

Creation and Science

Senior Church History
Professor Korthals

4-24-98
Matt Grunewald

The Beginning

What was God doing before he created the universe? He was in the woods picking out a switch for people who ask such questions. The beginning of the universe is important to all historians, whether they believe the Bible account of creation or not. If the universe had not begun at some point, there would be no subsequent events to record. Also important to the serious historian is an understanding of humankind's search for the cause of the world we live in. Our greatest difficulty in searching out for ourselves how the world began is that none of us were around to observe it.

The Christian historian who believes the Biblical account of creation has the main questions answered for him. When did this world begin? About six to ten thousand years ago. How did it start? By divine will the world was made. Who was involved in this creating process? The Triune God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. What in all was made? Everything. How long did this take? Six days, and on the seventh day God ceased his creating activity. Where this took place is really a non-applicable question unless one insists. The answer is "in heaven and earth." One question every good historian asks himself while examining any event is, "why did that happen?" That is, at least, in part answerable. One could simply say, "it is because God wills it," and we cannot know the depths of the wisdom and understanding of God. One can answer more fully by adding, "God is love." Why did God create the world and set history as we know it into motion? He did it out of love.

These Biblical truths are basic components of the Christian faith. We trust that this is how the world began as much as we trust that Jesus Christ physically rose from the dead. If the history of creation is not trustworthy, how then can we trust the history of

Jesus' life, death and resurrection? Because creation is a Bible truth we teach it and protect it from attacks from non-Christians. The anti-Biblical teaching of evolution is a re-writing of history to suit the specific interests of one faction in society. It is poor history, just as special interest history classes, which overemphasize one race or feminism or gay pride are all poor history. Yet evolution is the basis of history, science, social studies, psychology, and other courses which are often if not always required courses in our public schools. So much is founded on a false and spiritually dangerous recording of history.

The scoffing of the scientific community, which bases its work and philosophy on humanistic, anti-supernatural principles, is not a surprise to us Christians. What is most unfortunate, however, is the betrayal of many who call themselves Christians. They have found God and the Bible to be, in many ways, illogical, and have yielded to the pressure of worldly science. They have gone over into the camp of the evolutionists. Biblical creation is exchanged for Darwin's evolution, which is socially acceptable. Or so-called Christian theologians try to mix the two in an effort to please everybody. But Theistic Evolution or Progressive Creation denies the simple meaning of the Bible and misses the purpose of humanistic evolution. This wishy-washy tactic appeases neither true Christians nor true humanists.

This paper will discuss some of the ways in which past theologians have failed to remain true to God's Word in an effort to be in agreement with current scientific discoveries. It will also look at some of the ways in more recent times in which Bible-believing scientists have debunked evolution and shown the sensibility of creation.

The Traitors

Some theologians within the Christian church simply say the Bible errs. This has been happening since the 1800's, when the absolute truth of Scripture began to be questioned within the church. This is, of course, wide spread now. Other theologians say the Bible simply needs to be explained properly and it will be evident that it agrees with evolution in many ways. I will relate some of the key thoughts of two theologians who consider themselves theistic evolutionists. Since this is a history paper, I will refer first to a work of Dr. E. Bettex, a theologian who wrote several small books on Genesis 1-11. The work for examination here is, The First Page of the Bible¹, written in 1906. It is amazing the leaps and bounds of logic which must be made to constrict the Bible to support evolution at least in part. It is important to note that Bettex is not for Darwinism. Yet he takes what scientists have actually found (e.g.- a layer of coal) and scientist's guesses as to dating (e.g.- that coal layer took millions of years to slowly form), and then tries to make the timing work out with the Bible's account of a six-day creation. Still, Bettex sets aside the clear history related by the Bible for convoluted guesses presented as scientific fact.

