous amount of literature available, and the other was the fact that every attack on the Christian faith made today has, as its basis, the doctrine of evolution.”

Michael Denton adds, “Today it is perhaps the Darwinian view of nature more than any other that is responsible for the agnostic and skeptical outlook of the twentieth century.” And Huston Smith agrees that “more cases of loss of religious faith are to be traced to the theory of evolution . . . than to anything else.” So, how again is it that Darwinism is drawing people to Church?

Let a man question the inspiration of the Scriptures and a curious, even monstrous, inversion takes place: thereafter he judges the Word instead of letting the Word judge him; he determines what the Word should teach instead of permitting it to determine what he should believe; he edits, amends, strikes out, adds at his

pleasure; but always he sits above the Word and makes it amenable to him instead of kneeling before God and becoming amenable to the Word. — A. W. Tozer

[It] is “dangerous . . . to depart from Scripture, either as to language or sentiment;” and I believe that most of the controversies which have disturbed the church, have arisen from people's wanting to be wise above what is written, not contented with what God has plainly revealed there. — Letter from John Wesley to Joseph Benson

When wrestling with inerrancy in the 80's, Woodbridge's, *Biblical Authority: Infallibility and Inerrancy in the Christian Tradition* was particularly anchoring for this reviewer. J. I. Packer noted it laid bare the "shoddy scholarship" behind two faulty theses. Faulty thesis one: The Scriptures are authoritative in areas of faith and practice, but not in non-salvific matters like historical minutia, chronology, geography, zoology, or other scientific details. Faulty thesis two: Inerrancy is a novelty of the 19th-century. Once, when pressed in an interview for my stance on Scripture, I recall a curmudgeonly gatekeeper at a confessional school labeling my inerrantist view as "a late-19th century Princetontian construct." I'm guessing it wasn't meant to flatter, and in the ensuing 15 years at this college I encountered allies for both faulty towers above; artful dodgers very clever at quarantining their personal credo from "handbook dogma;" and camouflaging their true convictions from easy detection. How this comports with any meaningful integrity is a question to be picked up below.

Packer praised Woodbridge's book as a series of "knock-out blows" and a "nasty job" that needed doing. A Woodbridge or two would be needed to tackle the diverse topics, misconceptions, distractions, and camouflage in NEE. This reviewer is no Woodbridge; a deficit amplified all the more since a review can't counter a work 100 times larger. Compounding matters further is that fact that our fieriest emotions seem to incubate in wait for exchanges on origins. That's a confession more than an accusation. No one likes "nasty jobs", and I genuinely have no intent to alienate, hurt, demean, oversimplify or misrepresent. Where I fail, please extend forgiveness. Spoiler alert: straight talk, generalizations, and inelegant lopping off of corners ahead.

First off, the term "evolution' (and 'Darwinism') is hotly debated, so it's unfortunate that NEE leaves the burden on the reader to cobble together a definition. It seems they hold to a God-ordained evolutionary process as the best explanation for all the diversity of life we see. And that the creator has

providentially achieved his purposes via Darwinian pathways, meaning that humans and beasts are the same biological continuum. Thus, what separates the NEE's model of origins from secular university textbook orthodoxy is NEE leaves room for a divine foot in the door; though unfortunately it's never explained how "divine agency" is ferreted from the raw scientific data. Here NEE basically asserts that, "It doesn't matter HOW God created . . . as long as one affirms THAT God created" (16, 45, 53, 64, etc). But as we'll see, the "how" factor is deeply relevant for a number of reasons.

Many in NEE and COTN higher education don't hide their embrace of evolutionary ideas nor their denial of inerrancy. This transparency is rare and refreshing for progressives in confessional schools. But those who've fallen prey to the aforementioned two faulty towers don't always stop there. A denial of inerrancy is so often followed by the "monstrous inversion," noted by Tozer. No one familiar with Wesley can conceive of him invoking scientific dogmas to determine which Scriptures are binding or how they're to be exegeted. Early Wesleyan tradition is not perfect, but who would doubt that the key thinkers in those days were characterized by a complete submission to the incarnate Word and inscripturated Word—striving to submit to the best exegesis of special revelation, and not beholden the imprimatur of extrabiblical entities.

The COTN Manual doesn't have a commitment to strict inerrancy, though many in the rank and file do. And thus many COTN academics who defend neo-Darwinism bristle at any suggestion that the denomination ever held to anything like full inerrancy, wanting to put as much daylight as possible between themselves and fundamentalism (Al Truesdale runs point here, but see McCarthy, "Nazarenes and the Authority of the Bible, 1908-1988: Eighty Years of Changing Definitions In the Church of the Nazarene," and Reasoner, *The Importance of Inerrancy*).

If any NEE authors hold to full inerrancy, they hide it very well. If any draw a line in the exegetical sand defending a literal Adam and Eve, or literal primal act of disobedience in a literal garden, followed by a literal curse (resulting in things like thorns that didn't exist prior to the fall), their voices are drowned out. For the most part, evolutionary creationists don't go out on a limb to defend Adam and Eve as literal persons. And when they do, they hasten to qualify that the Edenic pair weren't created out of dust and a rib, but in fact had hominid "parents" who had evolved via some Darwinian pathway. Adam and Eve are at best reduced to a Neolithic couple on whom God chose to stamp His imago dei and establish covenant. The growing trend in TE (theistic evolution) is to see Adam and Eve as mere metaphorical representations instead of real people. Many recent books grapple

with the quest for a historical Adam. This is a watershed issue for today's Church, and NEE is a wake up call for the looming crisis in Wesleyan circles. The matter is critical simply because it is tethered to larger issues of soteriology, hermeneutics, theodicy, and the authority of Christ.

In the ivory towers of COTN the claim that Genesis 1-3 is "a mythological version of a historical reality" seems to have moved past mere exploring, to now being considered the better part of theological valor, and so-called "settled science." Thankfully, as NEE acknowledges (and laments), the laity is acting as a firewall against such encroachment. But how could a denomination historically known for its faithfulness to Scripture shift so quickly? A partial answer to this mammoth question must reckon with the long shadows of influential professors at COTN schools; those often and fondly referred to with gratitude in NEE.

Trevecca Nazarene's Fred Cawthorne, contends elsewhere that, "Evolution by no means contradicts" Genesis, and "it should strengthen, not threaten, our faith."

ONU scientist, Rick Colling, once referred to those who "aggressively ignore or deny many scientific concepts and principles, especially in the domain of evolution," and in so doing, they "squeeze God into small rigid boxes." He believes God "cares enough about creation to harness even the forces of [neo-Darwinian] randomness."

Darrel Falk Professor Emeritus of Biology at Point Loma, and past president of BioLogos, believes the mass of data across the scientific disciplines for the past 150 years "is absolutely clear and equally certain. The earth is not young, and the life forms did not appear in six twenty-four-hour days. God created gradually."

Lastly, Thomas Huxley seems to be enjoying a brief reincarnation as Karl Giberson, formerly of Eastern Nazarene, who thinks evolution is not only true, but actually "an expression of God's creativity." He has famously stated that "genetic evidence has made it clear that Adam and Eve cannot have been historical figures, at least as described in the Bible. More scientifically informed evangelicals within conservative traditions are admitting that the evidence is undermining Creation-Fall-Redemption theology." He has even said that he is "happy to concede that science does indeed trump religious truth about the natural world." To be clear, he did not contribute NEE chapter, but his long-time promoting TE ideas in Nazarene academia is evident in the pages. Consider this excerpt from, Saving Darwin, where he gloats:

Most evangelical colleges teach evolution, albeit quietly, carefully, and often tentatively, although there are exceptions. . . . Those of us teaching evolution at evangelical colleges are made to feel as if we have this

subversive secret we must whisper quietly in our students' ears: "Hey, did you know that Adam and Eve were not the first humans and never even existed? And that you can still be a Christian and believe that?"

This reviewer found precious little in NEE challenging this subversive tactic, and a good deal that dovetails with it. One wonders, with Al Mohler, whether donors, uninformed constituencies, and "parents who send their offspring to Eastern Nazarene College have any understanding of what is taught there — and with such boldness and audacity." Having doubts is part of growing up, but deliberately promoting and instilling doubts is beyond subversive. It is sinister.

In a 2009 BioLogos article, Giberson claims he knows of "no one who has ever lost their faith" in his classes. But elsewhere he actually boasts of the many students he's "converted" to evolutionism. He then adds that these "scientifically informed" graduates often became so dissatisfied with their home churches that they withdrew, "taking their enlightenment with them." He admits that his best students "have completely abandoned their faith traditions," and yet blames the churches! One can only marvel at the shunt across his critical pathways, willfully oblivious to the impact of his secret subversion for 27 years at ENC. It's bitter-sweet when subversives part ways with their schools; a blessing that new students have one less proselytizer for neo-deism, but incalculably bitter when thinking of all those who've already had traditional views of Genesis purged from their minds. Giberson's over-reach contributed to his ousting. In outing themselves, NEE may also alert university applicants, parents, apologist-pastors, God-fearing board members, and donors that the trumpet's clarity has waned (Mt. 7:15; I Cor. 14:8).

