

President's introduction

Now as regards this evening's address, it is rather a special occasion, as all must be aware the brotherhood is deeply troubled and concerned over bro Ralph Lovelock's notes on the origin of man. Most of us feel that the very foundations of the truth, as we understand it, is in danger by such an approach as bro Ralph Lovelock's. It is therefore at the request of the Bourneville arranging brethren and also at bro Graham Pearce's suggestion too, that he should deal specifically tonight with these articles or notes by bro Ralph Lovelock on the origin of man, under the general heading, as advertised, Science and the Bible. We have no doubt that we will have an intensely interesting, not to say vital evening and may we all be strengthened in the truth as a result.

Reading 1 Corinthians chapter 2

Science and the Bible – Brother Graham Pearce

My dear brothers and sisters the original intention this evening was of a broader character, to deal in the first half of science generally, and its failure, and the second half to deal with the word of God as an impregnable rock; but as has been said it is agreed to more particularly give our attention to what is troubling us within, from bro Ralph Lovelock's presentation on the origin of man. This must occupy most of our time. I've been a little unhappy about the total of what we did this evening, and therefore I would like to preface that part of the evening by my own expression of faith. I would like, for the first part and for some few minutes to briefly play out on three matters my own confession of faith.

These three matters are: - First on the bible and science; the second on creation (Genesis 1 and 2); and the third on the fall of Genesis chapter 3.

First on the Bible and science

The Bible

I suppose it's about 40 years now that I have been interested in the Bible, studying it day by day and appreciating its wonder and power, and the key word is power, that those who give attention to it whole heartedly, find it is a book which is self-sufficient; self-generating; quite capable of looking after itself; a book from which one can prove what one needs to prove by the comparing of scripture with scripture. A rock upon which he who is most diligent in the consideration of it, in the fear of God, is most secure and most strong. This I have found a wander as a young man, that even in the contentions with men of scientific outlook, one could work from this book alone and they had no answer. This was wonderful. Such is the Bible, but in relation to we mortal men and women who handle the Bible, how fallible and erring we are in relation to that word of God; and one has found from the experience of life so many, many things that men, brethren, put forward with their ideas which they found on the Bible, but which fail because they do not come up to the measure of Paul when he says 'the **whole** council of God.' Man is very fallible he so easily picks a little bit of scripture to support what he wishes to support, and does not take the whole of the word of God. A scientific taking hold of all the evidence.

Science

As for science, (the Bible and science), as for science I suppose my interest runs nearly parallel for nearly 40 years. The 6th form at school I can remember being thrilled with the ideas of science, being given, if I remember rightly, a book by Sir Richard Gregory that had just come out - Discovering the Spirit of Science, which was a in presenting the search for truth, truth for its own sake truth that must be found by honesty and patience, by comparing this with fact by careful experiment, by scientific method, and this seemed to me very well pretty much the same as the Bible readers and I speak for many young men, science and the Bible in this way. Passing through the usual of science I have spent nearly all my life associated with the laboratory and investigational science of things that are largely unknown and you want to know; and these two things have upon me. First that how difficult it is to find the Truth, speaking. How when you have so much knowledge you have to form your theory to get anywhere. You form your ideas of what you think the matter shall be and you do more work and

more facts come along, and how often you find you have to turn right about, foolish it might seem, but the further facts caught you with the light off and ?????? almost the opposite way, it is not unusual, but finding the Truth, very much is the finding of all the facts and how difficult that is. And the second thing that has impressed me with time is the moral integrity that science of this type requires. Moral integrity, the honesty, the purpose of the truth of the matter that you need to know, not to deceive yourself, not to be blinded, not to let yourself believe what you want to believe. How fallible man is in the science as in the Bible is what one finds, that so often you find there are people, just as it were, who haven't even got that honesty and can cover up what they've done and mislead you. Now these two findings have a considerable bearing in the matter of the theory of evolution, which???? Interest. We will find just on looking at the matter later that in the realm of geology and archaeology and anthropology you haven't got in fact sciences. It isn't possible, as you can with physics and chemistry to have it living before you and do experiments this way and that way until you find the truth. This field of evolution it's very, very difficult looking right back into the distant past, with very little that you can do about it to find out the truth. That is the one thing and the second is one as found by the public exposure of it the amazing dishonesty of men that have been associated with science; and not only that, perhaps that's the worst of things, but less than that, how men follow paths according to their feelings for their past beliefs and in fact you will find scientists are just like the religious men which perhaps?????that they have perverted religion as men can pervert so called science. That is my comments on the Bible and Science.

