

Letters

communities. Looking back to well-trodden church and denominational pronouncements may prove less helpful than frequently thought, especially where these have not been informed by nuanced scientific input.

Notes

¹R. Boomsma, "Embryonic Stem Cells and a Reformed Christian World View," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 56, no 1 (2004): 38–48.

²A. Teo and D. Calbreath, "Embryonic Stem Cells and a Reformed Christian World View: A Response to Robert Boomsma," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 58, no 3 (2006): 179–88.

D. Gareth Jones
ASA Fellow
Department of Anatomy and Structural Biology
University of Otago
Dunedin, New Zealand
gareth.jones@stonebow.otago.ac.nz

Seeking the Emergence of Created Man and Woman

We continue to seek the emergence of created humans. It has been more than a year since the above article was published in this journal (*PSCF* 58, no. 3 [2006]: 196–215). This theory of human origin was presented, anticipating evaluation from experts in the human-origins fields of study. The article presents evidence for the extinction of *Homo sapiens* during and following the Last Ice Age; and for the repopulation of the earth since 10,000 BC by the descendants of God's created, biblical Adam and Eve. This theory is diametrically opposed to the popular theory that we are all descendants of the apes and *Homo sapiens*.

In the year since publication of the article (which combines evolution and God's creation), we have not seen criticism in favor or opposed (except for one expert who supports Young-Earth Creation; and Peter Rüst's consideration of this theory in his article about the nature of Adam in the September 2007 issue of *PSCF*). However, in the meantime, we have gained some related insight into the academic fields of human origins. That insight comes from writings published in *PSCF* as follows:

- The title of Dean Arnold's December 2006 article, "Why Are There So Few Christian Anthropologists? Reflections on the Tension between Christianity and Anthropology," is self-explanatory.
- Two related conference talks in the June 2007 issue are: "Warfare and Wedlock: Redeeming the Faith-Science Relationship" by Ian Hutchinson; applies the term wedlock to the faith-science relationship for the natural sciences, where reproducibility and clarity (universal agreement) prevail; but also suggests that theories in history (his example, and I would add origin fields) where singular discoveries or events from the past cannot be reproduced, do not always have clarity. In my reading in human-origins fields, discoveries can be interpreted by different theories, e.g., there does not seem to be agreement on what caused the drastic cultural changes that came in the Developed Neolithic (beginning c. 9000 BC) or on why they occurred at that time.
- "The Professor and the Pupil: Addressing Secularization and Disciplinary Fragmentation in Academia" by Calvin DeWitt; suggesting that secularization and frag-

mentation in a study field can detract from addressing the big questions in that field and can result in ignoring ethical and spiritual levels.

Can we conclude from the above insights that when considering a major shift in human origins theory that includes creation by God, it could be difficult and inconclusive to attempt to reject or accept the theory and it would be more practical to ignore the theory?

The essence of "Seeking the Emergence of Created Man and Woman" acknowledges God's creation of the universe taken from Gen. 1:1 and God's creation of first life billions of years later; and accepts the theory of evolution combined with God's creation events of first life and a later creation of Adam and Eve. Extinction of *Homo sapiens* was derived from a different interpretation of published discoveries and theories concerning origins covering the last 15,000 years. The usual interpretation of that period supports cultural continuity of *Homo sapiens*. Support for the timely repopulation of the Earth by God's created humans is taken from convincing indications of God's Spirit being present, as seen in the first art works in different regions around the world beginning c. 8000 BC.

The article has now been placed on the ASA website along with the other 2006 journal articles (www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/2006/PSCF9-06dyn.html). We continue to seek expert evaluation from origins and faith sources, but with the assumption of silent approval, the next step is promoting internet exposure of this theory of God's creation to an interested public. Discussion seeking the truth about God's creating acts is needed for comparison to the theory that we humans are descendants of the apes and *Homo sapiens*.

Robert C. Schneider
ASA Member
66 St. Andrews
Hattiesburg, MS 39401
banddschneider@msn.com

The Gap in Creation

As an old earth creationist, I respond to certain issues raised in the Seely-Ross exchange (*PSCF* 59, no. 1 [2007]: 37–54). My view that Gen. 1:1 refers to the creation of the universe and a global earth (cf. e.g., Pss. 121:2; 124:8),¹ on which there was a succession of different "worlds" (Gen. 2:4; Heb. 1:2; 11:3); that there is then an undisclosed gap in time between the first two verses of Genesis (cf. the gap in Isa. 61:1,2 till "the day of vengeance," Luke 4:18,19); that Gen. 1:2a describes a destruction event (cf. similar phraseology in Isa. 34; Jer. 4); and that this was followed by the creation of a new world in six literal 24-hour days (Exod. 20:8–11); accords with the majority gap school interpretation (Thomas Chalmers, et al.). However, my view that the flood of Gen. 1:2 was a local deluge, which was then followed by a local creation on the local earth (Gen. 41:56; Matt. 12:42) under the local heaven (Deut. 2:25; Col. 1:23) of Eden's world (Luke 2:1; Rom. 1:8) in six 24-hour days (Gen. 2:10–14), is a minority gap school view (Pye Smith, Henry Alcock, et al.).² The better known majority gap school view, which is contrary to established scientific facts, is that of a global flood and global creation in Gen. 1:2ff.