Giberson, Falk, et al contend that evolutionary biology has disproven the myth that any first parents were progenitors of the human race. Such is hopelessly passé, they say, and the sooner Nazarenes scrap the idea the better. Similar sentiment can be garnered from NEE authors, who variously aid and abet the TE view. More below. In part one of this review I should have noted that a few NEE authors strike conciliatory notes and may be read profitably. I nodded in general agreement with most of chapters 3, 11-13, 22 and a few others. One chapter was so atrociously written that I can only think it was submitted late. But most chapters are clear, and come at the "exploration" from a wide (and helpful) range of disciplines. I noted four areas of concern, and now turn to six others. When painting with such broad strokes please bear in mind that clearly each critique won't fit every contributor.

1) CHALLENGING THE MAIN CANARD: We left off with salient quotes on how evolutionism in the last century has bankrupted the faith of many. Those assertions weren't intended as "debate stoppers" — few things are in our in-house kerfuffle on origins. The quotes merely remind us of the proven, toxic impact of evolutionism; a warning for the Church that this "universal acid" (Daniel Dennett's apt phrase) is relentlessly corrosive. Recall those earlier four quotes when hearing episodic calls for the Church to embrace evolution.

NEE is ostensibly premised in large part on preventing member loss. Such stark irony, however, to adopt and promote a philosophy that has actually caused the loss of faith of so many. Incalculable souls have left the church, or outright rejected Christianity because evolutionism is elevated above Christ's view of Genesis. Consider the case of the late Charles Templeton; a famous evangelist who turned his back on God. In his book, *Farewell to God*, Templeton gives at least a dozen reasons for losing his faith; 10 of which stem from his conviction that Genesis is no longer credible. In a communiqué with good friend, Billy Graham, he made it clear that "it's simply not possible any longer to believe . . . the biblical account of creation. The world wasn't created over a period of days a few thousand years ago; it has evolved over millions of years. It's not a matter of speculation; it's demonstrable fact" (p.7). Such words could have been lifted right from the pages of NEE (251).

So many have lost their faith in no small part due to the implications of evolutionism (I Tim 1:19). Names that often make the list are Charles Darwin, Julius Wellhausen, Ernst Haeckel, Leslie Stephen, Matthew Arnold, George Eliot, J.A. Froude, John Dewey, Karl Marx, Vladimir Lenin, Friedrich Engels, Joseph Stalin, Charles Strong (Augustus' son), Rudolf Carnap, John D. Rockefeller, W.K. Clifford, William James, H.G. Wells, Charles Sanders Pierce, John Muir, Andrew Carnegie, Oliver Wendall Holmes, Edward O. Wilson, William Provine, Richard Dawkins, Howard Van Till, Michael Shermer, Eugenie Scott, Ron Numbers, Jerry Coyne, and seemingly Karl Giberson (read *Saving Darwin*, pp. 155-56, and decide for yourself). See also Nancy Pearcey, *Total Truth*, ch 8, and *The Black Book of Communism*, by Courtois and Werth.

Exactly 100 years ago, in his book, *The Belief in God and Immortality*, James H. Leuba provided data that it's during their university years when a significant number of students lose their faith. This is nothing new. So what are we to make of the finger-wagging that young-earth creationism (YEC or "literalists") is somehow the main culprit in why so many (especially the 18-40 crowd) have left the Church/faith? I think this is a red herring. Someone's culpable, but who? In a 2002 interview, Eugenie Scott, Executive Director of the National Center for Science

Education, said she had “found that the most effective allies for evolution are people of the faith community,” adding that a single “clergyman with a backward collar is worth two biologists at a school board meeting any day!” Such clergy and atheists, she concludes, have in common “that we want to see evolution taught in the public schools . . .” What heightens the drama for us, is that Dr. Scott was being interviewed by none other than Dr. Oord! It remains to be seen how many others in COTN, like Giberson, Oord, and Falk, will be willfully compliant in this secular alliance.

Jerry Coyne is also upfront about what he calls “a dirty little secret in scientific circles.” Namely, affirming as a “tactical matter” that science and faith are perfectly harmonious, and “liberal religious people have been important allies in our struggle against creationism. . . . [but the claim that there are] religious scientists — is wearing thin [And] we can expect more books like those by Kenneth Miller and Karl Giberson.” Attempts to reconcile God and evolution keep rolling off the intellectual assembly line. It never stops, because the reconciliation never works.

NEE's inference is that evangelism and member retention would be easier if the scientifically ill-informed would just relax their ham-fisted literalism in favor of something more intellectually tolerable or scientifically informed (read: “less embarrassing”). So TE is something of a tunicate; to stop the hemorrhaging of membership allegedly brought on by out-of-touch churches/pastors who foment conflict between science and the Bible. Sure, many have unnecessarily left the Church over these type of issues. But as with the “Giberson shunt,” the notion of shared culpability isn't an option for NEE. There's a whole cluster of reasons why sheep leave the pen, and it's just too convenient and a gross oversimplification to say it's YEC or its corollaries that are responsible. Additionally, the exits are not always stage left. Many deplore denominations or pastors who have an index finger in the air, and are instead thirsting for venues where fearless expository teaching and faithfulness to special revelation are the norm. While this might be ridiculed as anti-intellectual, they might ask how is it any better to attend a church, university, or seminary top-heavy with backwards clerical collars?

Are there those who, as NEE contends, leave the faith for the lone reason of some perception of anti-intellectualism? Likely. But it may just as credibly surmised that their “conversion” by the likes of Giberson in COTN citadels of higher ed. was a significant contributor in developing a cynicism toward non-Darwinian church leaders.

Imagine how different things might have been if said prodigals had been schooled in institutions equipped to show how the Bible holds up under fire. There has to be many COTN pastors, parents, and parishioners grounded in apologetics,

and poised to guide young minds through the exegetical and scientific data (see recommended sources below). But NEE tends to caricature Darwin-questioning pastors as uniformed bumpkins fresh off the bus from Heavenly Hillsboro (i.e. that ultra-fideistic community notoriously portrayed in *Inherit the Wind*). This straw man fallacy seems to span most of the NEE volume; namely a composite sketch of pastors or creationists who suppress critical thinking, and either live in fear of science, or deny it outright. The Church will always have cartoonish “Rev. Jeremiah Browns” types, but the answer is not to side with the Hornbecks and Darrows.

NEE portrays some pastors who see science as an “enemy” and/or engage in an unsustainable literalism. But such parsons don't do such because of any mandate in Creationism demanding crass literalism. Instead, it's their wooden literalism that has led them to embrace some features that Creationists also hold. The more informed in COTN know what an uncharitable and coarse miscaricaturization it is to lump all Creationists with the “anti-science” class. Yet it's become such a key tactical smear for the NEE narrative that such misnomers aren't likely to end. We've come to expect secular evolutionary circles to indiscriminately lump thinkers like Sarfati and Snelling (for example) with snake handlers and flat earthers. No big news flash. But why do NEE authors pander to this false narrative? Is it so hard to grasp that while creationists tend toward a more literal reading of Genesis 1-11, this doesn't mean we can't recognize and accommodate non-literal nuances in the text, or discern when a figure of speech might be in play. Do NEE writers think YEC believes that God has wings? (Ps 91:4)

In sharing their struggle of coming out, some NEE authors share of fideistic pastors, or being taught anti-evolutionary songs, and of other unnamed pastors who preached the “evils” of evolution, referred to it as “the work of Satan” (81), or avoided scientific queries altogether. My hunch is that if we could track down these pastors they'd prove slightly less buffoonish than NEE suggests. But even if not, merely having a pastor who is less scientifically conversant than they is fairly shaky warrant for seeking contra-biblical answers on things like the definition of marriage, right-to-life issues, and the origin of life. For NEE to infer that those to their right “consider science an evil scourge to be repulsed at every turn” (174), etc, is not just monotonous, it is scandalous.

Whatever the case, it's sad that any answer-seeking youth would not be blessed with a well-informed pastor-apologist—one in the mold of a Kevin DeYoung, John MacArthur, Richard Phillips, or Matt Postiff. Such shepherds aren't easily stumped. Instead, they are passionately committed to helping their flocks see how much more theologically and scientifically satisfying it is to be content with “what God has

plainly revealed” rather than jumping on the TE bandwagon, or leaving the church altogether.