Second my confession of faith in relation to creation itself, the origin of the present world.

There are three possibilities, there are three positions one can hold in regard to a belief in the origin of things; the first straight forward evolution- a gradual progress, (usually held by????? people); the second, what is called Theistic evolution, and third what I will call true creation. Regarding evolution in general, as we know it's around us we will spend no time at all tonight, it is hardly within our purview, it is as we know a varied and theorist as to how by some grave processes things have come from practically nothing, if not nothing, by their own inherent powers and the forces of chance and surrounding circumstance to progress little by little to matters we can't??? What does concern us though is the second possibility, Theistic evolution, this means that such who uphold Theistic evolution, believe in a creator, believe in his divine interventions in the processes of evolution and thus as it were harmonise so called science with the Bible. They see there is, they believe, a development by natural processes, variations, mutations if you like to use the word but they recognize that it's a step from this species, lower animals to something higher, involved a divine intervention by God, an extra something added from God and so on to man. This Theistic evolution is widely held by Christianity around us, it is now considerably held amongst us, there are many of our brethren and sisters who rather vaguely, not having looked at the matter, somehow think this is the answer, that yes science does have its evidence for evolution and there is a God and he has intervened and this must be how things have come into being. Such of you of course has to take Genesis 1 and 2 as somewhat in the form of vision and allegory, not taken in its plain sense. The thing which we have before us this evening of Bro Lovelock's presentation - This is Theistic evolution- and if I may just comment in passing, a view which he expounded in Birmingham here in 1948 the book 'Christianity of Evolution' which is the record of that address given in the Birmingham Central meeting has within it the substance, the elementary substance, of what he is now putting forward, as I say this is something which has been growing within our community.

The third position is that of True creation. And when we say true creation you see the word creation is used by bro Lovelock by the theistic evolutionist quite a lot, they used the word differently as bro Sargent has commented in the Christadelphian. By true creation I am meaning short term, immediate acts of God, the producing from some primary sources by brief and short term action, from which we are quite able to know about in say the miracles of Jesus Christ, there is the wine, the water was poured as it continued to be poured, water became wine, water became wine, or bread became more bread, became more bread, something very simple that is of course, happily as to our view, in an instant more or less.

Now if we???to positions of accepting true creation by God in Genesis 1 and 2 and a kind of divine evolution, lies the question therefore of whether the seven days, six or seven days of Genesis 1 are a literal 24 hours or whether they are vision days, or various ways of expressing the matter, long periods of

time. May I state seven reasons why I believe that they were seven literal days of 24 hours.

