

## The State of Theology in Creation Science and My Vision for Its Future

William D. Barrick, Th.D.

ICC 2023, July 16  
Cedarville University

Theology used to be known as “the queen of the sciences.” After all, as Christians we believe that **“the fear of the LORD [Yahweh] is the beginning of knowledge” (Prov 1:7 NASU)**. Let’s first make certain we understand what theology is. Taken literally “theology” is the “study of God.” The chief textbook for studying God consists of His own written revelation, the Bible. In addition to His written special revelation God also provided us with natural revelation in creation itself. Paul says, in **Romans 1:20**, **“For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes, His eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly seen, being understood through what has been made, so that they are without excuse.”** The apostle identifies the content of that revelation as God Himself along with His character and attributes.

When we examine the state of theology in creation science, two areas cause concern for theologians: **(1) that which is internal to theology: how we interpret the Word of God has a profound effect upon creation science; and (2) those studies pursued external to theology which might cause Christians to alter their theology.**

### Internal to Theology

Creation science depends upon **exegetical accuracy** in the study of Scripture. A number of biblical scholars have exposed exegetical inaccuracies involved with many of the Old Earth Creationists’ biblical arguments supporting their Old Earth views. For example, we all recognize the exegetical inaccuracy of Hugh Ross’ treatment of “evening” and “morning” in Genesis 1 when he claims those terms merely refer to an abstract and metaphorical “sunset” and “sunrise” indicating the dawning of another era.<sup>1</sup>

After spending much time reading a wide range of published writings, we note that careless and slipshod handling of God’s Word harms creation science. For example, Jesus said, **“If I told you earthly things and you do not believe, how will you believe if I tell you heavenly things?” (John 3:12 NASU)**. It is common in creation science to hear this text cited in defense of how we have interpreted the physical evidence we see geologically, biologically, astronomically, chemically, or archaeologically. In other words, the spin given to the text implies that the people of Jesus’ day had not believed what He taught about historical and physical events like creation or the Flood, so how could they understand spiritual matters like the new birth? Until recently I have also cited this text in the same fashion and for the same purpose.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hugh Ross, “Old-Earth (Progressive) Creationism,” in *Four Views on Creation, Evolution, and Intelligent Design*, ed. J. B. Stump (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2017), 82.

However, at this point in His ministry Jesus had most recently spoken about “earthly” realities in regard to the new birth in the here and now.<sup>2</sup> According to Leon Morris, “The simplest way of understanding this is to see a reference to the present discourse. It was taking place on earth and concerned a process with effects discernible on earth. In contrast with this, Jesus can impart ‘heavenly things,’ that is higher teaching. But if men like Nicodemus will not believe the simpler things they cannot be expected to believe what is more advanced.”<sup>3</sup> The “spiritual” realities about which Jesus speaks best refer to the future kingdom. As Edward Klink puts it, “The message of Jesus (and the Gospel), therefore, is not abstract and otherworldly but is fleshly and about the real, physical world.”<sup>4</sup> Some commentators, like Merrill Tenney, say that “earthly things” refers to physical phenomena like the wind, but listen more carefully to what he actually wrote:

The “earthly things” Jesus alluded to were probably the phenomena he used for illustrations, such as the wind. If Nicodemus couldn’t grasp the meaning of spiritual truth as conveyed by concrete analogy, how would he do so if it were couched in an abstract statement? No one had ever entered into heaven to experience its realities directly except Jesus himself, the Son of Man, who had come from heaven. Revelation, not discovery, is the basis for faith.<sup>5</sup>

Therefore, even Tenney’s statement falls short of making a contrast involving on one hand secular knowledge or knowledge common to human observation or knowledge of events like creation and the Flood and on the other hand spiritual truths — the focus is on the new birth. We might also point out, as D. A. Carson does, that “no-one disbelieves in ‘earthly things’ such as wind and physical birth.”<sup>6</sup> In other words, the “earthly things” involve obvious truths. Colin Kruse reminds us, “The word ‘heavenly’ (*epouranios*) is found only here in the Gospels, but occurs another eighteen times in the Pauline letters and Hebrews (1 Cor. 15:40 [23], 48 [23], 49; Eph. 1:3, 20; 2:6; 3:10; 6:12; Phil. 2:10; 2 Tim. 4:18; Heb. 3:1; 6:4; 8:5; 9:23; 11:16; 12:22), always in contexts where the heavenly realm is in view, and nearly always contrasting the

---

<sup>2</sup> Or, perhaps “earthly things” might include Jesus’ incarnation, or the effects of the fall on human beings requiring regeneration.