And is NEE suggesting that TE has really has drawing power? NEE opens up their work with some impressive polling, but absent is any data that TE has wooed in an appreciable number of unbelieving scientists; ones who’ve prayed the sinner’s prayer and embraced a life of costly discipleship and full submission to Christ? If these converts exists, do they then go on to vigorously defend the miracles surrounding the Egyptian exodus, or the virgin birth, the raising of Lazarus, Jesus walking on water, and any phenomena which flies in the face of scientific convention? If our hermeneutic for Genesis 1-11 must conform to the edicts of Science, where would the genuflection stop? Where exactly does NEE differ from 19th century liberalism regarding miracles? Shooting the present reviewer would be way too easy, when instead a real answer to that straight question would be so helpful. NEE and BioLogos seem to be merely the latest in a long line of self-appointed intelligentsia since the Enlightenment, who are offering to “help” the Church avoid intellectual embarrassments (cf. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Rudolf Bultmann, etc). Inerrancy has likewise been mocked as “intellectually disastrous,” and annihilationists have lamented that eternal punishment is a “terrible blot” on the Church’s witness. So it’s fairly predictable that the TE/NEE/Biologos inner sanctum will also push for a kinder, gentler damnation. For once one demurs from a normative hermeneutic on Genesis, how likely is it really that she will suddenly come to grips with the grammatico-historical method on passages dealing with hell? 19th century liberals posited naturalistic explanations for everything the Church saw as supernatural. So, NEE as a whole must be asked why they hold to any miracle in Scripture? And how do they do this without appearing arbitrary? How are the above-mentioned miracles (Lazarus, etc.) any less embarrassing than holding to a non-evolutionary view of origins? At what point does a seeker-friendly theology cease catering to biblical criticism and “theistic naturalism?” Will the Church always need the imprimatur of 97% of scientists to tamp down its exegesis? If so, NEE prove too much, as 97% will never affirm the virgin birth, resurrection, etc. No wonder Biola’s Dr. Craig Hazen has wondered out loud whether it’s still safe in some circles to doubt evolution at all.

2) UNCHARITABLE DISCOURSE: One contributor, Trevecca President, Dan Boone, wants to see a “holy conversation” occur, yet hastens to add that he’s seen a “fear emerge” in the church, and likens creationists as those “determined to make a Custer’s last stand” (62). In the NEE introduction, Oord pulls some excerpts from

Boone's work, *A Charitable Discourse*, where Boone says he wants to "engage a young generation in an open-minded biblical conversation that welcomes scientific discovery, reasoned philosophy, and careful logic" instead of "ignoring all of these in favor of an interpretation of creation that is barely one hundred years old and rooted in the fear of science." A few pages later he alludes to the YEC position as requiring "a total . . . denial of science as we know it."

In his highly applicable chapter, Dr. Ronald Wright makes an apt point in his segment titled, "Us and Them Bias." Wright states, "If someone is expecting bias from another group they are much more likely to strongly criticize and belittle the other group. This can assist in the formation of unhelpful stereotypes. . . . There is also a tendency to automatically view one's own group as 'better' than an out-group." Wright shows how this is connected to "self-serving bias[es]" and the "false consensus effect." Wright main point is that "Obviously, these in-group/out-group dynamics can make dialoguing and listening to 'them' difficult wherever one is located within the origins conversation." But it seems Dr. Boone could benefit from his coauthor's words, when the latter concludes: "Some questions for critical self-examination here are, how do I portray people who hold positions different from me in the origins debate? What kind of stereotypes and/or prejudice am I guilty of when addressing 'those' people?"

How can Dr. Boone be so self-unaware as to the stereotypes/prejudices he labors under when addressing "those" literalists? Is it really charitable to make thinly-veiled swipes that some COTN'ers 1) are closed-minded, 2) are less than welcoming (or even in total denial) of scientific discovery, 3) embrace a relatively novel view on the opening chapters of Genesis, 4) employ less-than-reasoned-and careful philosophy and logic, and 5) have a fear of science? To claim creationists have done likewise is another adventure in missing the point; namely, Boone's rhetoric fits neither with NEE's stated goal not "to ridicule" YECs (13), nor the NEE website, which views their endeavor as "loving, constructive, and humble." Elsewhere in NEE, the YEC crowd is said to, "Grasp at anything . . . irrational" (81), "Drink from only one well" (93), "shrink back from Holy Spirit guided examination of new evidence" (157), operate in a "culture of legalism and fear" (247), "desperately grasping for straws," are engaged in "self deception" (253), and practice an "inexplicable valorization of Genesis 1 above all other texts in the Bible" (43). Dr. Wright references those who "strongly criticize and belittle" the "other group," but NEE doesn't seem aware (Mt. 7:3) of their own blinders in perpetuating "unhelpful stereotypes." Let's briefly look the gratuitous assumptions Boone makes with his inferences.

Open minded. The inference is that the “other” side is closed-minded. But this is something like Dawkinsian bluster, who said “It is absolutely safe to say that if you meet somebody who claims not to believe in evolution, that person is ignorant...” If someone every bit as scientifically credentialed as Falk and Giberson leans more toward historical maximalism, knowing the chequered track record of historical minimalists, is this closed-minded. And what exactly is the objective standard for determining open-mindedness? A little more humility and bend-over-backwards honesty is needed here, because there are closed and open minds on both sides. Much of what passed for science 150 years ago has today been completely overturned; what the open-minded accepted in the 1840's as scientific would now only be embraced by the closed-minded, for “science advances funeral by funeral.” One man’s closed-mindedness is another man’s skepticism; skepticism really being a non-negotiable for scientists.

One of the world’s leaders in evolutionary biology, geneticist Richard Lewontin, once referred to the scientific community’s “willingness to accept scientific claims that are against common sense” and that many “take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises . . . in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories.” Would someone in the NEE project explain why when creationist's share comparable reservations like Lewontin's, they're pegged as closed-minded?

Boone writes that he prefers to read Genesis 1 “as the story of God interacting with his already in existence, chaotic, death-bound, disordered creation” (64). But given his sermon, “God's Approbation of His Works,” Wesley would appear to be terribly closed-minded to Boone's dysteleology.

Denying science. Would Boone feel he was being addressed charitably if conservatives said he was engaged in a total denial of exegesis as we know it? Not likely. So why does he address conservatives in this manner? Neither Boone nor NEE provide specific examples of what science is actually being denied by the world's leading Creationists. Drs. Andrew Snelling, and John Baumgardner, and countless YEC scientists, would certainly like to learn from Boone where they are engaged in a total denial of science. Surely we don't accept every mere claim or interpretation as equally plausible scientifically. But this is hardly to be confused with shunning science. Many shunned the “science” of Haeckel's embryos and Piltdown Man. But on Boone's count, critics of those hoaxes would have initially been science deniers, when in fact the historical record exonerates them as being the better scientists!

Relatively novel view. Ron Numbers' seminal book, *The Creationists*, mistakenly concludes that YEC is a recent view, with its genesis in George McCready-Price. Mark Noll pushes things back a little further to SDA founder Ellen G. White. Despite the fact that repeating Numbers and Noll has become axiomatic in TE circles, the arc of YEC thinking stretches much further back in history. Terry Mortenson has done the Church a huge service by meticulously scouring Genesis commentaries written from 1639 to 1856, showing that the vast majority held to a normative hermeneutic, including a recent creation within a period of six 24-hour days, and of course a global catastrophic deluge. This doesn't prove the case, of course, but we're only focusing here on Boone's "barely one hundred years old" misrepresentation.

Progressive creationist, Dr. Pattle Pun, of Wheaton, affirmed that "It is apparent that the most straightforward understanding of Genesis, without regard to the hermeneutical considerations suggested by science, is that God created the heavens and the earth in six solar days, that man was created on the sixth day, and that death and chaos entered the world after the fall of Adam and Eve, and that all fossils were the result of the catastrophic deluge that spared only Noah's family and the animals therewith."

Jud Davis corresponded with renowned Hebraist, Hugh Williamson, and current Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford University. Regarding James Barr's claim that Genesis 1-11 was intended by the author/s to be taken as straightforward history (literal days, accurate genealogies, global flood), Williamson stated of his predecessor's words: "I have not met any Hebrew professors who had the slightest doubt about this unless they were already committed to some alternative by other considerations that do not arise from a straightforward reading of the Hebrew text as it stands."

Davis also received a response from Professor Emanuel Tov of Hebrew University, whose expertise in biblical Hebrew is unparalleled. Tov responded: "For the biblical people this was history, difficult as it is for us to accept this view."

Lastly, Davis inquired of Peter Williams, the current Warden at Tyndale House, who pulled on his encyclopedic knowledge and wrote, "Although the Young Universe Creationist position is not widely held within secular academia, the position — that the author of Genesis 1 maintained that the world was created in six literal days — is nearly universally held."

