Walla Walla University: The Collegian Debates Evolution vs. Creation
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By Sean Pitman The Collegian, the school paper for Walla Walla University, just published an entire spread on the topic of evolution vs. creation with student authors from multiple departments contributing (Link). An interesting survey was also published primarily reflecting the beliefs of WWU...
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The Collegian, the school paper for Walla Walla University, just published an entire spread on the topic of evolution vs. creation with student authors from multiple departments contributing (Link). An interesting survey was also published primarily reflecting the beliefs of WWU students on the topic of origins (a smaller percentage of faculty, staff, and alumni were also included in the survey).

While opinions both for and against the traditional Seventh-day Adventist perspective on origins (Link) were published in this issue, most of the articles seemed to undermine the importance of teaching the validity of a truly literal six-day creation week – despite the historically position of the Church that the literal nature of the six-day creation week is “fundamental” to the faith of Seventh-day Adventists.

For example, Katie Wittlake, a Religion Editor for the paper wrote in the lead article for this section:

To enforce a specific belief as necessary, especially one that is at odds with the general scientific community, is dangerous ground for Adventism. As I hear about the proposal to rewrite the 28 Fundamental Beliefs to include a more literal understanding of Genesis, I worry more about alienation from the larger community than I do about whether or not the belief is valid. Whether or not you take the Genesis account to be literal, figurative, or complete fiction, the message and mission of Adventism is not conveyed well if we put ourselves in a position of intolerance with disagreement (Read More).

In the lead article for the opinion pieces Jeff Ladish wrote:

I am horrified that the leaders of an Adventist conference would dramatically condemn fellow Adventists for teaching a standard scientific theory… To the vast majority of biologists,
questioning the explanatory power of evolution would be like questioning the existence of atoms… While some Adventists believe that a literal seven-day creation week is essential to the Sabbath doctrine and Adventist belief as a whole, other Adventists don’t see the details of creation as a church-breaking issue (God can still make a day of rest even if He didn’t create the earth in 144 hours). I agree with the latter group of Adventists. The church shouldn’t dictate which precise interpretations of the Bible are “correct,” and it definitely shouldn’t decide which scientific theories are legitimate (Read More).

Even one of the main characters involved with actively promoting long-age evolutionism within our schools from the beginning, Erv Taylor, professor emeritus of anthropology at UCR and self-styled “Christian Agnostic“, was asked to write an article for this issue:

If we all agree that all Adventist Christians confess that God is the Creator, may I submit that the current debate within Adventism is about the details of how and when God did it? It’s about what processes were used by God in creating the world and life forms. It’s also about how long it took for God to create the world and living organisms… Since the 2010 General Conference session, there are now a number of influential Adventist administrators who are publicly calling for the advancement of an Adventist shibboleth over this issue. This shibboleth would not be a single word, but a phrase. That phrase would be something similar to: “Creation in seven recent consecutive contiguous 24-hour days.” Regretfully, some are advocating the placement of some version of that code phrase into the statement of Adventist fundamental beliefs. If successful, this action would only create and foster even more polarization in our faith community (Read More).

In short, while the survey results did show that a small majority of students at Walla Walla still believe in the Adventist position on origins, a large number do not. From this article it also appears that they are not getting much support from the professors at WWU when it comes to providing students with good reasons, scientifically valid and doctrinally sound reasons, in favor of the Adventist perspective on origins.

Clearly, La Sierra University is not the only Adventist school that has been challenged by the issue of origins. While LSU may have been the most blatant in attacking and undermining the Adventist position on origins, many of our other schools (with the exception of Southern Adventist University and Southwestern Adventist University where the Adventist position on origins is still strongly upheld and promoted) seem to be heading down the same path or are at least very weak in their active support of the Church on this issue.
Our Adventist Church needs to take a hard look at what it expects from our own schools. In the mean time, both our church and our school system need to be very open and honest with students, parents, and the church membership at large as to what exactly is being taught to our young people on the topic of origins. At the very least we should not be advertising one thing, the promotion of the official standards of Adventism, while actually undermining or even attacking certain of these basic goals and “fundamental” ideals.