I think every one of us will find ourselves now driven to a decision as to whether we really believe in creation in a simple sense, in a literal sense, or whether we believe in evolution, theistic evolution or whatever phrase you like to use. First, the days are clearly recorded there in Genesis 1 as one reads the record it appears to represent action in relation to seven, literal days and the first point I make is that we are not left in doubt as to the kind of days, because the record takes care to describe the kind of days by saying they were evening morning days – evening morning is the Hebrew way of describing 24 hours, and in our language it would be as if one said not just days, but 24 hours. There is a repeated statement again and again pressing it home day after day evening was and morning was. The sense is defined in this way. The second; at least one of the days is undoubtedly literal – the 7th day. Because the 7th day Adam was alive for the whole of that day, because he was made in the 6th day, therefore when you come to measure time for the 7th day it must be in human times, times that relate to Adam; therefore when it says in Genesis chapter 2 that God rested and was refreshed, on the 7th day, that 7th day must be a day as Adam would understand. You cannot conceive Adam as a living man like you and I having a thousand years rest. It doesn't make sense, and the whole point is pressed home as we well know in the ten commandments where they were told 6 days shalt thou labour, the 7th day thou shalt rest, for it goes straight back to the record of Genesis 2, for in the 7th day God rested and was refreshed. So it is in terms of Exodus there are 6 days and there was one day, and we haven't any doubt about what that one day is; and it???? Its strength and meaning from the 7th day of Genesis chapter 2. So at least one of the days is????and if the one why not the rest, 7 literal days, how strange to have one a 24 hour day and the others not. And the very wording of Exodus 20 indicates a similarity between all the days, six days thou shalt labour, seventh day thou shalt not. Third passing from the seventh day to the sixth day, the 6th day, concerned with the most important matters of making animals and making man, that's the substance of the 6th day, and we are told quite clearly in Genesis 2, which is an enlargement, from another angle, of what is in Genesis 1- first that the animals were made out of the ground (verse 19) *'out of the ground the LORD God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam'*, so this making was not an evolutionary making, it was out of the ground and must have been a creative act from primary materials. The other important persons of that day were Adam and Eve and they likewise were formed out of the dust of the ground by a creative act. Therefore because Adam and Eve and the animals of the sixth day are creative acts in the definition of the scripture here, why should we speculate on a thousand years, a hundred thousand years for the doing of it? Time with God and his creation is of no meaning a thousand years is a day, a day of a thousand years. The language is of creation and if of creation than normally in God's creative acts it is by power and immediate action. Now fourthly this I find interesting, to look into the rest of scripture and see what light other inspired writers throw upon the creation. Will you look with me at a number of scriptures. Job chapter 38, God speaking to Job and opens up with him speaking of the wondrous works of God's work in the beginning of things when he laid the foundations, of the earth in verses 4 and 5. Then he passes on to say in this time of God laying the foundations and the corner stones, verse 7, *'When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy'*. Can you imagine the laying of the foundations of the earth occupying many, many thousands of years and the sons of God rejoicing together? The two ideas are incompatible. The sons of God rejoicing together is???? and they can only rejoice together over things just done. Clearly the sense of the wording here is, that some great work being accomplished it becomes an occasion for the sons of God to rejoice, therefore the picture is of something done immediately in the past. While in Job just to note a point or two further, which is of interest, in chapter 39 verse 17, he speaks of the ostrich, *'Because God hath deprived her of wisdom, neither hath he imparted to her understanding'*, one of the creatures evolved strangely by the force of circumstances? NO. Something quite precise that one, not wisdom, not understanding. How can you have a creature thus distinctly different, apart than by the act of creation? A similar phrasing in chapter 41 v12 Leviathan (whatever that may be) *'I will not conceal his parts, nor his power, nor his comely proportion'*, the hand of the artist, (comely proportion doesn't come by evolution), but here is a wonderful animal and God says despite its' power and wonder is comely in shape, a creative act of God. The Psalms psalm 33 v6-9 *'By the word of the LORD were the Heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth. He gathered the waters of the sea together has an heap; he layeth up the depth in store houses, Let all the earth fear the LORD; let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe*