Let us begin with Bettex's first words concerning Genesis 1:2:

There is a remarkable agreement between these words of the Holy Scriptures and the results of careful investigations of nature. Leading astronomers and investigators consider it an established fact that the earth formerly was a red fiery ball, sailing about in space and enveloped by dense vapors. These vapors in the course of time, in consequence of the earth's cooling off became for the greater part water, but enough of them remained spread over the earth to cause impenetrable darkness.²

¹ Presented by the Lutheran Literary Board of Burlington, Iowa. It is doubly sad to see the heresy of evolution attached to the name of Christianity and to Lutheranism.

² Bettex, F., The First Page of the Bible, pg. 10

Right away this theologian yields the literal truth of the Bible to scientific “established fact.” Evolutionist ideas are accepted in most denominations of Christianity today because of lap dogs to humanist religion such as this.

God said, “Let there be light!” But Bettex says, “What is light?” He anticipates his later application of the meaning of light to the length of days in Genesis chapter one. He says that “light” is an analogy for “activity.”³ So the simple meaning of light is changed to include this new idea of activity or work.

Bettex wants to line up with the evolutionist “discovery” that the earth is millions of years old. So he redefines the Hebrew word “yom.” The orthodox Christian understands that yom is used in different ways. It may be used to mark an event that will happen at an unspecified time. Expressions such as “the day of the LORD” are an idiom for an event that may last longer than a twenty-four hour period. This is simply the Hebrew way of speaking. But whenever yom is used to denote, not an event, but simply a day, an amount of time, it has always meant the normal twenty-four hour day. Bettex quotes the expression, “the day of the LORD,” and 2 Peter 3:8 to support his position. He redefines the word “yom” to regularly include the meaning of “a period of time, perhaps thousands of years.” Therefore each yom was a lengthy duration of creating activity followed by a lengthy period of darkness, a.k.a., non-activity.⁴

Bettex’s exposition on God’s command on the third day, which created the dry land, is a show of attempted reconciliation between humanism and the Bible. He agrees whole-heartedly with science opinion except that he will add: “but God made it happen.”

³ Bettex, F., The First Page of the Bible, pg. 17

⁴ Bettex, F., The First Page of the Bible, pg. 24-25

To him this maintains the glory of God. But to the Bible-believing Christian it is a pathetic effort to throw God a bone:

In the course of time when the earth gradually cooled off, there naturally appeared upon its surface a crust. Gradually becoming thicker, it contracted and formed wrinkles, just like scum on warm milk, when it becomes cold; and these wrinkles, corresponding in size to the earth, formed the first hills and mountains. Therefore the Bible does not say, "and god created the dry land," but, "let the dry land appear" (according to the Hebrew). The natural consequence of this was that the waters gathered themselves together at the deep places, whereupon on the one hand the sea and on the other the dry land appeared. Here also we have, with reference to an important point in the history of the creation of the earth, perfect agreement between the Bible and science. But all these things did not come to pass, as the atheists think, by themselves, but through God's creative word; and had He not spoken the words of the third day, the earth would still stand without form and void, and the mountains would not have appeared.⁵

It is interesting to note that Bettex does not mention the Great Flood of Genesis 6-8 where it would be appropriate. He describes the sometimes vast deposits of coal which lie beneath our feet. He uses these to support the Theistic Evolution idea that each day took a mighty long time to pass. Only through a long time of being underground and heated by the internal warmth of the earth's core would this plant-life have turned into coal. (The pressure of the Flood would have compressed the trees equally well.) Bettex notes that no animal fossils are found in the coal, which makes sense, since animal life would not pop up on primordial earth for thousands of years.⁶ (One can view in a jar of dirty water how like elements settle at similar rates, thus making bands of materials. The Flood easily could have done this.) A final note to this aspect of what we find in the earth: God may have made an earth which appears older than it is. After all, he did make starlight visible to us, even though the light of most stars would take (by scientific

⁵ Bettex, F., The First Page of the Bible, pg. 33-34

⁶ Bettex, F., The First Page of the Bible, pg. 46

accounts) millions of years to reach us the usual way. God made a heavenly canopy for us that is certainly younger than it appears.