More than ever it is time for the Adventist Church to take a clear stand on the importance, or non-importance, of its views on origins. Either the Church’s “Fundamental Belief #6” on origins needs to be clarified to highlight the Church’s stand on the nature of the creation of all life on this planet in just six literal days, and hold its pastors and teachers accountable to this standard, or it needs to clearly and decidedly remove this concept from the fundamental doctrinal positions of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.
ORIGINS & BEGINNINGS
As a Christian, do I believe in the saving power of Jesus because the creation account is recorded in Genesis? Or do I believe in the value of God's creation because Jesus shed some real flesh and showed us the Father?

Throughout history, our issues have tackled big questions and even the doctrine of Creation. Sadly, such debates have generated more heat than light. Did you know that in the Hebrew Bible the Old Testament, which has been used for about 30 years, such big words are almost completely absent? Instead, the sacred texts have much to say about the Creator God. He is all-powerful, loving, truthful, and worthy of our worship.

The Bible's first story (Genesis 1:1–2) tells us how the one true God created everything in our world, things both visible and invisible. The Creation account is built on parallels, the most basic feature of the Hebrew literary style. Moreover, historical context and symmetrical also characterize this passage. Today, when something is perfect and eternal and world is created from the hands of the Creator.

In the culture of the Bible, people liked to put “first things first.” The way we think about Creation and where they typically begin with Creation as a starting point, is a unique way of sharing what they want to say. Following the reasoning, the first story of the Bible is the most important, and its summary is found in the opening verse (Genesis 1:1). This is followed by the narration of how God did his work during the creation week, which climaxed in the blessings of the Sabbath day.

As limited human brains, we can never fully comprehend God or his creative acts, since that means understanding something out of nothing. What we can know from his revelation recorded in the Bible and in his “book of nature,” we praise God for what we know, and we boldly acknowledge how much we do not know.

In closing, let me propose that God's ways of creating and redeeming humanity are not based on our limited comprehension and as such should be considered as the greatest mystery of all. Thankfully, though we might not fully understand them, we can still proclaim the God who performs them. In response to these great miracles, we should praise, trust, and worship our God, the believer in the Creator God who is also my Savior. I invite you, friends, to make the same choice.

As a Christian, do I believe in the saving power of Jesus because the creation account is recorded in Genesis? Or do I believe in the value of God's creation because Jesus shed some real flesh and showed us the Father?

Whether or not I say I doubt creation. I don’t just know that happened, exactly. However, even if it was a factual account, there could be no more solid my faith than an allegorical narrative. If I can get it. Why? Jesus, as the center of my faith, has changed my life, not the text. He has actually changed me. He is gracious as a center of rebirth and regeneration. He is non-negotiable. I'm not saying I doubt creation. I just don't know that happened, exactly. However, even if it was a factual account, there could be no more solid my faith than an allegorical narrative. If I can get it. Why? Jesus, as the center of my faith, has changed my life, not the text. He has actually changed me. He is gracious as a center of rebirth and regeneration. He is non-negotiable.

I'm not saying I doubt creation. I just don't know that happened, exactly. However, even if it was a factual account, there could be no more solid my faith than an allegorical narrative. If I can get it. Why? Jesus, as the center of my faith, has changed my life, not the text. He has actually changed me. He is gracious as a center of rebirth and regeneration. He is non-negotiable.
INTRODUCTION TO THE ORIGINS SURVEY

This survey is designed to shed light on the attitudes and beliefs of the WWU community on the issue of origins.

In the course of extensive discussions with members of the biology department, we discovered that in the scientific community evolution and other terms used in the survey, such as "micro-" and "macroevolution" are interpreted in a broad variety of ways.

We did our best to accurately use the terms in a way most students would understand without requiring excessive definitions. However, we were confident that the students and faculty taking the survey would be able to navigate those subtleties with ease. As a result, we chose not to include any term definitions, hoping to evoke genuine, personal reactions from respondents.