of him. For he spake and it was done; he commanded and it stood fast'. No evolution in that, he laid the foundations of the earth the waters in their place, the storehouses for the water, this phrasing is a little picturesque but we know what it's referring to, it was an act of God, he spake and it was done. Psalm 135 v 7, 8 a little different approach, but very interesting 135 v7 –'He causeth the vapours to ascend from the ends of the earth; he maketh the lightnings for the rain; he bringeth the wind out of his treasures, Who smote the firstborn of Egypt, both of man and of beast'. You see the sense there, he's saying we know what he did in Egypt it was dramatic and power and miracle, and he's equating the two things he set out the heavens by the same hand and power; he did this to the Egyptians. No evolution in that. If you read Psalm 136 you'll find a similar sense. Jeremiah 27 v 5 if you'll look at that you'll find he speaks of God who, was the, let me just get the right phrasing or I might get it incorrectly, to get the full force of the words Jeremiah 27 v5 'I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm and have given it unto whom it seemed meet unto me' By my power and my outstretched arm, that expression of God's creative hand. Used a number of times, it is worth following through what the arm of the LORD means, but it always means revealed power in action. And the sense again here is he acted and he did it. So we have therefore in my fourth group these various scriptures that so clearly show real creative acts for the bringing in of the world as we know it. Reason 5, quite different. The unity and inter-connection of nature that it is not possible to have a slow unfolding of the various orders of life as they now are. Simple, we know how trees need insects for pollination, we know insects need nectar from the flowers to attract them. They're interconnected you can't have the one without the other if you bring the one into being the other must be there; carry on the thought, you've got your insects but you haven't got your birds your insects become a plague which eats everything up. All of nature is inter-balanced, wonderful, if you like to study it, and this involves these things coming into being as a system at a short epoch of time. Sixth reason Genesis chapter 1 has the phrase, after each day more or less, that it was good. God saw that it was good just v 21 as one illustration – after God has done that work which was creating the great whales and every living creature that moveth in the waters and every winged fowl of the air after his kind God saw that it was good. There's a perfection in that action there's no more to be done, it is good in God's eyes. How can there be evolution anymore? If evolution is the basis Theistic or atheistic, things have within them an inherent power to get better there is no stopping, even if you believe in a God as a creative hand behind it evolutionary speaking it must be going to a better state. This says after this time very good, this phrase again indicates the creative hand of God to bring into being those things. And seventh – a totally different line of thought and I believe very important. The Bible is written for simple folk. An important matter from 1 Corinthians ch1 just before the passage we were reading, Paul has those well-known words not many mighty, not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble God hath chosen the foolish, the weak, the small. At a???? the word of God is written for simple folk. Jesus himself, you remember, when the seventy came back, recorded his own view, I thank thee Father thou has hid these things from the wise and the prudent, (the scientist of our day whatever form it may be) and revealed it unto babes. So God's will is the revealing of himself to babes, this is important. Therefore Genesis chapter 1 and 2 is written for simple folk and not for the super scientist; and this means that it's written to be understood in the simple form in which you find it. If you were writing for babes how would you write? In veiled allegories and visions and things you really don't know what it's all about. If you're writing for simple folk you write plainly. And as one reads the account of Genesis 1 in a simple???? It's clear???? I don't believe it but you'll understand it. It clearly says God created day by day. If God does use allegory which he often does in the Bible he says so-reading in Ezekiel 17, Ezekiel opens the chapter an allegory and a parable of the eagle and the cedar tree. If God speaks by vision he says so. Ezekiel chapter 8 – Ezekiel was taken by the spirit of God and in the visions of God to Jerusalem, you know it's a vision. Genesis 1 Genesis 2 does it say visions of God allegories of God? Just a plain simple diction, to my mind it is intensely powerful, that when I read Genesis 1 and 2 it's simple to understand and I know that God has written for simple people and therefore it should be understood in its' simple plain sense. Corinthians chapter 2 which we had read is rather to the point, and that's what I'm saying here, that at the end of that chapter he does say, verses 12, 13 and 14 that the things of God are not received by the spirit of the world, and science is the spirit of the world, with all respect, and no disrespect for using that phrase, they are not known he says by the natural man and the man who knows not God is the natural

man. Therefore we may expect that what we find in Genesis 1 and 2 is not true for the scientist. It speaks of truth and those who are humble scientists, they may exist and God fearing may yet understand of course, but it is written for simple folk. Well that is my reasons for why I believe, and some reasons why I believe in creation as the Bible records it.