Another place where Bettex could talk about the Flood but does not is in his discussion of the size of now extinct plant-life. We would acknowledge that there was a different kind of climate in pre-Flood days. There was the “water above the expanse of sky” which was at least clouds, but may have been something unlike what we have today. God opened up the gates of the water above the sky and the springs of the earth to flood the earth above every mountain. After the Flood, God gave the rainbow as a sign of his promise to never again destroy the earth by water. This may have been the first rainbow in the clouds. That we cannot say with certainty. But if it was the first rainbow, the climate before the Flood was very different from what we have now. To the point, Bettex attributed the sizable plant-life to the light God created on the first day, since the sun was not due for another yom.⁷

Bettex does mention “the great flood” in connection with the animals that inhabited the dry land on the sixth day of creation. But I wonder what his understanding of the Flood is. He says the mammoths fled the flood to the polar regions, and so are found frozen there today.⁸ This does not comply with the suddenness of the Biblical flood. Again, the climate of pre-flood earth was definitely different from today. With the giant vegetation of pre-flood days, in a climate that seemed to be more evenly warm across the globe, there would have been food enough for elephant sized animals in places that are now icy wastelands.

⁷ Bettex, F., The First Page of the Bible, pg. 48

⁸ Bettex, F., The First Page of the Bible, pg. 72

Let us leave the Flood and leap back to the fourth day of creation. I simply wish to show the ridiculous ideas which are spawned by Theistic Evolution. Bettex states that Bible puts the sun on the fourth day of creation because it takes a longer time for a huge ball of gas to form and light up than it takes for a molten mass of metal to tighten up and cool off.⁹ What mighty flights of fancy one can take up when the simple truth of the Bible is set aside!

One final word on Bettex and his brand of Theistic Evolution. He does not consider himself a follower of Darwin. "The Bible knows nothing of Darwinism" because God commanded every living thing to increase "after its kind." Bettex believes that the universe was made through a slow and gradual process. But plants and animals and mankind went through no such evolution. I am happy to see that last sentence, but how can Bettex have his cake and eat it too?

Enough about Bettex. Let us focus our attention on another Judas to the first chapter of Genesis, L. Franklin Gruber, who wrote The Six Creative Days,¹⁰ printed in 1941. Gruber reveals his hand right away by stating that science and theology are working toward the same goal: an ever deepening understanding of this world. Our understanding improves as science reveals more facts and thus our interpretation of the Bible changes to become more accurate. This is also the point on which Gruber concludes his writing.¹¹ The Bible does not give a literal history of creation. Rather it speaks in a "phenomenal" way of the creation.¹² (This is an abuse of the true phenomenal

⁹ Bettex, F., The First Page of the Bible, pg. 51

¹⁰ Also presented by the Lutheran Literary board of Burlington, Iowa.

¹¹ Gruber, L. Franklin, The Six Creative Days, pg. 33ff, 100

¹² Gruber, L. Franklin, The Six Creative Days, pg. 35ff.

language, which is part of our own everyday speech and so is found in places in the Bible.)

Gruber begins his heretical stance by speaking against the simple meaning of the first verse of the Bible. He states that “in the beginning” is not an introduction to the history of the creation of the world. The words “in the beginning” describe a first act of creation. God made the heavens and the earth, which was the creation of primordial stuff. After that he started with the six days of creation.¹³ Gruber falls off the deep end of reality much earlier in his book than Bettex did. Before he is halfway through he speaks of other universes.¹⁴ This is pure conjecture on his part and he is fuzzy on making clear what his assumptions are supposed to support. Apparently he desires to point out that the days (yomim) in these other universes certainly would not be twenty-four hours long as ours are, and so we should not think that the days of creation had to be twenty-four hours long. Or Gruber may desire to humble us and make earth less important, less the focus of God’s creation, less the home of the crown of creation.

