

AAF Field conference
~1985?
see p. 17-19

THE CREATION/EVOLUTION DEBATE IN THE
LIGHT OF THE GREAT CONTROVERSY BETWEEN CHRIST AND SATAN

By

Jack W. Provonsha

The title of my remarks clearly identifies the tradition within which I speak although I suspect that some of the things I am about to say will hardly be considered traditional, at least by some. I make no apology for this. It is my conviction that the situation now facing the Adventist Church in regard to these matters is dangerous and calls for a high level of innovation and creativity on the part of all of us. How we handle these matters could spell the difference between disaster and progress for the life of the Church.

Certainly its unity is in jeopardy. I recently heard one of our leaders in the field of creation-science say that we probably had come to a time in Adventist history for a "parting of the ways." I have recently seen church administrators act as if they also believed that. The experience of the Missouri Synod Lutherans comes easily to mind. I happen to think that such are dead wrong and I will fight that tendency with all of my strength. I see it as the special responsibility of the progressive intellectuals in the church to see that it does not happen.

It will not be easy. There are those among us whose beliefs are largely based on "will-power" rather than rational conviction. You are aware of the mentality. The bumper-sticker I once saw that read, "God said it, I believe it, and that settles it," put it rather well. So did the person

who wrote in a letter to the editor of the Adventist Review, "If the Bible says a whale swallowed Jonah, I believe it. In fact, if the Bible said Jonah swallowed the whale I would believe it." These have little apparent awareness of how difficult it is always to be certain what God is saying in Scripture. Such seem never to have read Ellen White's adaptation of C. E. Stowe, published in Selected Messages book 1, p. 22,

The Lord speaks to human beings in imperfect speech in order that the degenerate senses, the dull, earthly perception of earthly beings may comprehend His words. Thus is shown God's condescension. He meets fallen human beings where they are. The Bible, perfect as it is in its simplicity, does not answer to the great ideas of God; for infinite ideas cannot be perfectly embodied in finite vehicles of thought.

The gulf between those who believe "by will-power" and the splendid, scientific integrity expressed in Sir Thomas Huxley's well-known admonition that we must have the courage to "face the facts though they slay us," is formidable.

But try to bridge it we must, not only for the sake of church unity, but for reasons of integrity. God requires of us that we be persons of integrity, including intellectual integrity, even in the face of possible inaccuracy. We are not morally bound to be correct. We are bound to be honest -- while we endeavor to be as accurate as we can be. We shall discover that we were mistaken about many things when we get to the Kingdom of Heaven, but no one will be there who "maketh a lie."

In these matters the trouble comes in trying to be as accurate as we can be. Those facts we are supposed to have the courage to face "though they slay us," are not all in yet, and those we have are often ambiguous. As

impressed as I am by what I've seen and heard thus far even on this conference, I remain unconvinced. No earth-history model that I've yet seen fully provides that neat, coherent synthesis of ideas and experience that we generally indicate by the expression "the whole truth."

Whether we shall be able to come up with the whole truth regarding earth-history in what the theologians call "time" as over against eternity, is open to serious question. We may have to live with unanswered questions and tentative perceptions throughout this life as "the way things are." (Perhaps that is part of the fun of it.)

Being able to do this as a community engaged in a common quest for truth is going to involve the ability to distinguish what is essential to faith from what is inconsequential. The latter may be subject to revision and restatement. The former will require mainly a sharpening of focus.

In this paper I wish to approach the concerns of the field conference from the standpoint of my special area of competence. As you know I am a moralist by interest and special training. I take this approach because there broods over this scene, like the proverbial "Cheshire cat," moral issues that have not received sufficient attention. In our quest we ignore these at our conceptual peril. But first a few preliminary remarks.

As Christians, those "facts" we must face though they slay us will include more than what Sir Thomas Huxley would admit. When physicist Woods at an after-dinner lecture was asked to distinguish a physicist from a metaphysicist he replied that the essential difference was that the

metaphysicist has no laboratory. He was wrong. As a physicist he was defining "laboratory" in much too restricted a sense. The entire physical, and biological universe including all of the intelligent beings in it, their beliefs, values, choices, and actions, and the whole sweep of time is an awesome laboratory for which the ordinary, secular physicist may have little appreciation. But this is the arena of the metaphysicist's (as Woods was using that tricky term) concern.