Now the third matter which I wish to speak upon, as to how I view it myself, to give something constructive and positive and this is necessary with what we have to look at with brother Lovelock -the fall of chapter 3 and we know in the fall we have got the three elements, man, the serpent and the temptation. Commenting very briefly, to try and give a picture as I see it, man was created by God self-centred, an independent unit of life just as are all the animals. He had inbuilt qualities that could reveal themselves as the desires of the flesh, the desires of the eye and ambition, those qualities that so generally go wrong within us. Basic qualities of his nature which the animals in measure had, the animals of course had only largely those desires of the flesh and not those other qualities leading to ambition that man has. For man of course distinct from the animals, had other higher qualities, those higher faculties of reason and speech, those abilities of appreciation of things more than earthy, things of harmony, things of beauty, things of colour, things higher than the natural mind and additionally too he was given qualities that belong to the moral plain, that he could admire and love and fear God and that he could have a conscience. He was not in a perfected state when made, it was only a beginning, described with all the rest of creation as very good, that means very good for the purpose that lay ahead. On the moral plain his nature was weak and deceivable as events showed. The serpent. The temptation of Adam, the testing of Adam was part of God's plan and he provided this suitably in the form of a serpent. The serpent was made somewhat higher than the ordinary animals for he had reasoning powers and speech. And in fact reasoning powers and speech are those which normally classify man. Powers of reasoning, powers of communication, this the serpent had, but he lacked the qualities of the moral plain and things of high appreciation. And therefore when he reasoned before Eve, he reasoned as best he could, on the limited plain of his abilities, in the words which we find in the text. Third the temptation itself. This no doubt was providentially arranged by God. We read again and again in the scriptures of God bringing to bear test and temptation, upon Abraham for instance, upon Hezekiah, when he would know all that was in his heart and God can providentially bring circumstances to provide a suitable testing. This he did on this occasion through the serpent. The serpent's reasoning we know well because of speculation which had no regard for God, because he knew not God, but the thing is, this line of reasoning found some appeal to Eve. It found a lodgement in her mind and she moved away from the tree and looked at it, and then those innate qualities of her nature were stirred up, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes and the pride of life. James chapter 1 found its' fulfilment in her. Drawn away of her own lust, lust conceived and it brought forth sin. So there was failure. So God allowed man to introduce good and evil into the world, good and evil which God had use for. It was a calamity for man, it was not a calamity in God's eyes, it was part of his purpose. The introduction of good and evil into the world, good and evil and failure, as a basis for character forming; character building; development of Godly characters. This is an important matter, many of you here have heard me speak about it before, the value of failure, when man comes into the situation of having failed then things start to work in the right direction. There is humility, he can no longer stand in his own glory which is natural to himself as an independent being, he is humbled and when he is humbled he has a need and he seeks God. And when God in his mercy responds, gratitude develops and gratitude extends to trust and trust extends to love. And with love there is wholehearted obedience within the scope of man's ability and he becomes indeed a loveable creature himself, a dependant creature in relation to his God. Is this the work that God has for those who will respond to him? The need of good and evil in the world for this period of the probationary span of earth's existence, that men through failure, through weakness may yet overcome and develop godly character. It was not a question of man having done something the wrong way and God having to change his plan. As John chapter 1 shows most clearly the logos was from the beginning, the whole purpose of God was there to go forward in the steps???? As Paul in Romans 11 says the calling and election of God is without repentance. God did not change. Adam, made in the beginning weak and deceivable suitable for what was to follow, bringing ultimately the good that God has in those creatures who knowing good and evil

have learned to???? the good. Just an???? a thought of course of Jesus who is to be the crowning head of all this work of God, we have one made somewhat differently from Adam, one made not so weak, one who was directly the son of God, a wonderful balance????one directly the son of God and having the potential to overcome, to be perfect. But he too learned obedience by the things which he suffered. God's making of character essentially involves this being mixed up with good and evil, this overcoming, this coming out of the states of things we know to the glories of God's grace and rest. It's beautiful and wonderful to see the fitness of all God's work, it's foolishness for men to sort of say 'well it looks as if God was responsible for what Adam did'. God responsible for evil? No rather God responsible for the great good that flows from the temporary evil that the earth will have seen.

Such is my presentation of my own beliefs on these important matters. Time goes so quickly. Now I think it perhaps will be best to spend just another 10 minutes or so for me to outline the thesis of bro Lovelock, so that after our interval we can start then straight away with examining it. I think that is the better thing to do than to stop just now.