These published survey results should be interpreted as indicative of how these 641 people are willing to describe their beliefs, and no one should use these survey results as a means by which to make windows into the souls of the WWU community.

We decided not to have a comment option on the survey, even though it was brought up often. After much deliberation, we concluded that if people were not comfortable with any of the options, they should live our lives as Christians and no one should use these survey results to determine how these 641 people should live their lives. We chose not to include any comment option on the survey, such as "micro-" and "macroevolution" terms.

As a result, we chose not to include any term definitions, hoping to evoke genuine, personal reactions from respondents.

These published survey results should be interpreted as indicative of how these 641 people are willing to describe their beliefs, and no one should use these survey results as a means by which to make windows into the souls of the WWU community.

We decided not to have a comment option on the survey, even though it was brought up often. After much deliberation, we concluded that if people were not comfortable with any of the options, they should live our lives as Christians and no one should use these survey results to determine how these 641 people should live their lives. We chose not to include any comment option on the survey, such as "micro-" and "macroevolution" terms.

As a result, we chose not to include any term definitions, hoping to evoke genuine, personal reactions from respondents.

These published survey results should be interpreted as indicative of how these 641 people are willing to describe their beliefs, and no one should use these survey results as a means by which to make windows into the souls of the WWU community.

We decided not to have a comment option on the survey, even though it was brought up often. After much deliberation, we concluded that if people were not comfortable with any of the options, they should live our lives as Christians and no one should use these survey results to determine how these 641 people should live their lives. We chose not to include any comment option on the survey, such as "micro-" and "macroevolution" terms.

As a result, we chose not to include any term definitions, hoping to evoke genuine, personal reactions from respondents.

These published survey results should be interpreted as indicative of how these 641 people are willing to describe their beliefs, and no one should use these survey results as a means by which to make windows into the souls of the WWU community.
THE UNIVERSE

This question intends to gather the thoughts on whether the universe has always existed or had a starting point. The choice “Has always existed” means that there was no beginning, but it has always existed in some form or another. The choice “Had a starting point” means that at some point, however long ago, the universe did not exist. The choice “I don’t know” means the respondent is unsure of what they believe on the matter. It’s easy to see the influence of Adventist tradition in the responses to this question. The top selection, that the universe “Had a starting point,” is the one most closely allied to traditional Adventist theology, in light of the recent controversy on the issue of origins. However, the significant number of unsure respondents is to be expected.

THE EARTH’S EXISTENCE

This question seeks the respondents’ beliefs regarding the Earth’s origin. “Exactly how Genesis says” means that the responder believes that God created the earth in a literal six-day creation beginning with light the first day and ending with humans the last day. “Through intelligent design” means that the responder believes in the existence of a third party who had any effect whatsoever in the earth’s creation. “By means of the Big Bang” means that the responder believes the earth was created through natural laws only. Each respondent could select multiple responses. It is to be expected that the majority of respondents, being affiliated with an Adventist institution, would believe the Earth came into existence exactly as Genesis says and through intelligent design, as the results show. Also expected is the relatively low number of respondents who said the Earth was created through the Big Bang.

GOD CREATED THE EARTH

This question explores differing nuances in belief regarding the amount of time it took for God to create the earth. “In six consecutive, literal 24-hour days” means the respondent believes in a literal six-day creation. “In six consecutive, symbolic units of time” means the respondents believe the earth was created in six periods of time that could range from unimaginably to infinite or even billions of years. “But I don’t believe the chronology is important” means the respondent believes that God created the earth, but the amount of time it took him to do so doesn’t matter. “But I don’t believe the Genesis account” means the respondent believes that God created the earth, but they don’t believe he created it as Genesis says. “I disagree” means the respondent doesn’t believe God created the earth. “I don’t know” means the respondent is unsure of an origins chronology.