In such a laboratory human observation and inductive reasoning -- the stuff of ordinary, secular science -- is not sufficient. The religious, biblically-oriented scientist will always carry out his work in a situation of balanced tension between inductive and deductive logic -- observation and faith, reason and revelation. The "facts" must be derived from both.

As an example, something we shall be looking at in greater detail, there is the "fact" that there is personality at the heart of things, that ultimate reality is spelled "who" and not merely "what." Surely this belief is one of the "unrevisables of Christian faith. But it involves more than merely objective observation. "Things," "objects," on the one hand, just lie there waiting to be observed and manipulated. All that is required is that we "go after them" with single-minded persistence. Experience of personality, on the other hand always depends to some extent on someone "coming after us," that is, upon initiative on the part of the person who is experienced.

Obviously, evidence that a person or persons have "come after us," may

"just lie there" to be discovered by observation and experiment, but creativity, initiative, autonomy are mainly the features we apply to personhood. Persons are characterized not so much by "being" or "having" but by "doing." In the realm of "person" lie actions that are unique, surprising, unexpected, unrepeatable, unpredictable, Einmaligkeiten -- things that happen only once. Personhood is thus, to some extent, beyond the methods of the ordinary, at least physical, sciences -- although, of course, residual evidence of personal actions may be scientifically observed. This also means that uniformity in any absolute sense is "off" the moment personality is introduced into the equation. Adding the personal dimension to earth-history can introduce significant uncertainty both as to time and process.

A useful way of thinking about the synthesis of inductive and deductive logic in the service of the "whole truth" is in terms of a two dimensional model -- a model with both horizontal and vertical qualities. The horizontal dimension corresponds to the the world available to ordinary scientific investigation, what "just lies there," is repeatable, testable, predictable, and objectively observable. The vertical corresponds to the surprising, the unexpected, the personal. To Christian believers these two dimensions repeat themselves throughout the whole of reality wherever personality is present. They are present, for example, in man who while a multidimensional unity shares many qualities with all men as man -- and we can write textbooks on anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, etc. But each is also this particular man or woman, unique, irreplaceable, who decides, who acts, who creates, who chooses. The former is the horizontal

dimension of human science, the latter, the vertical dimension of personality, sometimes cuts across the ordinary, the uniform, in surprising and unpredictable ways.

In this, man is a microcosm of the divine, for God, too is a bi-dimensional being, insofar as He is personal. This is the basis for the inclusion of deductive factors in the belief-system of Christians who are involved in the scientific enterprise. Person, on the above terms is a general "given" belief from which one deduces certain particulars. It is prepared for by early experiences of mainly parental personhood. Sigmund Freud was correct in his observations regarding the origins of such belief (as he was also wrong in calling it an "illusion"). Belief in a Supreme Being is as natural as having nurturing parents in early childhood. For children blessed with reasonably good parents or parent surrogates only later do the doubts and questions arise that become the aegis of arguments, proofs, and logic. The Divine Person first "comes after us," through our parents, as it were. Which is to say, we first believe, then later we look for corroboration and confirmation, Augustine's Credo ut intelligens.

Another unrevisable "given" from which we deduce essential elements in our belief system is the goodness of that eternal Person at the heart of things. The elemental goodness of God is not always easy simply to read off the record of man's historical encounters with Him. This is so mainly because it is man who has done the recording. But in the normative disclosure, the incarnation of our Lord, it becomes indelibly clear for all to see if they but have the eyes and the will to see it.

From this "given" we deduce another. God is not alone as a power in the universe. If God is "One" (another "given"), and He is good (another), He cannot be omnipotent -- at least not now. There is also evil in the world along with goodness. The fact of evil is another "given" both through our individual and corporate experience and by divine disclosure.

But as soon as we posit evil in the universe, that is, evil in the sense of SIN, evil for which someone is guilty, we have also posited evil personified. There cannot be SIN without a person who sins, by definition. Impersonal forces in the universe, even enormously destructive ones -- exploding suns, hurricanes, earthquakes, volcanoes, are not evil in the sense of sin. They simply "are." They are amoral in and of themselves. Destructive actions of subhuman animals are likewise amoral. Were the wolves to eat the lambs with which they are depicted as feeding in Isaiah's portrayal of a new heaven and a new earth they would not be "bad" wolves. That's what wolves as we know them are supposed to do. Only persons commit evil in the sense of SIN for only they can be responsible through choosing. Immoral persons can employ amoral means to achieve their evil ends, of course, but that does not thereby invest the amoral means themselves with moral value.