<sup>3</sup> Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to John*, New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1995), 196–97.

<sup>4</sup> Edward W. Klink III, *John*, Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, ed. Clinton E. Arnold (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016), 202. Cf. Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 126: “‘Earthly things’ ... may refer to the elementary teaching on the necessity of a spiritual birth (‘the matters that have been discussed in the preceding dialogue’ [Ridderbos 1997: 134]). If ‘Israel’s teacher’ stumbles over such a foundational truth, how can Jesus enlighten him on ‘heavenly things’ such as the more advanced teachings of the kingdom (Morris 1995: 197; Carson 1991: 199; Schnackenburg 1990: 1.377, referring to Heb. 6:1 and 1 Cor. 3:2)?” Cf., also, H. D. M. Spence-Jones, ed., *St. John*, vol. 1, Pulpit Commentary (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1909), 119: “The ‘earthly things’ are the subject-matter of the discourse as a whole, in apprehending which Nicodemus manifested such obtuseness. The change, renovation of human nature, the new beginning ‘from the Spirit’ of each human life, was indeed operated on the ground of an earthly experience, and came fairly within the compass of common appreciation. Though produced by the Spirit, these things were enacted on earth. When Nicodemus asks the question ‘how?’ he launches the inquiry into another region. There is wide difference between the question ‘what?’ and the question ‘how?’”

<sup>5</sup> Merrill C. Tenney, “John,” in *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, 12 vols., ed. by Frank E. Gaebelein, 9:1–203 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1981), 48.

<sup>6</sup> D. A. Carson, *The Gospel according to John*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1991), 199.

heavenly world with this world.”<sup>7</sup> In other words, the “heavenly” are not abstract “spiritual things,” but things about heaven itself. Also, the grammar of the two statements in John 3:12 indicates that the first (“If I told you earthly things and you do not believe”) speaks of what has already occurred, but the second (“how will you believe if I tell you heavenly things?”) refers to something yet in the future.<sup>8</sup>

We should stop using John 3:12 to support statements like, “if we cannot trust the Bible’s history, why trust it about salvation (John 3:12, 5:47)?”<sup>9</sup> Or, citing John 3:12 to declare that “Christ told Nicodemus that the things of heaven are much like the things on earth.”<sup>10</sup> Or, the following explanation supposedly supported by John 3:12:

Much of what’s discussed in the history in Genesis (such as a single man and woman being the father and mother of all people, and a worldwide flood devastating the earth) had a huge impact on the “earthly things” we can examine and study (such as human DNA containing mutations and sedimentary rock layers with fossils [dead things] inside of them). And the revelation in Scripture regarding “heavenly things,” such as the origin of sin and death (Romans 5:12) being linked to “earthly things” like fossils (dead things), is also clearly seen.<sup>11</sup>

Or, put far more directly,

Think about this verse very carefully, as I apply it in a particular way. If you can’t trust the Bible when it talks about geology, biology, and astronomy, then how can you trust the Bible when it talks about morality and salvation? The issues of morality and salvation are dependent upon the history in the Bible being true. God does not separate morality and salvation from geology, biology, and astronomy. However, it’s popular today for liberal scholars to claim that the Bible doesn’t speak about science.

Now if we can’t believe the Bible when it talks about earthly things—the rocks, the trees, and the animals and plants, then how can we believe the heavenly things (i.e., salvation) that are so important?<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Colin G. Kruse, *John: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries 4 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003), 112n23.

<sup>8</sup> Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to John*, New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1995), 197n51, “Notice the difference between the two conditional clauses. εἰ τὰ ἐπίγεια εἶπον implies fulfillment. It refers to what has actually happened, whereas ἐὰν εἶπω ὑμῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια has no implications about the fulfillment of the condition. It refers to what is as yet future..”