Geologist, Davis Young, no fan of YEC, likewise concludes that,

The virtually unanimous opinion among the early Christians until the time of Augustine was that human history from the creation of Adam to the birth of Christ had lasted approximately fifty-five hundred years...

It cannot be denied, in spite of frequent interpretations of Genesis 1 that departed from the rigidly literal, that the most universal view of the Christian world until the eighteenth century was that the Earth was only a few thousand years old (*Christianity & The Age of the Earth*, 19, 25).

And given the passing reference to Augustine, our TE friends are often all too quick to enlist him as “proof” that it’s not necessarily to hold to a YEC view And yet their failure to include this passage from City of God is glaring:

For as it is not yet six thousand years since the first man, who is called Adam, are not those to be ridiculed rather than refuted who try to persuade us of anything regarding a space of time so different from, and contrary to, the ascertained truth?" And "They are deceived, too, by those highly mendacious documents which profess to give the history of many thousand years, though, reckoning by the sacred writings, we find that not 6000 years have yet passed.

Again, this does not prove YEC, but only that evolutionary creationists can be just as myopic as anyone in when researching. Boone inconsistency is manifest when rejecting a view that he deems “barely” a century old, and yet at the same time adopting a philosophy of origins that is barely older. The YEC perspective dates back millennia. Boone can no doubt line up his linguistic witnesses in the dock, and we will be happy to look at their data.

Conservative thinkers are every bit as careful and reasonable in philosophy and logic. Though shying away from age-of-the-earth issues, ID theorist, Phillip Johnson, has undertaken the “nasty job” of exposing the metaphysical underbelly of the neo-Darwinian synthesis. *Darwin on Trial* and *Reason in the Balance* show just how unreasonable, illogical, and unscientific evolutionists have often been. And YEC scholars like Sarfati, Snelling, Boyd and Kulikovsky might just as easily see Boone as close-minded for not actually countering their apologia with better arguments.

Fear of Science. What does this even mean? Clinging to our KJVs in the church basement with one hand, while handling snakes with the other? I've never met a creationist who fears science qua science, but only ones intensely suspicious of philosophical naturalism masquerading in scientific garb. Yet the “fear card” is

played again and again in NEE. I have seen friends go off to pursue a PhD, and slowly cast off their former childlike (not childish) faith; one said he'd been "enlightened," another gave up infallibility and Adam and Eve, still another follows the subversive tactics in the mold of Giberson. I don't think people fear science as much as Boone may think. Does he really expect parents to celebrate when young ones go to the academy, take a bite from Darwinian apple, and for the rest of their lives try and pull others into a monstrous inversion?

3) JEPD? SERIOUSLY? Dr. Lowery, Chair of ONU's Theo/Phil Dept, is referred to as a key player in forming "new Wesleyan theologies" today. His pilgrimage away from creationism began, oddly enough, when pursuing an Asbury M.Div. There his YEC encountered unnamed seminary prof/s who pointed out that there were two creation accounts, and that the Pentateuch was compiled from several sources, and not written by Moses (250). Lowery's response was anger and disgust. Not at his profs, but at his church and denomination who let him down by shielding him from data "one to two centuries old." In his PhD studies, he later found the evidence for evolution mounting, while creationist ideas seemed "contrived and convoluted" and "desperately grasping for straws." In rejecting the truth of evolution, [literalists] are left with the "temporary pleasures...[of]...self deception" (253).

The "problem" of two creation accounts is brought up several times in NEE (see 45, 120, 193-194, 229, 255, 261), with Lowery and others apparently either unaware or willfully ignorant that good responses exist not only for this "apparent contradiction," but also for all of Lowery's objections; most of which seem to radiate from the now defunct JEDP theory. It's noteworthy that during my M.Div studies at ATS, Drs. Livingston, Wang, Oswalt, et al made sure we were at least aware of the many weaknesses in the Documentary Hypothesis.

But Lowery imbibed different perspectives, now accepts evolution, and is quite blunt what this means for him. The most obvious impact, he states, is how it's influenced his view of revelation. Namely, since "Biblical scholars tells [sic] us that the creation narratives in Genesis are adaptations of older creation myths"— like the Enuma Elish—we can no longer "view [these creation narratives] as historical accounts," though they "can certainly be regarded as revelatory." It's one thing to say Genesis is not science, now we're hearing that it is not even historical! While TEs of yesteryear shied away for making this point explicit, it is nothing short of staggering that the COTN has become comfortable with a professor who basically says the early chapters of Genesis are no more credible than the Epic of Gilgamesh?

The statement that adaptations from earlier pagan cosmologies can “certainly be regarded as revelatory” is certainly revelatory itself.

Lowery continues, “Although Jesus mentions Abel in the gospels, we don’t know whether he viewed Abel as a historical figure.” You read that right! And why stop there? Lowery admits he’s “not convinced that viewing Adam as of archetype [i.e. a symbol, but not historical] challenges the historicity of Christ as the second Adam.” Here we bump up against the first of two smoking pistols in NEE; namely chipping away at the authority of Christ (the other is dehistoricizing the fall). Where does Christ ever insert an artificial wedge between history and theology? What are we to do with a Savior who seems to take Genesis as straightforward history (no exceptions)? Walking the higher-critical tightrope means Jesus was either misled or misleading. In inviting us to overturn paleo-orthodoxy and embrace a framework that is barely over a century old, Lowery and NEE would have us believe that Jesus and Paul were either accommodating themselves to mistaken worldview of their contemporaries, or they themselves were mistaken. If Lowery offers another option, the implications could hardly fair better. For now, let’s wait to see if his take is justifiably derived from the fairest exegesis of the text by those who hold to a view of Scripture which COTN pioneers would recognize.

If Adam and the fall aren’t literal, asks Greg Koukle, “when did the moral wound occur in history that would actually be healed in history at Golgotha?” Some NEE contributors seem fine with the second Adam repairing a breach, but don’t clarify how this works if we fictionalize the first Adam, and Paul words in Romans 5:12-19 are reduced to nonsense. It’s hard to fathom how a sincere COTN member who holds a high view of Scripture can justifiably disagree with this.

Groups like NEE and BioLogos, frequently highlight Bruce K. Waltke’s 2010 endorsement of evolution, and his claim that Evangelicalism faces a crisis if it doesn’t accept modern science. The data, so he claims, “is overwhelmingly in favor of evolution,” and denying this “make us a cult.” A few years ago Dr. Falk praised Waltke’s courage in coming out. One cannot fail to see a little humor and an awkward inconsistency, for in that same year Waltke (along with co-authors, Houston and Moore) wrote:

Psalm 22 provides an example of how many modern commentators have distanced themselves from the tradition of the Christian Fathers. The spectrum has widened to include both Jewish and Christian commentators who have embraced secularism and those whose religious faith has been trumped by the authority of the academy. These contrast with those who

seek continuity with the traditional rabbis or fathers of the church. (The Psalms as Christian Worship, p. 376).

Many would contend that Waltke's handling of Genesis 1-3 suffers under the exact same inversion; where the secular academy trumps those who seek some credible exegetical continuity with paleo-orthodoxy.

4) THE PROBLEM OF NATURAL EVIL: All stripes of theistic evolution sooner or later must bump up against the problem of evil. More specifically they must address the problem of natural evil (paleo-natural evil), and when it originated. NEE, however, does little more than mention the problem

Mark Winslow shares that he has “seriously considered the implications of biological evolution,” and admits, “that the evolutionary story of the cosmos and of life has profound implications” (88). Two key elements Winslow acknowledges in this story are, 1) the proposition from Genesis 1 that God declared the created order good, and 2) “earth's rugged history in which untold numbers of animal species have come and gone prior to the advent of human beings.” He admits that he can't pretend to fully comprehend the declaration of the creative order was that one time good when sifting through the geological evidence, which suggest death and destruction.

As if anticipating the objections of some who would use paleonatural evil against God's goodness, Wesley held that the “cavils of minute philosophers” and “vain men” are, grounded upon an entire mistake; namely, that the world is now in the same state it was at the beginning. And upon this supposition they plausibly build abundance of objections. But all these objections fall to the ground, when we observe, this supposition cannot be admitted. The world, at the beginning, was in a totally different state from that wherein we find it now. Object, therefore, whatever you please to the present state, either of the animate or inanimate creation, whether in general, or with regard to any particular instance; and the answer is ready:—These are not now as they were in the beginning.

The problem with every stripe of TE is that essentially all natural evils we now see were present long before the advent of mankind. For Luther, Calvin, and Wesley, all natural evils are post-lapsarian intrusions; due directly to the disobedience of Adam and Eve and not part of the original created order. E.L. Mascall notes:

The teaching of the Christian church about the origin and nature of evil in this world has been steadily based upon the story of the fall of man . . .It was

until recent years almost universally held that all the evils, both moral and physical, which afflict this earth, are in some way or other derived from the first act by which a bodily creature endowed with reason deliberately set itself against what it knew to be the will of God.