What we are talking about, of course, is the Satan side of the Great Controversy to which we referred in the title. It is apparently more difficult to believe in a personal devil than it is to believe in a personal God if the polls mean anything. At least this is true for relatively sophisticated peoples. Evil spirits, forces, and mysterious,

personal beings abound in primitive societies as an expression of ignorance regarding natural causation. They serve, in part, as coping responses to the ordinary contingencies of existence.

But it is more difficult to personify evil at a level where evil is able to enter into serious competition (or controversy) with any conception of God that a present-day, believing scientist might find credible. (Actually, it is a "half-way" devil in which it is difficult to believe, a devil somewhat above the primitive's evil spirits with horns, split hoofs, bat wings, and forked tail, but far below the Majesty of Heaven.)

To engage in serious warfare with God, however, as in the Great Controversy, requires that the contenders for the throne be at least somewhere near the same league. (I am not advocating a return to Zoroastrian dualism with its good and bad gods, Ohrmazd and Ahriman.) Satan must surely be a universe-class contender if we may judge by the number and class of his followers. I once heard Krister Stendahl, then dean of Harvard Divinity School, and no unsophisticated primitive, by the way, say that it is impossible to deal rationally with the problem of evil without positing a personal devil. He immediately went on to note that to him the devil was not a simple notion and almost as difficult to define as God, Himself. The struggle will almost inevitably be conceived by humans in metaphysical metaphor and it may be important for us to be aware of that fact. The reality, itself, could be rather awesome if what we are coming to know about God's universe is any indication.

Of one thing we can be sure. We cannot simply transliterate God's

"condescensions." We must be prepared to look behind, through, and beyond the linguistic vehicles in which the truth is conveyed. Certainly this is true for elements in the divine disclosure that are not literally crucial to the controversy -- such as time. God has plenty of time.

A central issue in all of this, indeed, perhaps, the central issue, essential, unrevisable (in its essence although perhaps not in the manner of its expression), has to do with the characters of the protagonists in the conflict. Here is where the issue takes on the moral quality to which we referred at the outset. What we face is not a battle of Titans for power, for territory, for material possessions, the other usual things that set men against each other. It is a spiritual conflict. Satan, the destroyer, is not merely attempting to undo what God has done. His aim is not merely to destroy. Rather, what is being set forth, I believe, is an alternative ordering of reality.

Let us see if we can determine the terms of the controversy as they are given in the inspired writings. The clearest expression of the demonic side of the conflict that I know of is set forth in the writings of a German philosopher who, in terms of his devastating impact on the world, may have been one of the most influential thinkers the world has ever known.

Born in the latter half of the 19th century Friedrich Nietzsche was reared in a somewhat straight-laced religious home mainly by aunts and sisters. When he was 18 years of age he gave up his Christian faith. Later he was to say that it was the easiest thing he ever did. He seems,

however, to have spent the rest of his life, proving that it was the easiest thing he ever did.

Nietzsche's main claim to fame derives from the fact that he took Charles Darwin, as he understood him, very seriously in developing his moral outlook. The book expressing this most clearly was named appropriately, Der Antichrist, a title chosen with care because Nietzsche had come to hold Judaism and Christianity responsible for most of the world's social ills. Jews and Christians, he said, had "transvalued the values." They had veritably turned morality on its head in the service of their own decadence. But let him tell you in his own words,

What is good? Everything that heightens the feeling of power in man, the will to power, power itself. What is bad? Everything that is born of weakness. What is happiness? The feeling that power is growing, that resistance is overcome. Not contentedness but more power; not peace but war; not virtue but fitness. . . .What is more harmful than any vice? Active pity for all the failures and all the weak: Christianity.

. . .What type of man shall be bred, shall be willed, for being higher in value, worthier of life, more certain of a future. Even in the past this higher type has appeared often -- but as a fortunate accident, as an exception, never as something willed. In fact, this has been the type most dreaded -- almost the dreadful -- and from dread the opposite type was willed, bred and attained: the domestic animal, the herd animal, the sick human animal -- the Christian.

Christianity should not be beautified and embellished: it has waged deadly war against this higher type of man; it has placed all the basic instincts of this type under the ban; and out of these instincts it has distilled evil and the Evil One: the strong man as the typically reprehensible man, the 'reprobate.' Christianity has sided with all that is weak and base, with all failures; it has made an ideal of whatever contradicts the instinct of the strong life to preserve itself; it has corrupted the reason even of those strongest in spirit by teaching men to consider the supreme values of the spirit as something sinful, something that leads to error -- as temptation.