This is not enough for Gruber. In another couple of pages he again starts to speak of creation from a viewpoint outside of planet earth. He goes to great lengths to describe the following all to support the idea that Genesis 1:1 could be used for other planets, in that the “heavens and the earth” means all of creation, including earth. It is correct to say that the first verse of the Bible speaks of the whole of God’s creating activity. It is, after all, an introduction of the whole. At one point Gruber seems to be in agreement with the truth, but the next, his statements make no sense. They are laughable, and at the same time sad to read:

¹³ Gruber, L. Franklin, The Six Creative Days, pg. 43ff.

¹⁴ Gruber, L. Franklin, The Six Creative Days, pg. 50

(Because Genesis 1:1 speaks of the whole of creation) That first verse... would therefore be true for the inhabitants of any universe, with the simple substitution of the name of that world for the term *earth*. Thus, if there were rational beings on the planet Mars, that verse, for them, would read, "In the beginning God created the heavens and mars," of course using the name for the planet in the language it would be true of any other planet of our solar system, whether inhabited or uninhabited, as well as of any other body, whether revolving planet or flashing sun or star, in God's universal empire.

With the second verse the account then confines itself to our little football (read, "soccer ball") of a world, and tells us in some detail the story of its preparation as an abode for man and of his appearance thereon as created crown and lord. Moreover, as no two planets or stars throughout the universe are wholly alike in size, rotation, revolution, amount of heat and light, etc., probably no two bodies in space have had exactly the same creative or life history. Hence, the story of the creation of each separate world would almost certainly be somewhat different from the creative stories of all other worlds. What we might speak of as their creative week may have consisted of perhaps more or less so-called days, and longer or shorter, than ours, according to the nature, primary created condition, and purpose of each particular world.¹⁵

When Gruber attacks the length of a yom in the first chapter of Genesis he does not make the Bible his source of conviction. Rather, his measuring stick is science, and the Bible is the weak sister. He asks, "In the light of assured results of scientific search, can the record in Genesis stand the critical test of this twentieth century?" His answer is yes, but note the way in which Gruber approaches the matter, upholding science while Scripture is scrutinized for mistakes. And aside from that, truly unbiased science backs the simple truth of the Bible (as creation scientists point out). And beyond even that, Scripture stands apart as an unchanging witness to history. It is the Word of God and does not need science to prove it.

Gruber allows for evolution more completely than Bettex of three decades earlier. He believes in evolution, an evolution pushed along by divine will, just as Bettex

¹⁵ Gruber, L. Franklin, The Six Creative Days, pg. 53-54

supported. But Gruber allows even for the evolution of mankind from a lower lifeform – so long as it is God’s will that gave that first nudge along the evolutionary chain.¹⁶

Some of Gruber’s concluding remarks show his disbelief in the literal meaning of much the Bible says. He asserts that Moses wrote the creation account in a way which would be understood in a simple way by the simple people of the past, and that is just fine. But the account is far “richer” and more truly understood by the scientifically enlightened people of this modern age. We can now see that there was much analogy and symbolism in the language of the creation account. Despite his disbelief of the creation as God presents it, Gruber claims to still be a believer of miracles and the revelation of God’s Word.¹⁷ The same question falls to Gruber as fell to Bettex. How can you have your cake and eat it too?

No amount of allegorizing, side-stepping, and poetic praise can make up for the damage men such as the aforementioned have cause by supporting a false history of the beginning of this world. The Bible is not the lackey of science or humanism. Evolution makes God a liar. It steals from the genuine glory of God, who created the world in six days and has been so kind as to tell us about it. Any evolutionist thinking lays a poor foundation for knowing one’s purpose in life and understanding what is important in this world. History reveals why things are the way they are. If we are made by evolution, God does not exist or at least he is not as powerful as we first thought. But our world was made in a powerful way in six normal days. God is powerful, and he got everything right the first time. True and unbiased science shows this, as is related by Bible-believing scientists.