This position was also held by the well-known Nazarene theologian, H. Orton Wiley, who contends that Paul “clearly taught that before of Adam, there was neither sin nor death after his fall there were both, and these are regarded as the direct consequences of sin. It seems clear also from this statement, that natural evil is the consequence of moral evil for death is by sin.” Please note that NEE dedicates their volume to Wiley, and often pepper their theses with reference to Wiley’s (well-deserved) authority, especially when he refers to the early part of Genesis as “The Hymn of Creation,” or “The Poem of the Dawn,” and that “the best Hebrew exegesis has never regarded the days of Genesis as solar days.” But NEE is predictably silent when Wiley affirms Adam as a literal person, whose time-space act of disobedience directly brought about physical death, and natural evil. Such alone counters any theistic evolutionary scenario, all of which have physical death and natural evils long preceding the advent of mankind, and thus not allowing for any sin-death causal nexus. Most Christians will resonate with Wiley’s view of the impact of sin. But by implication, the view of sin held by BioLogos and NEE will be unpalatable as it appears indistinguishable from the Barthian view; sin being more about man’s finitude than his rebellion.

It was only after the comparatively new sciences of geology and paleontology came forward with their theories of the enormous age of the earth that theologians began to show an inclination to identify the days of creation with the long geological ages. But NEE, BioLogos, and TE will try and make it seem like deep time, poetic takes on Genesis, and non-literal creation days, etc all enjoyed defenders from the early church onward.

But NEE (and BioLogos, et al) downplay the problem of the origin of natural evil as if it’s no big deal; rhetorically dismissing it in a number of ways and suggesting such shouldn’t negatively impact ones perception of God’s nature and character as a loving and good Creator. Non-believers, however, are not buying this accommodationist theodicy. Bertrand Russell ponders:

Religion . . . has accommodated itself to the doctrine of evolution. . . . We are told that . . . evolution is the unfolding of an idea which has been in the mind of God throughout. It appears that during those ages . . . when animals were

torturing each other with ferocious horns and agonizing stings, Omnipotence was quietly waiting. . . . Why the Creator should have preferred to reach His goal by a process, instead of going straight to it, these modern theologians do not tell us.

David Hull isn't swayed either, noting that the process of natural selection "is rife with happen-stance, contingency, incredible waste, death, pain and horror," implying that the Creator projected by TE isn't a loving God, but instead is "careless, indifferent, almost diabolical. He is certainly not the sort of God to whom anyone would be inclined to pray."

Jacques Monod, the Nobel-prize winning biologist, describes natural selection as "a horrible process," and expresses surprise "that a Christian would defend the idea that this is the process which God more or less set up."

Biologist Theodosius Dobzhansky, stated: "The universe could have been created in the state of perfection. Why [then] so many false starts, extinctions, disasters, misery, anguish, and finally the greatest of evils — death? The God of love and mercy could not have planned all this. Any doctrine which regards evolution as predetermined or guided collides head-on with the ineluctable fact of the existence of evil." Dobzhansky added later, "What a senseless operation it would have been, on God's part, to fabricate a multitude of species ex nihilo and then let most of them die out! . . . Was the Creator in a jocular mood . . . ?"

Conservatives couldn't agree more that the NEE view of the Creator is consistent neither with the loving Creator of Scripture, nor the goodness of God as taught for the vast majority of Church history. And thus we see that the traditionalists' defense of a six-day creation, literal fall, and a global flood, could be every bit as much about theology (defending the goodness of the Creator), as it is about hermeneutics.

The issue of natural evil is touched upon in NEE, but there is no evidence that any author has felt the crushing weight of the problem. None has provided an apologia that would placate the skeptics on the left, or reassure the COTN thinkers to the right of why a caring Creator would call such a process "very good" (Gen 1:31). This just amplifies even more that in NEE's effort to make the faith more credible, the character of God is besmirched, biblical authority is eroded, and the Gospel is actually undermined.

No wonder that Coyne had written, "The reason that many liberal theologians see religion and evolution as harmonious is that they espouse a theology not only alien but unrecognizable as religion to most Americans." This is exactly what

William Provine had in mind: “[B]elief in modern evolution makes atheists of people. One can have a religious view that is compatible with evolution only if the religious view is indistinguishable from atheism.” Dr Jerry Bergman’s take on Giberson’s *Saving Darwin*, will undoubtedly be how many will view NEE.

Except for its thin veneer of close to meaningless theism, this book is almost identical in content and conclusions to the many atheists’ books on the market published to disprove the major arguments for God, the cosmological and teleological arguments. The reasoning in this work is also very similar to the writings by atheists and others against creation and ID. Even mocking believers is present, although not quite as vicious. When I was an atheist we used to call people such as Giberson “useful idiots” who were making major contributions to destroying their own religious edifice.”

5) NO EVIDENCE FOR MACRO-EVOLUTION PROVIDED: If one is looking for actual empirical data to support the neo-Darwinian synthesis, NEE is not the place to look, except perhaps in the footnotes. We cannot fault authors for this since they’re only allotted only 5-6 pages each to journal about their making peace with an evolutionary perspective, and a few authors steer their essays in a different direction altogether. Still, some science would seem warranted. Perhaps reviewers of this review will sidestep the request for just a little evidence with a dismissive platitude. But wouldn’t it be more effective to silence me by simply pointing to the pages referencing the empirical data that I missed?

Stephen Smith, a geochemist, writes of seeing his “students break down into tears as they stood on an outcrop of rock and saw evidence that contradicted what their church had taught them.” And yet he neglects to mention just what they saw, or where the outcrop is so the rest of us see this formation. Perhaps you’ve heard of the little-known Newtonian law: “For every expert, there is an equal and opposite expert.” Well, there have been many who have taken the annual AIG 6-day rafting trip in the Grand Canyon, and seen evidence that contradicted what the church of Lyell and Darwin had taught them.

Maybe the chapter by Herpetologist, John Cossel, was meant to provide a smidgeon of science with his case of the Costa Rican poison dart frogs (141-42). He suggests that over vast time two populations of a species were split and isolated from each other on either side of a huge mountain range. Today, on one side of the range we find a species that secretes a toxic poison; while the glands of those on the other side of the range do not (at least not at a lethal level). Cossel is the scientist; I’m a theologian. He could quite easily embarrass me on scientific matters, and no

doubt I could learn mountains from him. He notes that all frogs have such poison glands, but adds an odd note that this is what evolutionary theory predicts? I've heard enough "just-so stories" from evolutionists over the last 30 years to know that if some frogs didn't have such glands, evolutionists would also claim, "this is exactly what our model predicted." Much of what is labeled "predictive" seems to be nothing more than the outcroppings of an infinite plasticity that can be retrofitted to make any proposal appear predictive.

If all the above comes off as terribly disingenuous, I can only beg forgiveness. But I just don't see how the dart frog example even comes close to confirming macroevolution. Has evolution occurred here? Yes, but only if we banally define evolution as any change over time. What is really needed is evidence that frogs evolved from non-frogs; or proof of a Darwinian mechanism that shows how complex glands could arise from no glands by mutation and natural selection? To inject divine guidance is a form of God-of-the-gaps. And just-so stories aren't science either. And to point this out is not denying science but actually begging for science. My lay hunch is there's a stunning (if not irreducibly complex) chemical cascade involved in this process that can more easily be accommodated by an inference to design than incremental random mutation and natural selection.

I don't see Cossel actually proving an increase in (new) genetic complexity — much less how a major new system climbed Mount Improbable — and as such he gives just another variation on examples like bacterial resistance, Darwin's finches, or sickle-cell anemia.

Some applicable thoughts are made just two chapters earlier by Cossel's co-author, Dennis Williams. In what may be the best sentence in the entire volume, Dr. Williams surmises that the Creator "created the genetic foundations of life" whereby He "filled the DNA toolbox chock full of survival tools that could get turned on and maximized under the right conditions" (131). Williams shares that he grew up on a farm and frequently observed evolution happening, but admits that many will call this mere "microevolution," and then (very oddly) admits twice that his "imagination" goes beyond what the evidence actually says (128).

But let's look at his toolbox comment. YEC likewise hold as inherently plausible that each of the 170 species of poison dart frog had a genetic "toolbox" pre-loaded with the maximal tools for toxicity. And that predatory "pressures" could activate this "survival tool." The YEC model has long-made similar suggestions. The question of why a good Creator would include genetic coding for "defense-attack structures" is a good one. James Orr's idea of "anticipatory consequences" is one response among many. But Cossel isn't convinced, holding that all defense-attack structures

(thorns and diseases too) are not the “consequences of sin,” but are pointers to “a much greater God” who creates through “natural processes.”

