

influence over its Biblical exegesis.

The *Scientific Creationist View* takes both the Biblical and the scientific data in their integrity, and then attempts a synthesis of them. Its chief problems lie in at least four directions: (1) the problem of maintaining the proper order of priorities; (2) the problem of the amount of weight to be accorded to the scientific data wherever those data bear upon theological understanding; (3) the problem of the relative certainty of our understanding of the Biblical facts on the one hand, and our understanding of the scientific facts on the other; and (4) the problem of the achievement of a fine balance between the interpretation of both sets of data. However, the problems are not insuperable obstacles; they are simply methodological safeguards, which proponents of the Scientific Creationist View must be careful to observe.

The *Anti-Scientific Creationist View*, although it attempts to do justice to the Biblical data, does not do justice to the scientific data, but actively rejects or speculatively reinterprets them. As a consequence, it does justice to neither set of data. Having rejected God's General Revelation of his creative activity as a possible source of truth, in favor of a supposed ideal of objective, certain, clear understanding of God's Special Revelation in Scripture, this view must of necessity be characterized by a distortion and emasculation of the truth of the doctrine of Creation. Having begun by denying the theological value of God's Revelation in nature, the Anti-Scientific Creationist View ends by misinterpreting both God's Revelation in Scripture and His Revelation in nature.

We are thus brought face to face with the question of which of these Creationist views to adopt. At this point I must confess that the Non-Scientific Creationist View, the Theistic Evolutionist View, and the Anti-Scientific Creationist View, because of their failure to do justice to both the Biblical and the scientific data in their integrity, are unacceptable views of God's creative activity, at least to me personally and professionally. As to the Scientific Creationist View, a variety of this view has thus far appeared to synthesize, to my satisfaction, both the theological and the scientific elements in the doctrine of Creation.

At long last, therefore, I come to the "proposal" part of my topic, "A Proposed Creationist Alternative to Evolutionism." This proposal has two parts, the first rather brief, and the second somewhat more extensive. In