

- <sup>71</sup>Lindsay, R. B., 1968. Physics—to what extent is it deterministic? *American Scientist* 56 (2): 100-111.
- <sup>72</sup>Blum, H., 1955. Perspectives in evolution. *American Scientist* 43 (4): 595-610.
- <sup>73</sup>Asimov, I., 1970. In the game of energy and thermodynamics, you can't break even. *Smithsonian Institution Journal*. June, p. 6.
- <sup>74</sup>Simpson, G. G., and W. S. Beck, 1965. Life . . . an introduction to

biology. Harcourt, Brace, and World, New York. P. 466.

- <sup>75</sup>Maatman, R.W., 1970. The Bible, natural science, and evolution. Reformed Fellowship, Grand Rapids, Michigan. P. 129.
- <sup>76</sup>Prigogine, Ilya, Gregoire Nicolis, and Agnes Babloyantz, 1972. Thermodynamics of evolution. *Physics Today* 25 (11): 23-28.
- <sup>77</sup>Morowitz, Reference 47, p. 7.

## THE STORY OF EVOLUTION IN BIBLICAL STYLE

E. THEODORE AGARD\* AND CHARLES D. HOWES\*\*

Received 26 July 1978

*The story of evolution, as it is commonly presented, is put into a literary style similar to that of the Biblical account of creation. The days of creation are replaced by "ages" of evolution. The role of "time" as the medium in which faith is exercised to bridge the supernatural gaps in the evolutionary theory, is emphasized by the use of "Tempus", the Latin word for time, as if it were the name of a god. When the two accounts are thus compared in similar literary forms, evolution appears to be no more scientific than creation. It is therefore suggested that there is abundant evidence for a creation-based "scientific" theory of the origin of this earth and of the life upon it. The indications are that such an approach could have a better scientific structure than evolution. The details could readily be worked out if the same level of financial support could be obtained for the creation approach.*

### Introduction

A theory of the origin of this earth based on the story of creation as recorded in the first chapter of Genesis in the Christian Bible, is commonly rejected by supporters of evolution theories, on the grounds that this Biblical account should be regarded as a myth since it lacks a proper scientific structure. It is often overlooked that the Bible is not primarily a scientific textbook and was not written primarily for that purpose. Consequently, only the basic outlines of the story are presented, necessary for the establishment of a link between the origin of man and his spiritual destiny, which is the main theme of the Bible.

So much scientific thought and financial support has been given to the development of the evolution theory that it is not surprising to find it presented with an apparently better scientific structure. This article is designed to point out that evolution theory appears to be no less mythical than creation theory, when it is presented in the same format. The implication is that creation may also be found to have an acceptable scientific structure, if given the appropriate treatment.

Wherever gaps exist in the theory of evolution for which there is no sound scientific support, "time" is usually invoked as the medium in which faith is exercised, to resolve the difficulties. It can therefore be concluded that "time" serves a similar role in the theory of evolution, to that attributed to God by creationists. Hence the use of the term "Tempus", the Latin word for "time", in the narrative that follows where the story of evolution is presented in similar style to the Biblical account of creation.

The "days" of creation are replaced by "ages" of evolution. The first two ages correspond to the pre-geologic period. Events associated with the pre-Cambri-

an era make up the third age, the Paleozoic follows in the fourth age, the Mesozoic is identified with the fifth age and finally the Cenozoic with the sixth age. The evolutionary sequences of events differ in some respects from those in the Genesis account and parallels them in others, but the presentation of the theory of evolution in this literary form puts it in perspective in relation to creation, and emphasizes the role of faith in "Tempus".

### Narrative

In the beginning Tempus evolved space and a mass.

And the mass was exceedingly large and very dense and darkness filled the entire space. And the spirit of Tempus moved about the mass.

And Tempus caused the mass to explode, and there was a great big bang.

And Tempus was satisfied with the fragments resulting from the explosion as they receded at exceedingly high speeds. And Tempus separated the fragments from each other, placing each in its own path and grouping them.

And Tempus selected a special disk-shaped group of fragments, and called the largest and brightest portion near the center the sun. He then selected a special part for occupation and named it the earth. And the time that elapsed was the first age.

And Tempus caused an atmosphere to form about the earth, to separate the earth from outer space.

And Tempus caused water to escape from the congealing surface of the earth as it cooled, and much water rained upon it but some remained in the atmosphere.

Thus Tempus divided the waters.

And Tempus called the moist atmosphere Sky. And the time that elapsed was the second age.

And Tempus caused the earth's crust to sag in places, and the waters gathered together there.

So dry land appeared, great mountains formed and in some places the dry land parted and drifted as it was separated by the waters.

And Tempus called the dry land Earth, the gathering together of waters he called the Seas; and Tempus was satisfied with the outcome.

\*E. Theodore Agard, Ph.D., is a Radiation Physicist at the Kettering Medical Center, Dayton, Ohio 45429.

\*\*Charles D. Howes, Ph.D., is Technical Director of Loma Linda Foods, 13246 Wooster Road, P.O. Box 388, Mount Vernon, Ohio 43050.