Christianity is called the religion of pity. Pity stands

opposed to the tonic emotions which heighten our vitality: it has a depressing effect. We are deprived of strength when we feel pity. . . .Quite in general, pity crosses the law of development, which is the law of selection. It preserves what is ripe for destruction; it defends those who have been disinherited and condemned by life; and by the abundance of the failures of all kinds which it keeps alive it gives life a gloomy and questionable aspect.

And finally,

Wherever the theologian's instinct extends, value judgments have been stood on their heads and the concepts of "true" and "false" are of necessity reversed: whatever is most harmful to life is called "true;" whatever elevates it, enhances, affirms, justifies it, and makes it triumphant, is called "false." (Friedrich Nietzsche, Der Antichrist, in Walter Kaufman (ed.), The Portable Nietzsche, New York: The Viking Press, 1954, pp. 570, 571, 572, 576)

And where did Friedrich Nietzsche get this? Expressions like "will to power," "self preservation," and "the law of selection," come straight out of Origin of Species. As Nietzsche interpreted Darwin, the name of the survival game is POWER: power of the strong over the weak and the will to use it. That is the way it is in nature. The fittest survive. The big fishes eat the little fishes and the little fishes eat the littler fishes, the fit survive by possessing more wit, greater agility, stronger muscles, sharper claws, etc., etc. On these terms, man as a part of nature, when he is true to his origins, participates in the general behavioral configurations of the rest of nature. The truly noble men of the earth are thus like the ancient Romans whose legions marched through the world conquering and displacing its weak and decadent inhabitants such as the Jews and Christians who had perverted the very meaning of morality by transmuting weakness and decadence into virtues.

Well, ideas have consequences. It would be naive to attribute to ideas

even as forceful as these more credit than they deserve. And surely the causes of two great world wars were vastly more complex than anything Friedrich Nietzsche had to say, but there is strong evidence that Nietzsche furnished much of the philosophic undergirding of those two major human catastrophes. It is said that Hitler slept with Nietzsche under his pillow. (William L. Shirer in his recent The Nightmare Years, quotes from notes taken by one of Hitler's generals during one of Der Fuhrer's harangues just prior to the invasion of Poland, a passage that could have come straight out of Der Antichrist.) Surely the similarity between the "superior" type of human that "shall be bred, shall be willed, for being higher in value, worthier of life, more certain of a future," of Nietzsche, and Hitler's Aryan super-race is no accident, nor is the "holocaust" and all it represents. Similar attitudes also surfaced during the Kaiser's war. Thus two terrible world wars, and possibly a future third, more horrible than all the wars of history combined, can be said to have been at least conceptually conditioned by a view of nature that gained currency in the mid-nineteenth century. (Marx and Engels greeted Darwin's Origin of Species with enthusiasm as providing the scientific base for their rationalistic, humanisitic materialism. They even invited him to allow his name to appear in the introduction to Das Kapital, an invitation he refused, to his credit.)

All of which stands in sharpest contrast with the way of life proposed by our Master when He was here among men. "Blessed are the meek," He said. "They shall inherit the earth." And in His familiar contrasting of the worldlings with His own followers He admonished them,

You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them. Not so with you. Instead, whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be your slave -- just as the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many." (Matt. 20:25-28)

Constantly He urged them by word and example to show cōmpassion and pity for the weak, to extend kindness even to the enemy, to nurture and care for the unfortunate, to become as innocent as little children. He condemned the leaders, the haughty priests, scribes, and Pharisees for their shameless, arrogant, and self-seeking pursuit of power. (Nietzsche knew well his true enemy.)

And it wasn't just a matter of contrasting human, life styles. What were being displayed in Christ vs. Antichrist were opposing conceptions of reality itself. These were the terms of the great, universal controversy between Christ and Satan. What were being placed in opposition were two different ways of ordering the universe.