<sup>9</sup> Bryan Osborne, “A Powerful Reminder on a Beautiful Island,” Bryan Osborne Blog (August 14, 2017), <https://answersingenesis.org/blogs/bryan-osborne/2017/08/14/powerful-reminder-on-a-beautiful-island/> (accessed 27 May 2023).

<sup>10</sup> Tim Chaffey, “The Trinity—A Non-negotiable Doctrine,” Feedback (October 7, 2011), <https://answersingenesis.org/who-is-god/the-trinity/the-trinity-a-non-negotiable-doctrine/> (accessed 27 May 2023).

<sup>11</sup> Calvin Smith, “Understanding Easter: From Eden to End Times,” Calvin Smith Blog (April 11, 2022), <https://answersingenesis.org/blogs/calvin-smith/2022/04/11/understanding-easter/> (accessed 27 May 2023).

<sup>12</sup> Ken Ham, “Biblical Authority and the Book of Genesis,” Answers in Genesis (June 27, 2015), <https://answersingenesis.org/the-word-of-god/biblical-authority-and-book-genesis/> (accessed 27 May 2023).

Having provided the previous four examples from one leading creationist organization’s website, it is only fair that we look at other creationist organizations and their misuse of John 3:12. For example, “I believe that the Bible is a reliable theological source based on its historical accuracy; if the Bible got earthly events right, it can be assumed to be trustworthy when talking about heavenly things too (John 3:12).”<sup>13</sup> Or, this statement: “Furthermore, because evolutionary dogma totally undermines the Bible’s history, then it undermines the whole message. As Jesus said to Nicodemus, if people won’t believe the earthly things, how are they going to believe the heavenly (theological) things? (John 3:12). A Bible that is thought unbelievable in matters that can be tested will hardly be heeded in things that are not testable.”<sup>14</sup> Or, consider the following:

Far from such appeasement on Genesis history protecting the credibility of the Bible, the reverse happened. The *whole* Bible, with its faith and morality, came under attack. And these critics are being consistent—if the first book of the Bible needs to be twisted to fit ‘science’, why not everything else? As Jesus told Nicodemus (John 3:12): ‘I have spoken to you of earthly things and you do not believe; how then will you believe if I speak of heavenly things?’ If Jesus was wrong about earthly things (such as a recent creation (Mark 10:6–9) and a global flood (Luke 17:26–27), was He also wrong about a heavenly thing like John 3:16, only four verses later?<sup>15</sup>

Or, published just a few months ago,

... why should we trust Genesis when it says God created if we can’t trust it on the details? After all, Jesus told Nicodemus, “I have spoken to you of earthly things and you do not believe; how then will you believe if I speak of heavenly things?” (John 3:12). So if Genesis can’t be trusted on an earthly thing, such as Earth’s age, the sequence of creative acts upon it, or the Flood that covered it, then why trust it on a heavenly thing such as who the Creator was?<sup>16</sup>

Even Henry M. Morris began his 1964 article in *Bibliotheca Sacra* with John 3:12.<sup>17</sup> All of this appeal runs contrary to the majority of evangelical commentaries on the Gospel of John. In other words, we are not listening to trained biblical scholars and what they tell us John 3:12 says.

As yet another example of poor exegesis, creationists have sometimes cited Romans 5:12 (“Therefore, just as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men, because all sinned—”) to prove that the death of animals (usually, a

---

<sup>13</sup> Lita Sanders, “Is Belief in God a case of Christian wish fulfillment?,” Feedback (March 27, 2010), <https://creation.com/is-god-christian-wish-fulfillment> (accessed 27 May 2023).

<sup>14</sup> Don Batten, “Nice theologians leading the church away from the truth,” Creation.com (January 16, 2018), from a May 2017 CMI newsletter, <https://creation.com/nice-theologians-leading-the-church-away-from-the-truth> (accessed 27 May 2023).

<sup>15</sup> Jonathan Sarfati, “Loving the Bible to Death,” *Creation* 27, no. 4 (September 2005): 6, <https://creation.com/loving-the-bible-to-death> (accessed 27 May 2023).