While quite a few more respondents believe in a six consecutive, literal 24-hour day creation than any other option, less than 50 percent of the total responded that they believe in a six consecutive, literal 24-hour creation. This could be viewed as uncertainty in the student body to declare a six-day literal creation, a fundamental Adventist belief, as absolutely true. However, it may be that the responses for “But I don’t believe the chronology is important” took away from the number of respondents indicating belief in a six consecutive, literal 24-hour day creation.

EVOLUTION

This question seeks the responders’ beliefs regarding evolution and their comfort with the term when associated with different modifiers. “Does not happen” means the responder believes in microevolution (this can mean anything from speciation to the Big Bang) and macroevolution (variance that does not cause speciation). “Happens at the micro level, but not at the macro level” means the responder believes in evolution below the species level but not speciation or anything higher. “Does not happen” means the responder believes evolution does not happen at any level. While the responses of those believing in micro- and macroevolution and just microevolution can be expected at such a ratio, given for different possibilities of interpretation of the words “micro” and “macro,” it is surprising how many people at a university level of education responded that they believe evolution does not happen at all.

THE AGE OF THE EARTH

This question attempts to find out what people believe regarding the age of the universe, how old it is, and how we know it. The purpose of these questions is to determine respondents’ beliefs regarding the age of Earth and life on it. The options are some of the most popularly accepted estimates for the age of earth. The responses to these questions show that at WWU, most people make a distinction between the age of the earth and the age of life on it. The most popular answer to question 10 was “I don’t know,” while “Is about 6,000 years” was the most selected response to question 11. A similar number of people answered each question with “I don’t know,” and none of the responses earned more than 33% of the respondent pool.

THE ANIMALS WE SEE TODAY

This question attempts to find out what people believe regarding the creation of animals and their change since coming into existence. This question separates the different categories in evolutionary beliefs without using technical terms. Specifically it shows how many creationists believe in macroevolution (speciation). The majority of respondents have answered that they believe animals were created but then some or all evolved into what we see today.
Alisa Oberg
Psychologist

My mother is a pastor. My father, a scientist. These supposedly opposing professions form a supportive and encouraging environment.

Anyone who is responsible for the care of my beliefs about origin and development. It is difficult in a short piece to adequately communicate my own beliefs, but my beliefs are fairly simple: I am a Christian, I believe in evolution, and I believe in the Bible. For these three statements need not be contradictory, but in fact exist in accordance with one another. The evolution I’m referring to is the interaction with my relationship with God and my commitment to a life of faith. Alisa Oberg in the ASWWU Social VP.

In the world of origin, creation, and geological strata aren’t redundant. Send your own to come from our source, the consequences of sin being dead, and finally at the end of an eroded variable, creates a situation that has “no more death.” At its roots, evolution is a theory that is irreconcilable to Christianity.

I recently talked to a good friend of mine who was a student at a school in Taiwan. She was in tears as she told me about a baby, a beautiful baby, that had just been delivered. She had just been told by the doctor that “Death isn’t a part of God’s good and perfect plan.” When I learned about this, I felt like I was a part of something so much more than that. I felt like there was a conversation going on inside of me, a conversation with God.

The Bible is a story of God. God didn’t use death to bolster their faith in Him than on being scientifically constructed around a creationist. Then, I have settled, for the time being, on teaching evolution. God created living things. Living things develop. Evolution is a biologically natural process that resides within God’s creations. Surrounding ourselves with science eats into the fact of evolution’s existence. However, surmounting our problems with faith in a Creator God confirms that existence in a world that was created, and done so by a being outside of our comprehension. My belief in a God who created all living things can and must be informed by scientific and theological observations in the natural world.

It seems perhaps ironic that the Scriptures which inspire these convictions in me are the same Scriptures which allow for evolution, the very idea of evolution and the prism of natural selection, but it is the reality of evolution, the very idea of us all being connected to something more than a world, that is irrefutably to Christianity. The more I have read about the evolution, the more I have come to understand that the universe was created in six literal days.

The Seashell on the Mountaintop

It is no longer a debate over carbon dating and the oil fields or the rise and fall of communism or the Super Bowl. It’s not what we need to argue over. What is the most important thing to house arrest for his heretical views. The story of Galileo is comparative. We have a mountain of evidence that the Church made a mistake.