Almost as an afterthought, Cossel proposes a supposed transitional form between frogs and salamanders that he says do “not make sense, except in the light of evolution.” But the reader is urged to search online for Creationist responses to this “frogamander.” (cf. D. Catchpoole, 2008; J. Bergman, 2013) Cossel’s assumptions are just faith in Evolutionism; i.e. “I would have seen it if I hadn’t believed it.” His frogs demonstrate micro-evolution (variation within the species), and nothing remotely close to padding any common ancestry thesis. And until actual proof is presented this is only thinly veiled question begging.

A key to understanding Cossel is perhaps on his very first page. There he approvingly references Dobzhansky’s famous dictum which has achieved something of canonical status; namely “Nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evolution.” Stephen J. Gould also invoked Dobzhansky’s “faith” as “exhibit A” that Darwinism was compatible with “religion.” But Dobzhansky’s religion mirrored that of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, late high priest of evolution.

In a 1977 eulogy, Dobzhansky’s student, Francisco Ayala relayed the following; “Dobzhansky was a religious man, although he apparently rejected fundamental beliefs of traditional religion, such as the existence of a personal God and of life beyond physical death.” So when Cossel describes Dobzhansky as a “fellow Christian biologist,” and no doubt portrays him as such in class, those students and readers who don’t do a little background check, are suckered into believing that he’s something like a God-fearing Christian, when there is not evidence to support this. We are seeing something of a parallel between Cossel’s use of Dobzhansky and Jerry Coyne’s aforementioned tactical matters.

And as if the above is not revelatory enough, double-PhD, cell biologist, Dr. Jonathan Wells, asserts,

that the claim that “nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evolution” is demonstrably false. A person can be a first-rate biologist without being a Darwinist. In fact, a person who rejects Dobzhansky’s claim can be a better biologist than one who accepts it uncritically. The distinctive feature and greatest virtue of natural science, we are told, is its reliance on evidence. Someone who starts with a preconceived idea and distorts the evidence to fit it is doing the exact opposite of science. Yet this is precisely what Dobzhansky’s maxim encourages people to do (*Icons of Evolution*, p. 247).

If the reader would like to sample some of the scientific evidence against evolution, please consult the suggested resources below. If you want to prime the pump, please see Casey Luskin's The Top Ten Scientific Problems with Biological and Chemical Evolution at <http://www.discovery.org/a/24041>

6) SOME REDUNDANT THEMES IN NEE—ONE, THE BIBLE ISN'T A SCIENCE TEXTBOOK. We often hear the straw man in NEE that Genesis/the Bible (15, 135, 147, 236 etc) isn't a science textbook. Such is a "loaded" statement, for who has actually ever made this claim? If NEE can't provide the name of one prominent Creationist who says this, then please have some integrity and dispense with the rhetoric. When Kevin DeYoung doesn't buy into the storyline that science or higher criticism have proven that Adam and Eve weren't real people, or when a conservative does not believe the opening chapters of Genesis are poetry, it is highly disingenuous and frankly a non sequitur to blurt out, "Oh, so you think it's a scientific textbook?"

One of my colleagues and truly good friend, often shared this well-rehearsed quote with students. "Some believe that God created on Sunday, October 23rd, 4004BC, at 9:00 in the morning Greenwich Mean Time." When delivered smoothly, it always got a laugh. But I wonder if any student ever challenged him on that. The prof of course had Ussher in view, but never mind that he put words in the bishop's mouth. The rhetorical effect was all that mattered, and I think a lot of that goes on in NEE circles, and frankly in creationist circles also. To say "the Bible is not a scientific textbook" is a well-rehearsed rhetorical device, but there's little chance that NEE/Biologos/TE will ever give it up. Just like the mis-use of Galileo (see next point), such rhetoric and "guilt by mere innuendo" has been just too effective.

The Gospels aren't science textbooks either, but as divine revelation do we affirm the veracity of water turning to wine, multiplying loaves and fishes, walking on water, Lazarus raised, Bartimaeus' healing, Malchus' ear restored, and an empty tomb as actually happening, or do we side only with what passes muster with the editors of Scientific American? COTN members who love their denomination and roots deeply enough will ask this: "When NEE tries to separate the theological wheat from the historical chaff in Genesis, what prevents them from doing so with the Gospels?" Their artificial division is a product of the Enlightenment, not paleo-orthodoxy. If in repeating that "Genesis/the Bible is not a scientific textbook" all that's meant is that Genesis does not provided exhaustive knowledge, such would be pedantically obvious. NEE's inference of course is much more biting; namely that

the consensus hermeneutic of Genesis 1-11 —from the early Church to Darwin's day — is scientifically untenable and inaccurate.

In a technical sense the Bible is not any kind of textbook; it is supernatural revelation. So, neither is the Bible a philosophy textbook, or history textbook, or anthropology textbook, etc. But when Scripture broaches these areas, wouldn't it stand to reason that their veracity (or lack there of) would be a reflection on the trustworthiness of the One who inspired the Text? We do still believe that all Scripture is God breathed, don't we?

Ever since higher criticism has infiltrated into the Church, such was accompanied by a constant tug to "methodologically naturalize" areas that touch upon science? And this is another area where NEE-types appear wholly arbitrarily; namely they seem to embrace some passages at face value (like Christ's resurrection), while dehistoricizing Genesis 1-2 (cf. Lowery), and the flood narrative, since these are laden with ancient near eastern misconceptions. Bear in mind that higher critics also claim the passion narratives accounts are laden with the mythology of so-called dying and rising "savior gods." So what specifically is NEE's rationale for decoupling from what science has to say on the passion narratives, when they've all but fully accepted what "science says" on Genesis? Are there any credible guidelines they give for when they decide not to follow the 97%? Until then we must call their arbitrariness for what it is.

Marrying Christianity too closely with the (alleged) science of our day is risky business. Seismic shifts are certainly coming in the Darwinian paradigm, necessitating some frantic readjustments by the TE crowd. It will be interesting, if not pathetic, to watch how the TE camp copes with the coming paradigm shift in evolutionism.

TWO, A DISENGENOUS REVISIONISM OF GALILEO: Bible interpretations have been wrong so often we're told. And this comes through with primary reference to the Galileo debacle (see 156-57, 206, 282, 285, 340, 360). ENC's Lowell Hall, writes the fears of the fixed-earthers proved unfounded. "Christians came to accept the motion of the earth around the sun without decreasing their faith in Scriptural integrity" (156). The parallel is obvious: if others could shed their literalism of the "foundations" and "pillars" of the earth, and embrace a new interpretation, precedent is set for YEC dialing back their literalism as well. Playing the Galileo card is somehow meant to silence or shame those who have favored the grammatico-historical hermeneutic; as if they would join the inquisitionists in demonizing Galileo's telescope.

But rare is the thinker who probes beyond the revisionism of John Draper's *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science*, and Andrew D. White's *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*. With so many anachronisms, clever caricatures, and urban legends surrounding the inevitable demise of geocentricity, it would be so nice if NEE and YEC could agree to get the facts straight in this epic showdown.

First, Galileo main infraction was disobeying a papal decree, and at first was only residually about hermeneutics. He loved the Word, writing, "Holy Scripture could never lie or err . . . its decrees are of absolute and inviolable truth." No one can justify what Rome did to Galileo (9 years of house arrest, etc). But it is essentially propaganda to herald him as a humble scientist (he was incredibly arrogant) who ran into a buzz saw of Bible thumpers who did all they could to thwart the progress of science. I have yet to see TE apologists highlight that it wasn't just the church that resisted Galileo, but opposition came from every quarter—from intellectuals, academics, philosophers, and most astronomers (like Tycho Brahe). It is heartbreaking to imagine how such "historical omissionism" may have played into the larger narrative of helping COTN youth to convert to evolutionism.

Second, it's somewhat of a rationalist myth that the Galileo controversy was the reaction of intolerant fixed-earthers vs. truth-loving heliocentrists who were in possession of unassailable scientific facts. Most of the church intellectuals, including the Pope himself, were "Galileisti." In fact, it was not so much Galileo's scientific theories that got him in hot water, but rather that his ideas were an assault on dominant Aristotelian physics/philosophy (among other things) of the day.

Third, the initial "evidence" for the heliocentric model was far from convincing. Mary Hesse notes that Galileo's ideas were decreed "dogmatically without sufficient evidence to support them" at the time. She continues that despite some "short-sightedness, the representatives of the Church had some reason on their side; theirs were the reactions of men who found, as they thought, the whole structure of their world being threatened by irresponsible speculations which did not at the time even have an adequate body of evidence in their support." Literalists often deserve to be corrected, but with no convincing evidence available in Galileo's to support his theory, resistance cannot be honestly labeled as irrational, intolerant, or as "science-denying" as NEE seems to infer.