This extended even to the natural order. The Old Testament's, depictions of the ideal natural world, especially Isaiah's prophecies of the new heaven and the new earth, are consistent with the way Christ taught men to deal with one another. Isaiah declared,

The wolf will live with the lamb, the leopard will lie down with the goat, the calf and the lion and the yearling together; and a little child will lead them. The cow will feed with the bear, their young will lie down together, and the lion will eat straw like the ox. The infant will play near the hole of the cobra, and the young child will put his hand into the viper's nest. They will neither harm nor destroy on all my holy mountain, for the earth will be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. (Isa. 11:6-9, see also Isa. 65:17-25 where "new heaven and "new earth" are made explicit)

Now, I know that these are examples of sublime Hebrew poetry and may in the mind of Isaiah have been intended as poetic descriptions of the state of God's people Israel after their restoration. He may not have intended literally to portray a natural ecosystem differing markedly from anything we can imagine as actually functioning. (To my mind "prophetic speech-figuring" is not synonymous with "unreal," however. It is reality at a different dimension.) I can see no way that one can devise a life system in which there is no destruction or death -- that is, not if anything eats. Even the fruit of the tree of life is destroyed as it is consumed for food. The "straw" that Isaiah's lion eats becomes very dead in the process. Perhaps it is only that there is no predation in heaven and the new earth, at the upper end of the food chain, that is, by man's fellow creatures with whom he readily identifies, lest man ~~not~~ be tempted to Nietzsche's folly. I don't know. It is of no great importance to my point in any case. That point is that when the ideal state is depicted by the prophetic artist, the tubes of paint have colors that are harmonious with Christ's portrayal of reality! The ideal state for man is illustrated by an idyllic animal scene, and it is hard to imagine that that scene bears no relation whatever to reality - especially since it is so consonant with the ideal picture of man Christ gives us in word and deed. Isaiah's vision of the natural world of the hereafter is distinctly Christian!

The trouble with that vision of nature, however, is that it does not clearly resemble anything we can observe now or anything that has ever been as far as we can tell by the paleontologic record. The record of the

long past seems very much like the present and Nietzsche's picture of reality seems vindicated rather than Christ's. As near as we can discover, the big fishes have always eaten the little fishes and the little fishes have always eaten the littler fishes both in man's egosystems and in the ecosystem around us.

That's not totally true, of course. If we are attuned we can hear the strains of both worlds commingled. That's true in the natural world.

Lewis There are moments of beauty, even in the midst of nature's tragedies, when notes from that other land seem wafted in on the air. It is also true in the human. As the old refrain goes, "there's enough of good in the worst of us and enough of bad in the best of us that it ill behooves any of us to criticize the rest of us" (or something like that).

The Bible accounts for this by the Fall. What was created by God "very good" becomes changed by man's sin. (The Fall is another "given" from which the believer may deduce the particulars.) In ways that are not entirely clear, the whole of nature is involved in man's sin and looks forward to redemptive deliverance. Paul writes,

The creation waits in eager expectation for the sons of God to be revealed. For the creation was subjected to frustration, not by its own choice, but by the will of the one who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself will be liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the glorious freedom of the children of God. We know that the whole creation has been groaning as in the pains of childbirth right up to the present time. (Rom:19-22)

In this present world it may not be possible to separate the commingled realities either conceptually or in practice. I am not aware that it is possible, as things now stand, to run a business, or a railroad, or an

institution, or a country, or a denomination on a pattern of strict, literal adherence to the admonitions contained in the sermon on the mount. In this life, businessmen who respond to the theft of their coats by giving up their cloaks too, usually lose their shirts -- and their pants -- and their shoes and socks -- and their stores -- and -- and. Countries that do not look to their defenses soon cease to exist as free states. I've just returned from attending a portion of the General Conference Session. It is my distinct impression that the meek are not often "elected" to high office even in the church.

In this life we may seek to be as harmless as doves, but we had better keep a sharp eye peeled. Perhaps it is like the wheat and the tares. They are truly separable only at the harvest. What is required of us, however, even now, is that we know the difference. While living in this world we must keep our eyes on that better land. Otherwise we are in danger of committing the Nietzschean error of normatizing the imperfect -- to our peril.

To summarize, the Christian believer, as scientist carries out his work somewhat differently from his secular colleague. The method of inductive logic which has proven so fruitful in scientific investigation is supplemented for him by a series of "givens" -- from revelation or wherever -- that could not come to him merely by inductive reasoning -- by their very nature. From these he deduces truths not available to his secular colleague. He may find it desirable to "test" these "givens" to be sure that they are, in fact, truly "given." But having done that, he accepts them as the basis for the interpretation of his scientific

7/1/82
investigation. These form his basic premises. Some of these premises are revisable as he goes along, some are not. Those that are not revisable, at least to any great extent, are usually foundational convictions without which one ceases to be a believer. They are such "givens" as the personality of God, the creatorship of God, the goodness of God, the reality of evil, the personality of evil, what constitutes "good," what constitutes "evil," The Fall of creation and its restoration. Others might be added but these seem to be the essential "givens" for the issue at hand. (It will be noted that I have omitted time and creative method as essential "givens." They are more crucial to one type of Scriptural hermeneutic, I think, than they are to the matter under consideration.)