Now in setting out what bro Lovelock believes in his thesis we have the advantage that I did put on to paper what I thought he believed. I went to see him with what I thought he believed in the form of charts rather similar to this, I discussed it with him for 2 or 3 hours, I got the matters corrected that I may have had wrong, and since that time, as some of you may know, he was at Oxford and I was at Oxford and this matter was gone over and he was present and after I had outlined what I understood as his belief, he said yes this was a quite fair statement. So whereas I think you will find the notes so very difficult to really piece together in places, I think we can cut all that very short by just going over briefly the charts we have in front of us which do present us with????

Chart one is his presentation of Genesis ch1, he believes of course that these were vision days and that the language is used to describe????long periods of times, he believes substantially in all that science puts forward and there is a list of what???? of science speaks of the knowledge it thinks it has of times passed. That is taken from bro Lovelocks notes; it doesn't differ particularly from any other scheme it goes from????500 million years and against that scheme I have taken from his book, the placing of some of the days, at least, as to how they would fit in, in other words the third day of Genesis chapter one is the time when these???? comes into being, the fifth day reptiles and importantly on the sixth day is animals and man. So we have more or less the sixth day starting about 100 million years ago. The making of man himself would be something in the order of a ¼ million years back. His views are what I have described as theistic evolution, he himself avoids the word evolution, whether fairly or unfairly it's not for me to say. But describing what he means he believes that the basic times described in Genesis 1 were initiated by divine interference in the processes of what were going on. That there is an evolving development of things. But that to get from the lower form of life to the next higher form of life, this can't come about, science proves in fact it can't come about, an upgrading by natural forces, but he says that God interfered in natural processes to bring about a change and so comes step by step upwards. And that in addition to a progress by divine intervention, you also have a considerable development through natural variation; variation of natural processes the operation of established laws producing variation and progress. So applying this to the important matter of man to whom we are really concerned, (the origin of man). Man would start when it says 'let us make man in our image,' would start with an intervention of God in some way, and man would therefore be in his first form of this time, somewhat more than any animal that had existed. Man would have come from the animals, but would be more than the animals. And having thus initiated what they would call homo-sapiens, a basic crude man, as you might say, in the beginning of things, then from that point of time man will progress by natural variation to get better and better, so you will have, as shown here, that man's progress goes right forward into the future. And the wording let us make man in our likeness and in our image, means a making that is still going on. The making of man is still going on until eventually he will be in God's image and he will be very good and he will be perfect. It's using the scripture to cover an evolutionary development with God intervening at intervals. Now this as I commented is more or less outlined in 1948

very briefly in that book. Now as to when this let us make man began, I think he would not put it back so early as this at all, he would put it probably 50.000 years when man, as we know man in the form of his present shape would come into being and probably these he would call animals, but this I wouldn't know for certain. He did speak about it but wasn't clear himself. Now Genesis 2 which speaks of making Adam in v7 is a distinct and different matter from Genesis 1. The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. This was the making of an actual, individual Adam at an epoch in time some 6 or 8000 years ago. Genesis 2 he takes as more or less historical ideas, that at an epoch in time an Adam and an Eve were made; this is confusing to you I know, but one must get clear in one's mind that when it says in Genesis 1 v26 that God said let us make Adam in our image and in our likeness he calls that the making of the Adam race and isn't the thing of a moment, but a period of thousands and thousands of years that making, the making of an Adam race still going on into the future. But when it says in Genesis 2 he formed Adam of the dust of the ground, that was an Adam individual who was formed at that time. As to the detail of Genesis 2 he does not take it literally it's a vision, picture language, and whereas you and I would probably think that forming man of the dust of the ground and breathing into his nostril the breath of life was a description of a method of man coming into being made from primary elements and then being in the form of man, as he will be in the resurrection and then being given life at a point in time, he has nothing like that at all in mind. To him Adam personal was derived from the Adams then existing, he was one of the race then existing and God added a little something to him. He was made better, higher than the others by a something God gave to him, by which he could have an association with God. And for bro Lovelock, let us God made man from the dust of the ground, is to tell you that he was of common origin he wasn't made of gold or something enduring he was of common origin like the animals. In fact he equates him with the animals because in v19 it says out of the ground God formed the beasts, it just says of common origin no more than that. And when one asks what does breathed into his nostrils the breath of life mean, he does not provide any answer. The garden, he takes as a literal geographical place, he spent some time in referring to Eden, the tree he takes as a literal tree,???? Eve he takes as indeed out of Adam. Taken out of Adam, a person formed out of Adam, but when we read how she was formed, a rib taken, a sleep upon Adam, flesh opened, a rib taken out, flesh closed. Eve formed, this to him is picture language which he confesses he doesn't know what it means, but be sure it doesn't mean that God was creating Eve in this way. His words are 'this is not a detailed account of method, one cannot say what if any are the anatomical significance of these words.' And he thinks perhaps it's put in this way to suggest the relationship of Jesus Christ and his Bride. This of course one finds very shattering and bewildering, but what seems such plain Language can't possibly mean what it says, and he provided no worthwhile alternative.