¹⁶ Gruber, L. Franklin, The Six Creative Days, pg. 66-69

¹⁷ Gruber, L. Franklin, The Six Creative Days, pg. 97

The Creation Scientists

We are grateful for the work of scientists who believe the simple truth of the Bible. They do not possess the bias that is for evolution and against creation. They have managed to struggle through our education system which pushes evolution as absolute fact and which mocks Christianity in general and creation specifically. What follows are the observations from two scientists of more recent years than the above theologians. Note that science has marched on, giving us many wonderful conveniences in modern life. Yet there is no agreement still between humanistic evolution and Christian creationism. Following the remarks of the following scientists will be a brief description of some of the fruits of their labors for the benefit of future generations who do not desire to be taught humanism and evolution in their schools.

Henry M. Morris brings up the primary point which every creation scientist notes: there can be no agreement between evolution and creation.¹⁸ The two come from opposite biases. Creation is the historical account given by the Bible. It gives glory to God for his work. Evolution is the guesswork of scientists using incomplete facts. It is based on humanism. There is a special hate for God by the humanist. The humanist cannot accept the obvious explanations for nature which the Bible provides in creation and in the Flood. The Bible must be false and God cannot exist. So the random, pure chance, lengthy process of evolution is contrived. The opposite natures of evolution and creation make all the more clear the inconsistency of those who support Theistic Evolution or Progressive Creation. Whose side are they on? Creation and evolution are opposites and there is no real middle ground.

¹⁸ Morris, Henry M., The Remarkable Birth of Planet Earth, pg. 70-72

Morris supplies seven key points on why a Christian cannot believe in evolution.

1) Evolution contradicts the Bible record of a finished creation. God said it was good and then rested. There is no continuing improvement, as evolution claims. 2) Evolution contradicts the doctrine of fixed and distinct kinds. God blessed all living things with the command to multiply according to their kind. 3) Evolution is inconsistent with God's omniscience. Evolution is all about trial and error. Survival of the fittest means some were not fit and not good enough to continue on. 4) Evolution is contrary to God's nature of love and mercy. According to evolution, billions of living things of all kinds died in the process of fighting for life. All of this death would be needless if only God would create everything right the first time, as the Bible says. 5) Evolution contradicts the universal principle of decay. Things do not improve with time naturally. If that were true, my rusty 1984 Chevy Celebrity would be a shiny, slick black Saab 9000 by now. But, in accordance with natural order, my Chevy continues down the way of the whole world into destruction. 6) Evolution is incompatible with Christian ethics. If evolution were true, then we are our own masters and responsible to no one. But since God created us, we are his servants and are subject to his demands. 7) Evolution produces anti-Christian results:

Jesus said, "a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit" (Matthew 7:18). Evolution is the root of atheism, of communism, nazism, behaviorism, racism, economic imperialism, militarism, libertinism, anarchism, and all manner of anti-Christian systems of belief and practice.¹⁹

The other creation scientist, who is of worthy note, is Donald E. Chittick. He impressed me particularly with his concern for the preaching of the gospel (which evolution inhibits). Chittick borders on being a true Lutheran and may be a Lutheran.

Nonetheless, his book is worth having by any Lutheran pastor. Chittick provides a practical definition for the theistic evolutionists, “Theistic evolutionists, like atheistic evolutionists, make the same basic assumption that nature is autonomous. But theistic evolutionists also assume that God was somehow involved in the process, perhaps in an initial act of creation.”

