

ical makeup, change to another one? Is that part of your question?

Would it give rise to future generations of another organism?

I don't think so. What evolution tries to state is that when these mutations enter in - and some of them are so minute and so undetectable that you don't know when they're occurring and when they don't. We are not changing in this process. At least the biologist doesn't know this yet - no change in chromosome number. What we are changing is a characteristic, a chemical change in the gene itself. And the genes are the determiners for hair color, for eye color, for size of ears, and so forth. And suddenly some of these things crop up that can be only explained under those terms.

I don't know which of the scientists wants to answer this. I wanted to ask two questions. I wanted to ask if there isn't an agreement between the age of man and plant and animal as determined by the biologist or archaeologist or whoever the scientist may be, is there agreement with Genesis 1? And secondly I wanted to ask if it isn't agreed that ~~XXX~~ many biologists, the theory of evolution that they live by, is simply a evolution within a broad species and doesn't attempt to explain creation or doesn't conflict with Genesis 1.

I'll take the first half of that. As far as correlation of the age of man, or the age of plants, or the age of the earth, with Genesis 1 - I find no problem of correlation, particularly in the light of Dr. MacRae's discussion of dating which we have perhaps grown up with. I think it's a matter of order of magnitude. The Scripture indicates that man is younger than the animals and the animals are younger than plants and that plants are younger than the earth. And I think that the investigations of the scientists will bear out those facts. Now I find no conflict in accepting Genesis 1 and the account of creation, also accepting the observations of science, geology, or astronomy, or archaeology.

End of Record 9