If what I have said above is correct, the task of the believing scientist as he relates to earth-history, is to find some way of balancing his facts derived from observation and those given by revelation so as to do justice to both. No one suggests that this will be an easy task. It will tax our collective, creative abilities to the limit. What is urgently needed is an intellectual climate in the church that will enable us fully to employ our best gifts to this end.

I certainly do not have the answers to the questions confronting us, but I am going to make a suggestion developed over many years of pondering the matter and talking with many esteemed friends both inside and outside of the scientific community. It is based on the above notion of the Great Controversy.

If we grant the conflict the awesome, cosmic and temporal proportions I

have suggested, and the protagonists the qualities outlined, it becomes plain that this battle of the Titans is finally a struggle between two competing orderings of reality. The victory of one over the other at the end comes with a demonstration that one, even though giving the appearance of success for a time (it seems to work) has within it the seeds of its own eventual destruction. It appears that God, in the course of the conflict, "suffered long with Satan [time is not a problem to God] allowing him to work out the principles of his government." (That's a quote from Ellen White, by the way) Since Satan is a universe-class contender and time is not a limitation could it be that the working out of those principles could look very much like what we see in the natural record that is attributed by the secular scientist to the autonomous working of nature in its process of evolution?

The genetic experiments carried out by so godlike a figure would make even our most advanced ventures seem like child's-play, perhaps progressing even to the level of hominids, lacking only the "image of God." Such intelligent guidance of the process of evolution is precisely the link that is missing in the ordinary secular version. The idea of a totally random evolutionary process is utterly incredible on the face of it. It would take an almost-divine, personal intelligence to make it work. What I am proposing is that personal intelligence. And, of course, as soon as personhood is introduced the time frames might be considerably different from those that ease the acceptance of randomness.

And then suppose that at some point of relatively recent time, after Satan's principles have become clear to the hosts of heaven, God stepped

in to demonstrate the alternative to the devil's method -- the Genesis story. With the alternatives before them there is a choosing of loyalties and there is war in heaven to be continued here on earth until the end of time.

Fantastic? Of course. Is this the way it happened? I have no idea though the above conjecture is not inconsistent with the record. The record certainly shows signs of the demonic kingdom at work if our characterization of the two kingdoms is anywhere near accurate. The evolutionist's picture looks more like a painting of the devil than it does a portrait of God. Indeed, the record shows elements of both kingdoms though the imprint of God's kingdom was so quickly obscured by the Fall.

The advantage of a model such as outlined above is mainly that it can take the "heat" off while we carefully examine the evidence. It is one with which I, for one, can live until we have more facts to go on. It leaves the Genesis story largely intact. It also allows us to take seriously the messages of the rocks and fossils. You see, both accounts could contain truth. They could just be addressing themselves to different aspects of reality, the one a record of the kingdom of darkness, the other the story of God's kingdom, but neither, by itself, complete history. (Haven't we been told that the two books, when properly understood would shed light on each other?)

One final word. In the light of the the Great Controversy, the one thing we cannot allow is the confusion regarding God's character that is resulting from attempts to make God the author of the evolutionary

Prolegomena

process. This is also the implication of spreading out creation week over vast periods of time. Nietzsche's god is not the God of Jesus Christ. Of that there must be no doubt in our minds.

In Karl Menninger's book Whatever Became of Sin? The author relates a variation of the biblical parable of the wheat and tares. It seems that someone sowed tares in the master's wheat field one dark night. When it was discovered the chief steward did his best to find out who was guilty of so dastardly a deed but without success. And then one day one of the servants confessed to him that he knew who was the culprit. The steward in anger berated the man for not coming forward sooner. The servant replied that even now he was afraid to reveal the secret. "I saw him. When he passed me in the darkness I recognized him. It was the master, himself, who sowed the tares in the field." The steward and the servant resolved never to reveal the truth to any man.

No. That is the one thing we cannot allow, that God sowed in His universe the seeds that belong to His adversary. He wouldn't do it. Indeed, He couldn't do it and be a moral God. There must be another way to deal honestly with the evidence and we must find it. The time is late.