<sup>16</sup> Jonathan Sarfati, “Can evangelicals agree on ten theses about creation and evolution?,” Creation.com (23 March 2023), originally published 24 January 2019, <https://creation.com/ten-theses-todd-wilson> (accessed 27 May 2023).

<sup>17</sup> Henry M. Morris, “The Bible Is a Textbook of Science,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 121, no. 483 (October–December 1964): 341–50 (esp., p. 341).

discussion about dinosaurs and fossils) did not take place before the fall. Thankfully, most creationists have discarded that proof text, since it speaks only about the death of humans, and now they use the more appropriate and more exegetically accurate reference in Romans 8:20–22, “For the creation was subjected to futility, not willingly, but because of Him who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself also will be set free from its slavery to corruption into the freedom of the glory of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groans and suffers the pains of childbirth together until now.” In other words, Romans 5 tells us about how the Fall brought death upon human beings, while Romans 8 tells us about how the Fall brought death and corruption upon the rest of creation.

As creationists we do not help our cause by using Scripture out of context or inaccurately. Yes, this requires more labor on our part, but *lazy exegetes make poor theologians*. Unfortunately, a lot of lazy exegesis has taken place in the biblical creationist camp. Inaccurate exegesis of the biblical text undermines too many writings, films, and blogs supporting biblical creationism. *Inaccurate interpretation gives the enemies of biblical creation an opportunity to discount biblical teaching.*

How do we remedy the existence of lazy exegesis?

- (1) Listen carefully to those most highly trained and experienced in the exegesis of the biblical text in its original languages.
- (2) Make certain that skilled theologians and exegetes review every book, journal article, or blog post before publication.
- (3) Join in intradisciplinary research and writing — theologians and scientists working within their own areas of expertise to come to agreement with each other on how best to present research results in the light of the priority of Scripture.

Where do we find such highly trained and skilled biblical exegetes and theologians? We need to rely upon sound Bible colleges and seminaries who take Genesis as historical truth and present a literal six-day creation as well as a global catastrophic Flood. Above all, we must vet the biblical scholars we hire or work alongside. The best biblical scholars might have obtained their graduate degrees from Old Earth institutions, but survived with their faith intact and strengthened by the challenges they faced. As for intradisciplinary research and writing, John Whitcomb and Henry Morris showed us the way with their seminal work, *The Genesis Flood*, with a biblical scholar and a trained engineer and hydrodynamics expert comprising the team. We need to get back to that model of team research.

### **External to Theology**

John Walton, who argues against Young Age Creationism, recognizes the priority of Scripture even if he pushes a theological agenda filled with inaccurate exegesis: “Science is not in the position to dictate what claims the text may or may not make. Scientists can offer suggestions or raise objections, and these can be appreciated, but these must be evaluated in light of the statements that the text makes—such is the evangelical commitment.”<sup>18</sup> Elsewhere he added, “We need to defend the teaching of the text, not a scientific reconstruction of the text or

---

<sup>18</sup> John H. Walton, *Genesis*, NIV Application Commentary 1 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 321.

statements that are read between the lines of the text.”<sup>19</sup> He is absolutely correct in these declarations, even if his own example too often gives precedent to science (so-called) over Scripture — as in his abandoning the traditional view of the historicity of Adam as the original head of the human race.

The conflict between theology and secular science has a long history. Ever since Adam’s disobedience in the garden of Eden, secular knowledge has competed with spiritual knowledge for supremacy in the lives of human beings. Warfield bemoans the fact that in his day,

“Modern discovery” and “modern thought” are erected into the norm of truth, and we are told that the whole sphere of theological teaching must be conformed to it. ... What is demanded of us is just to adjust our religious views to the latest pronouncements of philosophy or science or criticism. And this is demanded with entire unconsciousness of the fundamental fact of Christianity—that we have a firmer ground of confidence for our religious views than any science or philosophy or criticism can provide for any of their pronouncements.<sup>20</sup>