Fourth, at the risk of oversimplification, the Church would never have gotten itself embroiled in this mess had it not canonized Aristotle's natural philosophy, including geocentric thoughts (that were later tweaked by Egyptian astronomer, Ptolemy). Given this misstep, matters were destined to be compounded with the

Church's imprudent (I call it "desperation exegesis") use of Psalms 93:1; 96:10; 104:5 as proof texts (see also Josh 10:12-13 and Eccl 1:5). While the Galileo saga is often invoked to censure conservatives, the sword cuts both ways. For it seems that TE should also learn the lesson of a Church aligning itself too closely with a theory of secular origin. Any model incompatible with Scripture is doomed to fail, as will the evolutionary model. It is loaded with scientific problems, it presents insurmountable theological hurdles, and it has inspired some of the most barking mad exegetical speculation in all of Church history. So when NEE intimates that adopting evolution will make us more relevant, it is they who risk complete irrelevance when the next Copernican shift hits the philosophical fan. In the future, churchmen who refused to see the heavy price exacted by absorbing Darwinian precepts, are destined to have George Santayana quoted at them. Indeed, we all have much to learn from the Galileo affair.

Fifth, Galileo's intense interrogation by Rome is well documented. But while there may have been threats of torture, he was never actually tortured, or even thrown in jail, but the popular perception is that he endured both. To get a more accurate picture of what really happened surrounding the Galileo controversy, see M. Finocchiaro, "Galileo Goes to Jail" and Jeffrey Burton Russell, "Exposing The Myths About Christianity," chap 46). Historian Gary Ferngren writes that "the traditional picture of Galileo as a martyr to intellectual freedom and as a victim of the church's opposition to science has been demonstrated to be little more than a caricature." Many on the left have been so preoccupied with belittling literalists, that they don't seem aware how deeply they've imbibed revisionistic kool-aid regarding Galileo. To ignore the above details, and keep repeating the unfounded mantra that "literalists impeded scientific progress" is pure propaganda.

Sixth, we all know that the Church danced down an embarrassing hermeneutical path in the 17th century. But how likely would this have been if the Vatican hadn't first waltzed with derivatives of a secular model? Instead of following Scripture, the Church elevated tradition, and allowed Greek philosophy to sway its theology and exegesis.

Additionally, it's no minor detail that the earth's rotation is never called into question in the historical books. The key biblical texts at the heart of the geocentrism controversy were largely lifted from poetic texts; verses forced to perform a role they were never intended to play. How unfortunate, then, that NEE's mis-assessment of events in Galileo's day has two grievous outcomes. One, it gives them cover to perpetuate the myth that the genre, historicity, and exegesis of Genesis are up for grabs. And two, it is NEE who forces (prose narrative) sections of

Genesis to perform a role they were never intended to play; namely overriding authorial intent by poeticizing texts meant to be taken historically. The early chapters of Genesis are not nearly as ambiguous as NEE infers.

Atheists like Thomas Huxley could only shake their heads observing how men of the cloth handled the Bible. He wrote, "If we listen to many expositors of no mean authority, we must believe that what seems so clearly defined in Genesis . . . as if great pains had been taken that there should be no possibility of mistake . . . is not the meaning of the text at all."

THREE, GENESIS 1-3 EMPHASIZED AS POETRY. NEE constantly refers to the creation account as poetry (73, 223-225, etc). While the opening chapters of Genesis are stylized, absent are the earmarks of Hebrew poetry. Compare Genesis 1 with Psalm 104, for example, and you'll see how different these texts are. If one wants poetic reflections on the acts of creation, she can read Job 38:1-11, and Psalm 33:6-9, and Psalm 104. And even when poetic elements appear in Gen (1:27 and 2:23), these don't mean that the referents aren't literal. Poetry often serves as a vehicle to convey real, space-time events. NEE seems to labor under the false assumption that literary form and literal meaning are mutually exclusive in Genesis. Many will be deeply concerned that NEE repeatedly reduces the creation narrative to mere poetry. There is no indication of primary research in NEE informing that inference; leading one to believe that NEE's classification of Genesis 1 as poetic (non-literal) is merely for expedience. This allows left-leaning COTN academicians to maintain a veneer of being biblical, while at the same offering no discernible data that their conclusions are drawn from a rigorously focused application of the historico-grammatical method to let the data speak for itself. Perhaps the hours were invested, but the claim of "Genesis being poetry" seems more of a gratuitous postulate rather than something made exegetically explicit. NEE claims "it's poetry" and moves on as if the genre type were indisputable, and hopes no one will call their bluff. COTN scholars are much better than this. Both sides can agree that the structure and style of Genesis 1 is unique, but it is simply not accurate to call Genesis poetry for the following reasons.

Biblical Hebrew has distinct, even unmistakable, devices to convey the poetic—but such are almost completely absent in Genesis 1-11. Where are the tropes and symbolic language? Where is parallelism of juxtaposed couplets, or the metrical balance so characteristic of Hebrew poetry? Instead we find meticulously composed prose. Parallelism is a feature of Hebrew poetry, true, but there's no rule meaning that the referents is therefore ahistorical. And those proposed parallelisms

in the creation record aren't as precise as often claimed (and definitely wouldn't justify overturning Young's assessment below).

Steve Boyd has done an exhaustive, computer-aided, exegetical analysis of the grammatical constructs and patterns used in Genesis 12-50 to depict historical events. He then compared the grammatical constructs of Genesis 1-11 and found that they are actually written in a more emphatic historical style than the rest of Genesis! Consider just one example. In Hebrew, the "waw-consecutive + imperfect (vayyiqtol)" is the standard grammatical means to convey real, sequential history; a construct rarely found in Hebrew poetry. Yet the waw is found more than 50 times in the first chapter of Genesis alone!!

So when surveying Genesis 1:1–2:3 analytically, it isn't even remotely credible to call it poetry or some other literary teaching device. It should be read just like the rest of Genesis; maybe more so. Of course the theological elements are what we're after and what our hearts need; not some sterile petri dish analysis of the text. But NEE's leftward pull has forced us to defend the basics here; namely that the authorial intent of the opening chapters of Genesis was clearly to convey historical events via the vehicle of prose narrative. NEE may cluck their tongues all they want, but in the words of Robert Dick Wilson, "We boldly challenge these Goliaths of ex-cathedra theories to come down into the field of ordinary concordances, dictionaries, and literature, and fight a fight to the finish on the level ground of the [hermeneutical] facts and the [exegetical] evidence." Milton S. Terry seems to concur, that "any satisfactory interpretation of Genesis must be preceded by a determination of the class of literature to which it belongs." And then he said, "every thorough Hebrew scholar knows that in all the Old Testament there is not a more simple, straightforward prose narrative than this first chapter of Genesis."

The late Dr. Edward J. Young of Westminster Seminary likewise affirms:

To escape from the plain factual statements of Genesis some Evangelicals are saying that the early chapters of Genesis are poetry or myth, by which they mean that they are not to be taken as straightforward accounts, and that the acceptance of such a view removes the difficulties...To adopt such a view, they say, removes all troubles with modern science...Genesis is not poetry. There are poetical accounts of creation in the Bible—Psalm 104, and certain chapters in Job — and they differ completely from the first chapter of Genesis. Hebrew poetry had certain characteristics, and they are

not found in the first chapter of Genesis. So the claim that Genesis One is poetry is no solution to the question.

If NEE authors want to say Genesis 1-3 strikes poetic resonance in their heart, or want to ponder the artistic elements in the creation account, like rhythmic style, that's fine. But principle thrust of the first few chapters of Genesis is history, not mere poetry, hymn, or liturgy. Since this is apparently willfully ignored in the ivory towers of COTN, it is clear that something other than the biblical text is driving pulling their hermeneutical cart, and the denomination is in for even choppier waters. Theologian R. Laird Harris offers an appropriate comment:

I am appalled at the freedom with which our Christian scientists are toying with the Biblical texts. I may soften that by adding that our theologians are doing so too and so the scientists naturally are taking it up. But the scientists should have a chance to hear the criticisms of various theologians rather than jumping to the first far out exegesis of Genesis that seems to meet the scientific need.

At any rate, we have seen that NEE has recurrent themes in saying 1) the Bible is not a scientific textbook, 2) revisionism regarding Galileo, and 3) taking what seems on the surface to be prose narrative in the creation narrative and re-labeling it as poetry. Such spin can be found throughout NEE.

