

Table A1.1. Six Models of Origins

Rau, G. (2012). Mapping The Origins Debate. Nottingham, England: Inter-Varsity Press, England.

Names						
Used by Rau	Naturalistic Evolution (NE)	Nonteleological Evolution (NTE)	Planned Evolution (PE)	Directed Evolution (DE)	Old-Earth Creation (OEC)	Young-Earth Creation (YEC)
General	materialistic evolution	theistic evolution	theistic evolution	theistic evolution	progressive creation	recent creation
Label used by opponents (submodels)			evolutionary creation		day-age creation, gap model	scientific creation
Label used by opponents ¹	Darwinism	Darwinism, deistic evolution			creationism	creationism
Basic Propositions						
Scientific process	random, spontaneous, natural processes	universe created, then undirected natural processes	universe created perfectly, no subsequent intervention		major body plans created separately	each kind created separately
Interpretation of Genesis account	ancient myth, no God	ancient myth, God exists	nonconcordist, ² Adam and Eve not individuals	nonconcordist, Adam and Eve are individuals	concordist, days extended	concordist, days literal
Distinguishing Features						
Theology?	no supernatural	Creator	Creator	Creator	Creator	Creator
Teleology?	no purpose	no purpose	purpose	purpose	purpose	purpose
Intervention?	no intervention	no intervention	no intervention	intervention	intervention	Intervention
Genealogy?	common descent	common descent	common descent	common descent	<i>de novo</i> creation	<i>de novo</i> creation
Cosmology?	old universe	old universe	old universe	old universe	old universe	recent creation
Underlying Philosophy						
Theology	atheistic, agnostic ³	monotheistic, deistic, other ⁴	monotheistic	monotheistic	monotheistic	monotheistic
Relationship between science and religion ⁵	overlapping or complementary domains: ⁶ religion inferior	complementary domains: equal	complementary domains: each superior in its area	interacting domains: each superior in its area	Interacting domains: equal	overlapping or complementary domains: ⁷ religion superior
Methodology of science	naturalism: only natural causes	methodological naturalism: only natural causes	methodological naturalism: only natural causes	open inquiry: best natural or supernatural cause	open inquiry: best natural or supernatural cause	imperfect inquiry: secondary to perfect revelation

Table A1.6. Modern Proponents of Each Model

Names

	Naturalistic Evolution (NE)	Nonteleological Evolution (NTE)	Planned Evolution (PE)	Directed Evolution (DE)	Old-Earth Creation (OEC)	Young-Earth Creation (YEC)
Authors⁸	Dawkins Dennett Gould Mayr Scott Wilson	Barbour de Duve Haught	Collins Galk Lamoureux Miller Van Till	Behe Haarsma Schaefer	Kenyon Meyer Newman Ross	Austin Nelson Bergma Oard n Reynold s Brown Ham Sanford Humphr Sarfati eys Wise Morris
Organization s⁹	Berkeley ENSI NCSE TalkOrigins		Biologos		RTB	AIG CMI CRS ICR

Multiple-Model Position					Intelligent Design (ID)¹⁰	
Authors					Dembski Johnson O'Leary	Wells Woodward
Organization					ARN DICSC	IDN ISCID

¹ This highlights the dichotomy in the public debate. The two middle positions are more recent (both popularized since 1995). Each has been classified by opponents with the extremes (Darwinism or creationism), but there are significant difference, as shown by comparing the following distinguishing features.

² See appendix 2 for a comparison of concordist and nonconcordist positions. Interpretations of Adam and Eve tend to follow this pattern, but there are exceptions.

³ Many adherents of NE are secular humanists, an atheistic religion that is essentially existentialist.

⁴ Traditional polytheistic religions rarely try to harmonize their creation story with science. . Thus they effectively mirror NTE or YEC positions: either the two represents different realms, answering different questions (as NTE) or the religious teaching is held to be correct based on its inherent merit (as YEC). Many other religions, including Easter pantheism and New Age reach the same conclusions but for a different reason, contending that the physical is illusory. Since they do not normally attempt to explain the scientific evidence in light of their religious beliefs, they are not part of the debate and thus are not included here, but logically would present arguments mirroring on of these two positions.

⁵ Overlapping means the whole truth can be known by either empirical (scientific) or nonempirical (religious) methods. If this is the case, one must provide a better explanation, eclipsing the other. Diagrammatically, this could be shown as the overlap of two full circles. Complementary means that each tells us about something different, using different methodologies to answer different questions, the perceived relative importance of each differs among models. Diagrammatically this could be shown as two half circles. Interacting means that although each is primarily responsible for one area, the other still has something important to contribute to that area. Diagrammatically, this could be illustrated by a symbol shaped like the yin/yang.

⁶ Overlapping = atheism, complementary = agnosticism

⁷ Overlapping = do not support ID; interacting = support ID

⁸ This list is by no means complete, but will serve as a starting place to identify some of the more prolific and better-known authors.

⁹ Organizations: NE: Understanding Evolution (Berkeley), Evolution and the Nature of Science Institutes, National Center for Science Education, Talk Origins Archive; PE: Biologos Institute; OEC: Reasons to Believe; YE: Answers in Genesis, Creation Ministries International, Creation Research Society, Institute for Creation Research; ID: Discovery Institute Center for Science and Culture, Intelligent Design Network, Access Research Network, International Society for Complexity Information and Design

¹⁰ These authors promote intelligent design, which is compatible with any of the last three models, rather than a specific scientific model. Some author who do take a position on a particular model (Behe, Kenyon, Meyer) also support IF. Not all those in either DE or YEC would support ID. See chapter 2, sec 2.2.4 for further explanation.