How should we go about the process of interpreting (exegeting) the biblical text? Does Scripture instruct us to consult secular scientists before interpreting the Bible? Following that order of procedure implies that secular science stands as the greater authority. When it comes to origin science, instead of biblical interpreters first consulting scientists, scientists ought to first consult Bible scholars. The reverse produces a hermeneutics of doubt and a minimalist position (the accuracy and historicity of Scripture is viewed as minimal, so the interpreter must begin with doubting the Scripture writers’ truth-telling). ***In other words, giving priority to scientific views makes the Scripture subject to whatever scientific viewpoint or theory is currently popular and subject to change with every new discovery or new theory.***

### A Call to Biblical Accuracy

Nothing undermines biblical authority like exegetical inaccuracy. Every use of a biblical text out of context gives the enemy of biblical creationism a firm foothold on the opposition’s side in the spiritual tug of war. Too many biblical creationists carelessly hang their arguments on slipshod exegesis and then wonder why their opponents so gleefully celebrate dislodging the shallow anchor from a sandy footing.

Cornelis Van Dam makes a valuable observation: “Scripture does not need human efforts to prove its veracity. It stands on its own authority. Indeed, science is incapable of giving any lasting assurance of the Word’s truthfulness.”<sup>21</sup> Furthermore, speaking of Genesis 1 and 2 he admits, “These chapters are not scientific treatises, although it is possible that processes that scientists know about today are hidden in the simple language of Genesis 1 and 2.”<sup>22</sup> Later he states, “Christian scientists [Christians who are scientists], however, can be encouraged when

---

<sup>19</sup> Walton, *Genesis*, 100.

<sup>20</sup> Benjamin B. Warfield, “Heresy and Concession,” in *Selected Shorter Writings, Benjamin B. Warfield*, 2 vols., ed. by John E. Meeter, 2:672–79 (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 1970), 676–77; originally published in *The Presbyterian Messenger* (May 7, 1896).

<sup>21</sup> Cornelis Van Dam, *In the Beginning: Listening to Genesis 1 and 2* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2021), 34–35.

<sup>22</sup> Van Dam, *In the Beginning*, 29.

their research leads them to articulate theories that are consistent with Scripture. After all, the events that Genesis records are factually true.”<sup>23</sup>

Responding to how Denis Lamoureux depicted my young-earth view in *Four Views on the Historical Adam*,<sup>24</sup> I wrote:

I do not believe that the Bible is a book of science — an accusation too often falsely leveled against young-earth creationists. The Bible presents theological and historical truths from God’s viewpoint and in accord with his own wisdom and knowledge. The biblical writers’ worldview is God’s worldview, which he expects them to represent accurately. When the Bible says (on more than one occasion) that God created the heavens and the earth and all they contain in six actual days, that discloses God’s view, not man’s. God always speaks truth and always expects his servants to speak and write truth — especially those whom he chose to write the Bible.

If the Bible were a book of science, it would present human scholars’ interpretations of the evidences they themselves observe, just like books and journals of science. If the Bible were a science textbook, it would present theories and report the testing of theories. However, the Bible, in contrast to science books, dogmatically communicates the direct revelation that God himself has provided. Only God witnessed the six days of creation, so no man can claim to speak of that series of events unless he has received revelation directly from the Creator himself. No science book can or will do this.<sup>25</sup>

In this I am found in agreement with the venerable E. J. Young who wrote, “It is of course true that the Bible is not a textbook of science, but all too often, it would seem, this fact is made a pretext for treating lightly the content of Genesis one. . . . The Bible may not have been given to teach science as such, but it does teach about the origin of all things, . . .”<sup>26</sup> As Van Dam explains, “Although Scripture is not a scientific textbook, scientists should make use of any information relevant to their investigations that is found in Scripture. Such information is truly reliable.”<sup>27</sup>

Beyond these points concerning the relationship of the Bible and science, if the Bible were a science book it would require constant revision and correction to keep pace with the changes in science even from year to year, much less from generation to generation. Who wants a Bible subject to the changes we observe in our high school and college science textbooks? The Word of God does not change (Isaiah 40:8).

---

<sup>23</sup> Van Dam, *In the Beginning*, 33.

<sup>24</sup> Denis O. Lamoureux, “Response from the Evolutionary View,” in *Four Views on the Historical Adam*, ed. by Matthew Barrett and Ardel B. Caneday, 229–35, Counterpoints: Bible & Theology (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2013), 230.