Chapter 3 gives us the serpent and the temptation, this is historical likewise as Adam and Eve themselves, not a precise serpent, a precise occasion a thing happening, but again???? something????over considerable time and here the serpent has an important meaning it is a symbol and it is a symbol of the Adam race that has been in existence for a long time before Adam personal came on the scene. He doesn't think that a serpent was there at all really, it was a vision, and just as in Revelation 12 you a dragon which was not a real animal, but a picture animal to describe things then, he supposes that something similar was portrayed on this occasion. The actual temptation did take place he believes, but the serpent is symbolic and the sentence on the serpent is also symbolic, when it says upon thy belly shalt thou go, cursed above all cattle, shalt thou be thus, shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. This he takes as being an allegorical symbolical sentence and the rest of this part of Genesis 3 is literal.

So that we have then what is put before us I think, I hope clearly in chart 2 covering what he believes and emphasising therefore there are two streams of life. There is the Adam race of chapter 1. Let us make Adam in our image, which started back at some point over 50000 years ago when some sort of homo-sapiens came into being, which have been by variation progressing until eventually it will become in the image of God very good and perfect. Then he has a second matter in Genesis chapter 2, the creation of an individual Adam and an individual Eve who were derived from these people, but by divine

intervention, and he illustrates the sort of thing he has in mind by referring to Jesus, how God intervened in the formation of Jesus that Jesus was not by natural parents but the spirit of God came upon Mary, that's an intervention of God; so an intervention of God produced an Adam and Eve which were on a somewhat higher level than the people around them and were for the first time capable of association with God. Now unfortunately I see there is one thing I left behind me among the things and that was the Christadelphian of September, never mind in it there was a quotation which I can almost quote to you from memory. He is emphasising the distinction between the two peoples, the race of Adam and Eve, and Adam and Eve, he says physically that they would be of the same species, but such a difference as between a wolf and a dog, and then when he comes to describe their difference on a moral plain, he puts the one as being without any knowledge or????? ability to seek and be connected with God, and the other to be Adam himself now prepared and able to enter into association with God, with conscience and the ability to take on God's ideas. I'm sorry I haven't that brief quotation but nevertheless it is all before us here, where I have gone to the trouble of extracting from his text the phrases that pick out the clear distinctions of the two classes. The Adam race is like the beast of the field, not in covenant with God, not in contact with God not seeking God. But the Adam and Eve and his descendants they are chosen from the race, taken by God at the commencement of his relationship with man, selected and divinely modified members of the race, a different race among mortal men in????? Later on this in the forming of Adam and Eve, the beginning of the call of man to salvation. And he ??????the phrase supermen having longevity a master race,????? wisdom. Those too which were so succinctly???in his phrase in the Christadelphian, put before us clearly two distinct groups and streams of life, connected, the one derived from the other and this becomes????? to Genesis 1 and Genesis 2, so that in a sense we have what he calls harmonizing the Bible with science, others would call it compromising the Bible with science. Genesis 1 he lets go to science and Genesis 2 he puts forward to the bible things of man and salvation and proposes that these two streams of life are a harmony within in the Bible.

Now after the interval it will be my task to analyse this and to see whether in fact it fits the account, whether it fits the rest of scripture, and whether in can in fact be squared with the basic doctrines of salvation.