Chittick knows how theistic evolutionists are made. He once was one. It was the result of knowing from the Bible that God is real. But then being taught in school that evolution is real. So, many students decide that the Bible needs to be interpreted more widely.²⁰ The biggest problem which arises from this is, if one can reinterpret creation so that it is no longer a historical account, how can one trust the historicity of the rest of the Bible? “A direct straightforward reading of the Bible gives the impression that simple historical statements are being made.”²¹

As any good creation scientist does, Chittick goes through the creation weak and shows how scientific evidence is in agreement with creation.²² He also asks several questions which baffle evolutionists, but are obvious to the Bible believing Christian. (Which came first, the chicken or the egg?)²³ Chittick writes on the Flood, as well, which answers many of the challenges an evolutionist might set before us.²⁴

Since Morris had his list shown, it is only right to show Chittick’s list. He lists six things which make it difficult for the creationist to convince the evolutionist of the Bible truth. But they are not all impossible obstacles, so he names them “veils to understanding the past.” 1) The Fall of man has resulted in death and decay and sin entering the world.

¹⁹ Morris, Henry M., The Remarkable Birth of Planet Earth, pg. 72-76

²⁰ Morris, Henry M., The Remarkable Birth of Planet Earth, pg. 97

²¹ Morris, Henry M., The Remarkable Birth of Planet Earth, pg. 100

²² Morris, Henry M., The Remarkable Birth of Planet Earth, pg. 147ff.

What we see now is not the perfect world God created. (Not to mention that sinful man is now inclined to hate everything about god and seek his own way.) 2) The Flood changed the face of the earth. While it is the answer to some of the things we find in the earth today, it also hides from us what the world was like before Noah. 3) Time is a big obstacle. By human standards, creation still took place a very long time ago. A lot can change in the earth in just one thousand years. Time erases details of the past. 4) Cultural conditioning can be overcome one person at a time. But we live in a culture that is humanistic and therefore anti-creationist. This makes convincing people of creation an uphill battle. 5) Primitive man. Another part of cultural conditioning is to think of early man as primitive, unskilled, tree-climbing, cave-dwelling, hand-clubbing morons. The Bible shows that Adam, the first man, had intellectual abilities far superior to our own. The early generations of mankind are noted for the cities they built, the crafts they invented, the music they played. As the centuries passed, humankind has become worse; losing those gifts to the point that people who are so skilled today are declared geniuses. 6) The educational system is the sixth veil through which we must peer in order to see the past. The United States' public education system preaches evolution as low and humanism as gospel. Those brought up believing the heathen teachings of our education system will never understand the actual history of how the world began.²⁵

The creation scientists do a great service for society by not allowing all that is science to be swallowed up by atheism, humanism, and evolution. They continue to study God's creation diligently, understanding that god designs everything with a purpose.

²³ Morris, Henry M., The Remarkable Birth of Planet Earth, pg. 67ff.

²⁴ Morris, Henry M., The Remarkable Birth of Planet Earth, pg. 207ff.

²⁵ Morris, Henry M., The Remarkable Birth of Planet Earth, pg. 184-192

Meanwhile, the evolution scientist gropes about for a phantasmic origin and finds no meaning in what he believes.

The Plan

There are a good number of societies which further the cause of creationism and encourage scientists to continue their studies on behalf of creationism. One of these is the Institute for Creation Research, which owns the copyright to Morris' book. Another is the Creation Research Society, which puts out a quarterly newsletter, copies of which may be found in the Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library. Yet another is the Creation-Science Center, which brings us Chittick's book. There are also complete series of smaller science programs for grade schools to use in teaching. Our Lutheran high schools use science textbooks which include a chapter warning against the falsehood of evolution, so teenagers are forearmed against the humanistic pressures that await them in other institutes of higher learning.

I will also name some books in particular which help fight against evolutionist teaching. The Flood, by Alfred M. Rehwinkel (LCMS), answers many of the challenges of the evolutionist with explanations based on the changes the Flood brought on this earth. Creation: Accident or Design? is a textbook written for students who belong to the Seventh Day Adventist denomination. Nature and Nature's God is a collection brought together by Herman W. Schaars, a former teacher of Immanuel Lutheran Church of Milwaukee (LCMS). He uses two pages to write about one particular part of creation: a leaf, a dog, a mosquito. In each part he describes what is particularly wonderful about that created thing, praises God who designed it so well, and relates some of the ways that thing has been used. This is a good book to have on the shelves of our elementary

