

views were gaining adherents, but a sizeable percentage of evangelicals still accepted either the gap theory or the day-age theory of creation--or a combination of the two. However, a considerable number of evangelicals felt that a precise interpretation of the Biblical account of creation was unnecessary, and that it would be better for Christians to let such matters be handled by professionals of the scientific world. It was felt that perhaps the first chapter of Genesis gives us only the bare information that God was the author of creation, together with spiritual lessons which might be drawn from this fact. The number which hold this view has continued to increase up to the present time.

Soon after the midpoint of the century the seeds of a sizeable revival of the old "flood geology" view began to germinate. Many of the basic problems which we mentioned at the beginning of Chapter 10 began to be in evidence, even as they were in the 18th and 19th centuries. Lack of acquaintance with the methods and results of scientific research, among the clergy and among theological students; and the tendency to avoid the task of integrating the discoveries of science into one's own theological system, were two of the more prominent contributing factors in this revival of "flood geology." At the start of this resurgence of the old view, a few fundamentalists began to intensively use George M. Price's books on the Flood view of geology,¹⁶ and to study older theological writers concerning the effects of the Biblical Flood. As a result of this trend, we now have several rather vocal groups of fundamentalists who are giving much the same negative response to the geologic evidence for age as the theologians of the early 19th century did. They are unfamiliar with the evidence, and usually feel that it would be improper for them to make a serious study of it. Most of them seem to be honest in their contention that the Bible is the only source-book needed when it comes to studying the past history of the earth.

The willingness of these fundamentalists to take an anti-science stance with regard to the past undoubtedly has been enhanced by the fact that several segments of the scientific community have, during the past decade, come under heavy fire from the general public. (This has been seen in the frequent condemnation of scientists for doing work which has led to the production of destructive weapons, and to pollution of our environment.) Another factor contributing to their lack of confidence in science is that many scientists frequently have promoted their theories and hypotheses too boldly, and have failed to properly communicate their data to the public. A third enhancing factor has been the (mistaken) feeling that somehow the evidence for great age in the earth is inseparably tied to the theories of evolution. And, since the theories of evolution have so many obvious weaknesses, it is felt that the evidence for time should be disregarded along with evolutionary theories. With reference to this position, there is a failure to realize that even though many geologists do make the facts regarding age a part of their own evolutionary system, their use of the facts in this way does not invalidate or "contaminate" the evidences for age. No human being can invalidate any part of God's natural record by misusing it.