BRIEF CAVEAT REGARDING THE FALL: NEE wants to make Christianity more relevant, but relevancy at the price of truth is not acceptable. With the nose of scientism now under the tent, a blanket of doubt has been cast over Gen 1-11 (Giberson's subversive tactic), and it seems only a matter of time before the other doctrinal dominoes fall. Doctrinal entropy and shedding religious convictions is a gradual, step-by-step affair.

The battle over "day" is worthwhile, but shouldn't distract us from what's really going on: at stake is our New Testament soteriology that has always been buttressed by the ontological scaffolding of the opening chapters of Genesis. Christ as "eschatological Adam" makes little sense without a historical Adam or fall. Scoffers of the cross often see what NEE cannot. Bozarth famously stated, "It becomes clear now that the whole justification of Jesus' life and death is predicated on the existence of Adam and the forbidden fruit he and Eve ate. Without the

original sin, who needs to be redeemed? Without Adam's fall into a life of constant sin terminated by death, what purpose is there to Christianity? None."

To those claiming Adam and Eve are only just symbols, Richard Dawkins responds, "Symbolic?! So Jesus had himself tortured and executed for a symbolic sin by a non-existent individual? Nobody not brought up in the faith could reach any verdict other than barking mad."

Patricia Williams likewise concludes that

Liberal theologians who treat Adam's story as a myth ruin Paul's neat equations. Adam and Eve's mythological disobedience cannot be atoned by Jesus' historical actions, nor can Adam and Eve's mythological sin be responsible for our sinful nature or our death . . . if Adam and Eve are not historical, the historical Jesus has no work to do under existing atonement theories that treat the atonement as a deed"

Luke announces Jesus "the son of David...the son of Abraham...the son of Adam, the son of God" (Luke 3:23-38). So where in family tree does myth become actual history? Where do the historical beginnings begin? Was there no tempter or temptation? Here's the thing, once the historicity of Adam and Eve is jettisoned, what allows COTN to keep the miracles of the New Testament? If modern science is the basis for poeticizing the first Adam, what is it that keeps those on the left in NEE and BioLogos from following those same presuppositions to deny all other miracles? Late-19th century liberals were much more logically consistent here.

Olasky writes that we might think "Genesis teaches that God formed the man of dust from the ground, and Eve from Adam — but if they were the product of evolution, than early Genesis becomes a myth, and everyone who assumed the history to be true (including Jesus and Paul) were naive. Original sin becomes a theoretical construct rather than harsh reality, so why do we desperately need Christ?"

CONCLUSION: It's truly amazing that in nearly 400 pages of "exploring evolution," nary a peep is heard from the 60+ authors of evolution's corrosive influence on theology. Instead, evolution (with it's extinctions and our common ancestry with brutes) "honors" God. Not one mention is made of any weaknesses in current evolutionary thought (see recommended resources below). Not a single mention is made of all the mistakes and retractions made in the last century in the name of evolutionary dogma. And unless I overlooked something in my few sweeps through

the volume, I don't recall any reference to actual scientific evidence for the neo-Darwinian synthesis; no paradigm confirming data that YEC and ID are allegedly denying.

NEE sets out to give COTN a rationale for embracing evolutionary creationism; assuring the reader that matters of faith and practice are unscathed, and Biblical authority is not impacted. But sifting through the mountain of mere assertions, this reviewer was struck by the truly low view of Scripture that some (not all) NEE authors seem to have; and equally bowled over by the complete confidence most have in the main rubrics of modern evolutionary thought. Absent is any rigorous Scriptural argument.

Wesley held that the Bible was “the only standard for truth,” adding “My ground is the Bible. Yea, I am a Bible bigot. I follow it in all things, both great and small.” Conservatives who hold to a special creation viewpoint might also be likened as “Bible bigots,” but in this age of untiring capitulation to modernity such is a backhanded compliment. We won’t be shamed into compromise; any more than theistic evolutionists will be shamed into orthodoxy. NEE tries to offer us Genesis without tears but only ends up giving us tears without Genesis. By being too accommodational and trendy in recent decades, COTN will have no easy task extricating itself from the present quagmire. In surrendering at such a foundational level as Genesis we are on a very slippery slope — the authority of the Second Adam [John 5:46-47] wobbles, the perspicuity of Scripture is dimmed, a sustainable exegetical method is wanting, and the fall will never rise above a “poetic construct.” How can a strong evangelical voice be maintained on the vital issues of our day if we become apologists for a worldview that has shipwrecked the faith of so many in the past? How exactly do we place our faith in Christ without, as one writer put it, “having faith in what Christ had faith in?”

BioLogos is stealth syncretism, an “evangelical trojan horse” of a different color according to Phil Johnson. Since Biologos funded NEE, it is perhaps not too unfair to think that Johnson's word directed at Biologos, are also for the most part descriptive of NEE also. He writes:

In every conflict that pits contemporary “scientific” skepticism against the historic faith of the church, BioLogos has defended the skeptical point of view. BioLogos's contributors consistently give preference to modern ideology over biblical revelation. Although the BioLogos PR machine relentlessly portrays the organization as equally committed to science and

the Scriptures (and there's a lot of talk about "bridge-building" and reconciliation), the drift of the organization is decidedly just one way.

All NEE contributors come across as very sincere. I don't doubt that every brother and sister is very nice. But niceness does not mean a free pass on theological scrutiny and accountability. Real 18 and 19 year old kids are sitting in their classes. And this wouldn't be the first time that nice people have promoted a theology so at odds with the convictions that have sparked revival over the centuries. I intentionally phrase it this way because when God's Word has been preached unflinchingly through history, untold millions have come to the foot of the cross; and in strong contrast, a Pentecostal awakening due to a monstrous inversion has no historical precursor. Causes have effects. As Ed Wharton notes, "Any view of these chapters in Genesis other than authentic history will necessarily regard the genealogies and the tracing of the messianic seed-line as unhistorical and unimportant. This will eat away at trust in God's Word and cause faith's fire to go out."

Convictions don't erode overnight. Princeton Theological Seminary's path to liberalism can be traced to when its staunchest apologist were too accommodating to evolutionary philosophy. Oswald Skov wrote that as Darwin's theory gained traction, the Church "put up a storm of protest for a while, but by 1900 the liberals had made it acceptable. A failure to plug this hole caused the dam of conservative theology to burst with a flood of all kinds of denials of Biblical truth." The tragedy of once-Christian institutions forgetting why they were even founded is a familiar one (see Sproul quotes in part one of this review). James Burtchaell's *The Dying of the Light*, and George Marsden's, *The Soul of the American University* plot how former Christian schools have slouched toward modernity. The common denominator in all these shifts from conservative theology to full-blown secularism, is the half-way house of liberal theology. A denomination comfortable with open theism, errancy, and full-throated Darwinism should not be surprised when the transgender, polygamist, annihilationist, and "double belonging" chickens eventually come home to roost. For how often in history, really, do denominations and universities drift to the right?

SUGGESTED RESOURCES:

BEGINNING-LEVEL BOOKS

The Young Earth, John Morris

Darwin on Trial and Reason in the Balance, Phil Johnson
The Battle for the Beginning, John MacArthur
Icons of Evolution, Wells
Refuting Compromise, Sarfati
Ultimate Proof of Creation, Understanding Genesis, Jason Lisle
More Than Myth? Robert Stackpole and Paul Brown eds

INTERMEDIATE LEVEL TEXTS

Darwin's Doubt, Stephen Meyer
Darwin's Black Box, Michael Behe
Creation And Change, Douglas F. Kelly
The Unofficial Guide to Cosmos, David Klinghoffer
The Mystery of Life's Origin, Thaxton, Bradley, and Olsen
The Politically Incorrect Guide to Darwinism and ID, Jonathan Wells
As It Is Written: The Genesis Account Literal or Literary? Kenneth Gentry Jr
The Great Turning Point, Mortenson
The Genesis Account, Jonathan Sarfati

ADVANCED RESOURCES

The Biotic Message, Walter ReMine
Earth's Catastrophic Past, 2 vols, Snelling
Radioisotopes and the Age of the Earth, 2 vols, Vardiman, et al
Grappling with the Chronology of the Genesis Flood, Steven Boyd, ed
Evolution: A Theory in Crisis, Michael Denton (classic 1986 work)
Evolution: Still a Theory in Crisis, Michael Denton (30 years later)
The Design of Life, Dembski and Wells
A Case Against Accident and Self-Organization, Overman
Creation, Fall, Restoration: A Biblical Theology of Creation, Kulikovsky
Genetic Entropy & the Mystery of the Genome, Sanford
On the Origin of Species, Darwin (a must to be conversant with the debate)
Annals of the World, Archbishop James Ussher (another classic not to be missed!)

An abridgement of this review was published in *The Arminian Magazine* 33:1-2 (Fall 2015), 34:1 (Spring 2016), 34:2 (Fall 2016), and 35:1 (Spring 2017).