

Creation, Evolution, and Intelligent Design

Seongchan Jang

There have been four major views on God's creation, which are Young Earth Creationism, Old Earth Creationism, Evolutionary Creation, and Intelligent Design. Although they all confess their commitment to the Scriptures and admit that God is the creator of the universe, their interpretation and attitudes towards what we call science vary, especially in terms of the process of God's creation.

Ham, who supports Young-Earth Creationism, asserts that Genesis 1-11 should be read literally, meaning that it took a week for God to create the universe, that God's original creation was cursed due to Adam's fall, and that the earth was once destroyed by flood. He points out that the dark-light-alteration proves that day in the creation account literally means a day. He also adds that if God's creation had taken place over a long-stretched period, a day wouldn't have been used. He also notes that the Sabbath commandment in Exodus 20 is aligned with God's rest on the seventh day after the completion of His creation, proving that day in Genesis 1 literally means a day. Another interesting comment made by Ham is that there is no way to verify the length of period before death and suffering began.

While Ross, who takes the view of Old Earth Creationism, agrees that proving the historical accuracy of Genesis 1-11 is the key to guiding people to faith in Christ, he believes that there is a significant time lapse implied by the void in Genesis 1:2 between the primordial earth and the first day of God's creation. In addition, he notes that the

verb used in Exodus 20 is not “created”, but “made” or “fashioned” in Hebrew, implying that God’s creation is not an instant incident, but His craftsmanship over a long period of time. Thus, the account of six-day account of God’s creation should be viewed as the final phase of God’s creation. He also notes that there is no phrase, “And there was an evening and there was a morning before the seventh day” is mentioned. He also adds that scientific findings affirm that the history of the universe is over billions of years. Radiometric dating along with other scientific ways of measuring the age of the earth is too concrete to be dismissed. Therefore, he concludes that adherence to Young Earth Creationism conflicts not only with science but also with the Scripture. Instead, he claims that there should be more efforts to constructively integrate the Scripture and science.

Meyer, who takes the side of Intelligent Design, points out that the sun and the moon, which are a primary indicator of night and day were created on the fourth day of God’s creation, asserting that God’s way of counting the time is not the same as our way of counting it. He also quotes Psalm 90:4, “A thousand years in your sight are like a day,” claiming that it shows that God’s perception of time differs from ours. He maintains that at least the first three days of God’s creation prior to the sun and the moon should not be reckoned in a 24-hour frame.

Ham goes on to point out that the means of God’s creation in the Scriptures was His speaking and that all the creatures were complete and functional right from the beginning. He also notes that the order of God’s creation in Genesis 1 conflicts the chronological order of events suggested by the evolutionary view of the universe of life. On the contrary, evolutionary creationists suggest that the fact humans have so much in

common with other creatures including social behaviors and aspects of the intelligent, will, and emotion is a strong proof that they share the common ancestor as their source. Moreover, she maintains that God as the creator can also be viewed at the creator of the evolution mechanism in a broader sense. However, Ross finds this claim absurd on the ground of the distinctive account allocated to depicting the origin of humans as a spiritual being alone out of all the creatures.

Ham also maintains that the genre of the passage is historical account, not poetry, parable, prophetic vision, and mythology. He argues that the names, places, and events contained the passage are real, and it proves that Genesis 1-11 is historical narrative. However, Haarsma, who believes in Evolutionary Creation, claims that the passage is designed for the readers who didn't have access to modern science. She argues that unlike Ham's argument, Genesis 1-11 contains and utilizes imagery and metaphors, which were common in the ancient Near East for those readers. Therefore, she asserts that it is imperative to interpret the passage in the light of scientific findings and knowledges, especially if the account is not entirely clear and has room for multiple interpretations. She believes that this type of attempts and efforts should not be regarded as an anti-biblical act. Moreover, she states that in face of an unsurmountable pieces of scientific evidence, clinging to the literal interpretation of God's creation and ignoring other possibilities of looking at the same account will only make it more difficult for reasonable people to accept the Christian faith.

Ham goes on to argue that despite the possible omission of names in the genealogies in Genesis, the span of time covered is not affected because there is no

missing years in the numeric calculations. On the contrary, Ross claims that the genealogy in Genesis is not complete.

There has been a heated debate on whether the flood in Genesis is regional or global. Unlike Ham, Ross argues that marine fossils that were found on Mount Everest are not enough to prove that the flood in Genesis was global on the ground that the mountain was once under the ocean and was elevated later.

Ham also argues that there is increasing scientific evidence that supports and confirms that the account in Genesis 1-11 is literally true. Yet, the others claim that they also have sufficient pieces of scientific proofs and findings.

Personal Thoughts

Outside the realm of Christianity, evolution has generally been viewed as more scientific and rational compared to God's creation. It seems that as much as I looked down on the idea that the monkey evolved to the human, I have encountered a lot of people who find it absurd to believe that the universe was created by the speaking of God. I must agree that clinging to God's creation against evolution theory is one of the biggest obstacles to having faith in Christ. It is also true that an unsurmountable amount of so-called scientific findings seems to suggest that the account of God's creation in Genesis looks obsolete and irrational. Therefore, I feel that it is worth scrutinizing the account of God's creation in the scripture and testing the validity of it against the evidence presented by those who deny it.

I personally liked the attempts to explain the age of the universe which mainstream science claims to be older than six thousand years. I also agree that we the believers should bear the responsibility to examine the Scripture thoroughly against scientific findings in order to facilitate faith in Christ. It would be utterly irresponsible for Christians not to make any efforts to prove that the account of the Scripture is not contrary to science.

I also agree that if there is room for multiple interpretations, to take scientific findings into account is an absolute necessity. Although I cannot agree with the interpretation that six-day creation account should not be taken literally, I found it legitimate to suggest that there was an unknown period between the initial creation of God and six-day creation by God as the final phase. However, some of the interpretations, especially by evolutionary creationists, seem to dismiss the authority of the Scripture and put more weight on the cultural context than on the account in it. Especially, their claim that the creation account in Genesis is designed for the readers who didn't have scientific knowledge and should not be interpreted literally seems too far-fetched and contrary to the commitment to the Scripture.