schools. The language is simple and every plant or animal has its likeness drawn on the page. Finally, one WELS author is Martin P. Sponholz. His Separate from His Word: A Christian Commentary of the History of Science, among other things, provides a record of Darwin's trip to the Galapagos Islands. He writes briefly on Agassiz, a contemporary of Darwin who saw a creator in the order of the universe. Agassiz tried valiantly to nip Darwinism in the bud, but failed. He watched his own students (who adored Agassiz, but were not convinced of creationism) become Darwinists, one after the other. Sponholz also provides advice for what children need to be taught about science and creation and evolution.

All of these efforts bring to light a point we need to acknowledge. Evolution needs to be challenged early on by each individual. The humanistic scientists have a sympathetic ear in every sinful, selfish human being. So many of "our own" in the church have gone over to the side of the atheists, pretending that a veneer of "but God made the evolution happen" will make them accepted by all.

The Conclusion

I was never very good at long conclusions, but Donald E. Chittick supplies some words which are suitable to summarize and end this paper:

As we have noted, creation and evolution are opposing philosophies. One is supernatural; the other is natural. They are both interpretive schemes for explaining scientific facts. Furthermore, they are philosophical opposites. They are antithetical. If one is true, the other is false. They cannot both be true at the same time. If origins came about entirely naturalistically, nothing supernatural was involved. On the other hand, if origins involved supernatural acts, then it cannot be entirely naturalistic. Both views are based on faith. Evolution is based on faith in the idea that nothing supernatural was involved. Creation is based on faith in acts of a Creator. ... Which of these two approaches is true?... The Bible of course presents creation.²⁶

²⁶ Morris, Henry M., The Remarkable Birth of Planet Earth, pg. 62-63

Nonetheless, as always, the Bible says it best:

“Praise the LORD.

Praise the LORD from the heavens, praise him in the heights above.

Praise him, all his angels, praise him, all his heavenly hosts.

Praise him, sun and moon, praise him, all you shining stars.

Praise him, you highest heavens and you waters above the skies.

Let them praise the name of the LORD, for he commanded and they were created.

He set them in place for ever and ever; he gave a decree that will never pass away.

Praise the LORD from the earth, you great sea creatures and all ocean depths,

lightning and hail, snow and clouds, stormy winds that do his bidding,

you mountains and all hills, fruit trees and all cedars,

wild animals and all cattle, small creatures and flying birds,

kings of the earth and all nations, you princes and all rulers on earth,

young men and maidens, old men and children.

Let them praise the name of the LORD, for his name alone is exalted; his splendor is above the earth and the heavens.

He has raised up for his people a horn, the praise of all his saints, of Israel, the people close to his heart.

Praise the LORD.” (Psalm 148)²⁷

The End

²⁷ Holy Bible, New International Version

The Bibliography

- Bettex, F., The First Page of the Bible, Burlington, Iowa, The Lutheran Literary Board, 1919,
- Chittick, Donald E., The Controversy: Roots of the Creation-Evolution Conflict, Portland, Oregon, Multnomah Press, 1984,
- Coffin, Harold G., Creation-Accident or Design?, Washington, D.C., Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1969,
- Gruber, L. Franklin, The Six Creative Days, Burlington, Iowa, Lutheran Literary Board, 1941,
- Morris, Henry M., The Remarkable Birth of Planet Earth, San Diego, California, Creation-Life Publishers, 1972,
- Rehwinkel, Alfred M., The Flood, St. Louis, Missouri, Concordia Publishing House, 1951,
- Schaars, Herman W., Nature and Nature's God, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, the Dept. of Christian Education (LCMS), 1970,
- Sponholz, Martin P., Separate from His Word: A Christian Commentary on the History of Science, New Ulm, Minnesota, DMLC Print Shop, 1989,
- The Holy Bible, New International Version, St. Louis, Missouri, Concordia Publishing House, 1973.