<sup>25</sup> William D. Barrick, “A Historical Adam: Young-Earth Creation View,” 197–227, “A Rejoinder,” in *Four Views on the Historical Adam*, ed. by Matthew Barrett and Ardel B. Caneday, 252–54, Counterpoints: Bible & Theology (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2013), 253–54.

<sup>26</sup> Edward J. Young, *Studies in Genesis One*, An International Library of Philosophy and Theology: Biblical and Theological Studies, ed. J. Marcellus Kik (n.p.: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1973), 43.

<sup>27</sup> Van Dam, *In the Beginning*, 49.

In the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River we can observe physical evidence for the geological history of that area. Making observations of that data does not comprise a study in divine revelation. From a general, or natural, revelational standpoint, that data provides divine revelation concerning the existence, omnipotence, wisdom, and glory of God. However, the scientific (e.g., geological) conclusions drawn from that data do not come from God, even if the scientific interpretation proves correct.<sup>28</sup> We must remember that “Scientific truth is not superior to biblical truth”<sup>29</sup> — *nor does scientific truth qualify as absolute truth or infallible truth.*

## Fresh Voices

I have cited Cornelis Van Dam several times in this address. He presents a fresh examination of the topic of biblical creation. He sets the stage for his volume by identifying its purpose: “After considering the evidence, this book comes to the determination that we should accept the plain, straightforward reading of the Genesis text as a reliable account of the historical events resulting in the creation of the world we now live in.”<sup>30</sup> He identifies his secondary purpose as ascertaining “the place of science in the study of Genesis 1 and 2 and the implications that the historicity of Genesis has for the credibility of the theory of evolution for explaining the origin of creation.”<sup>31</sup> Chapter 2 (“The Place of Extrabiblical Evidence in Interpreting Scripture,” 17–58) should be required reading for every Christian interested in the Bible and science. We need more theologians and biblical exegetes following in his footsteps. We need young people to replace those of us who are older. I am greatly encouraged by men like Van Dam, as well as by young people who are currently rising in the realm of theology in defense of Young Age Creationism like Dustin Burlet and Hans Madueme. May their numbers increase one hundredfold. Biblical creationists must become more forceful about the priority of the Word of God for creation studies. We must demonstrate it by the way we work in concert as theologians and scientists.

Every creationist organization should have highly skilled biblical scholars on staff and actively involved as editors for all publications. *This is a necessity, not an option.* Organizations have spared no expense at hiring highly qualified scientists to do research, to write, and to speak in conferences — as they should. However, most creationist organizations have no full-time biblical scholars on their staffs. They might have a theologian involved in a specific project or they might have a few theologians they ask to review some of their materials before publishing, but such a practice fails to demonstrate the priority sufficiently. Just as the organizations require their scientists to possess a high level of academic achievement, the theologians must likewise be holders of earned Ph.D. (or Th.D.) degrees from solid, conservative seminaries or have demonstrated the firmness of their Young Age Creationist convictions despite a less than conservative academic background. And, just as a team of scientists works best in pursuing the goals of research and publication, so a team of theologians committed to the historicity, inerrancy, and authority of Scripture will work best to ensure that the priority remains on the Bible’s testimony.

---

<sup>28</sup> Nicolas H. Gootjes, “What Does God Reveal in the Grand Canyon?,” in *Teaching and Preaching the Word: Studies in Dogmatics and Homiletics*, ed. by Cornelis Van Dam (Winnipeg, MB: Premier, 2010), 21. Cited in Van Dam, *In the Beginning*, 38n58.

<sup>29</sup> Van Dam, *In the Beginning*, 48.

<sup>30</sup> Van Dam, *In the Beginning*, 9.

<sup>31</sup> Van Dam, *In the Beginning*, 9.



Having said all of this, I want to express my thanks to God that a group of theologians and scientists joined together to establish the Creation Theology Society in December of 2020 with just these matters in mind. We're a new society, but we hope to continue to grow and to exert significant influence by example. We join with our sister societies, the Creation Geology Society and the Creation Biology Society, to include the interdisciplinary sessions and publications that we hope will set the tone for biblical creationists worldwide.