Origins' THEORIES AND CHRISTIANITY

Religious Editor

The Church is clear on matters of origin. Genesis starts the discussion, and throughout this Bible we begin to see a understanding that the world was created in six days. We also see the importance of a literal creation in the New Testament.

No, they didn’t. In fact, there’s no evidence that what is seen was not made up, rather than direct observation of it. Rather, I should say Who. The Church is clear on matters of origin. Genesis states, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. In the middle of this turbulent debate over carbon dating and original Hebrew texts, how can we relate to the story of the one peaceful man and the/seashells that God gave us. The Church is clear on matters of origin.

Where does this lead? In the middle of the world as it is, the Bible says, “In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth.” The Seashell on the Mountaintop. God is the Creator. I believe He created the earth in a brilliant, magnificent, and intricate way. I believe that what you believe about creation is really about something else, and that is what you believe about God. The Church is clear on matters of origin.

In the world as it is, the Bible says, “In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth.” The Seashell on the Mountaintop. God is the Creator. I believe He created the earth in a brilliant, magnificent, and intricate way. I believe that what you believe about creation is really about something else, and that is what you believe about God. The Church is clear on matters of origin.

No, they didn’t. In fact, there’s no evidence that what is seen was not made up, rather than direct observation of it. Rather, I should say Who. The Church is clear on matters of origin. Genesis states, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. In the middle of this turbulent debate over carbon dating and original Hebrew texts, how can we relate to the story of the one peaceful man and the/seashells that God gave us. The Church is clear on matters of origin.

Where does this lead? In the middle of the world as it is, the Bible says, “In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth.” The Seashell on the Mountaintop. God is the Creator. I believe He created the earth in a brilliant, magnificent, and intricate way. I believe that what you believe about creation is really about something else, and that is what you believe about God. The Church is clear on matters of origin.

No, they didn’t. In fact, there’s no evidence that what is seen was not made up, rather than direct observation of it. Rather, I should say Who. The Church is clear on matters of origin. Genesis states, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. In the middle of this turbulent debate over carbon dating and original Hebrew texts, how can we relate to the story of the one peaceful man and the/seashells that God gave us. The Church is clear on matters of origin.

Where does this lead? In the middle of the world as it is, the Bible says, “In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth.” The Seashell on the Mountaintop. God is the Creator. I believe He created the earth in a brilliant, magnificent, and intricate way. I believe that what you believe about creation is really about something else, and that is what you believe about God. The Church is clear on matters of origin.

No, they didn’t. In fact, there’s no evidence that what is seen was not made up, rather than direct observation of it. Rather, I should say Who. The Church is clear on matters of origin. Genesis states, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. In the middle of this turbulent debate over carbon dating and original Hebrew texts, how can we relate to the story of the one peaceful man and the/seashells that God gave us. The Church is clear on matters of origin.

Where does this lead? In the middle of the world as it is, the Bible says, “In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth.” The Seashell on the Mountaintop. God is the Creator. I believe He created the earth in a brilliant, magnificent, and intricate way. I believe that what you believe about creation is really about something else, and that is what you believe about God. The Church is clear on matters of origin.
spaghetti night
wEDNESDAYS 5-8 pm
meat sauce—vegetarian maranara alfredo—mizithra and butter garlic bread & salad $9.85
free coke with student id and meal.
Events listed here are a reflection of the rich diversity of interesting activities in the Walla Walla Valley. Their listing here does not indicate official endorsement by The Collegian.

02/02 THROUGH 02/08

**FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 3**

- **Pacific Northwest University of Health Sciences**
  WHEN: 12 p.m.
  MORE INFO: The WWU Pre-Professional club is offering a trip to PNWU on Friday, February 3. Contact the Career Center for more information.

- **Sunset**
  WHEN: 5 p.m.

- **Vespers: Black History**
  WHERE: University Church
  WHEN: 8 p.m.

**SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 4**

- **FirstServe and The Second Service**
  WHERE: University Church
  WHEN: 9:30 and 11:45 a.m.

- **The Awakening**
  WHERE: FAC Auditorium
  WHEN: 10:30 a.m.

- **“Total Praise: A Festival of Choirs”**
  WHERE: University Church
  WHEN: 4 p.m.

- **Summer Camp Club Lunch and Vespers**
  WHERE: Rogers Elementary
  WHEN: 2 p.m.

**SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 5**

- **WWU String Quartet Recital**
  WHERE: FAC Auditorium
  WHEN: 7:30 p.m.

**MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6**

- **Final Day to Declare Executive Candidacy**
  WHERE: ASWWU Offices (across from the SAC)
  WHEN: 5 p.m.
  MORE INFO: Download an Executive Declaration of Candidacy on the ASWWU website. Please turn it in to the ASWWU Offices.

- **Peace Corps Information Session**
  WHERE: Reid 240, Whitman College
  WHEN: 6 p.m.

**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7**

- **CommUnity: Senior Recognition, Gregory Dodds**
  WHERE: University Church
  WHEN: 11 a.m.

  WHERE: KRH 347
  WHEN: 12 p.m.

- **Interview Skills Workshop**
  WHERE: KRH 203
  WHEN: 6:30 p.m.
  MORE INFO: Hone your interview skills at this helpful workshop sponsored by the Career Center.

**SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 4**

- **FirstServe and The Second Service**
  WHERE: University Church
  WHEN: 9:30 and 11:45 a.m.

- **The Awakening**
  WHERE: FAC Auditorium
  WHEN: 10:30 a.m.

- **“Total Praise: A Festival of Choirs”**
  WHERE: University Church
  WHEN: 4 p.m.

- **Summer Camp Club Lunch and Vespers**
  WHERE: Rogers Elementary
  WHEN: 2 p.m.

- **William O. Douglas Lecture: "The Western Paradox: Public Lands, Dependent States and Speaking for the Earth"**
  WHERE: Kimball Auditorium, Whitman College
  WHEN: 7:30 p.m.

**FEBRUARY 8–12**

- **Harper Joy Theatre Presents: One Act Play Contest**
  WHERE: Harper Joy Theatre, Studio Theatre, Whitman College
  WHEN: 8 p.m.

**GRADUATING SENIOR PORTRAITS**

- **Thursday, February 2, 4–8 p.m.; Friday, February 3, 10 a.m.–3 p.m.; Sunday, February 5, 9 a.m.–2 p.m.**
  WHERE: ASWWU Offices (across from the SAC)
  MORE INFO: These are the only times. Please dress in business casual attire. Photos will be shot from the waist up. Bright colors encouraged.

**AFRICAN-AMERICAN UNIVERSITY DAYS**

- **THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2**
  - **Date Auction Confab**
    WHERE: Alaska Room
    WHEN: 6 p.m.
  - **Ken MacKintosh's massive 1973 mosaic, "In the Beginning God ..." dominates the lobby of the Melvin K. West Fine Arts Center. The title, taken from Genesis 1:1, indicates the professor emeritus's desire to capture the mystical events of the creation story in a stunning work of art. Photos taken by Anthony White and used with permission.
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INFORMATION
THE VALUE OF
SPEAKING
DETAILS
HOW AND WHEN
ON THE ENVIRONMENT
OVER THIS ISSUE?
One would reasonably assume that all Christians are theists and thus, almost by definition, would confess that God is the Creator of the world and all that is good in the universe. We could also reasonably assume that all Adventists are, first of all, Christians. On this basis, we can anticipate that all Adventist Christians would confess without hesitation that God created the world and all that is good in the universe. Thus we could say that all Adventists would agree: God is the Creator. But there are major theological battles currently under way in the contemporary Adventist Church over the issue of Creationism. What is the problem?

Within the last decade, the institutional Adventist Church has spent literally hundreds of thousands of dollars bringing together on three occasions an international group of Adventist scientists, theologians, and church administrators to address the topic of faith and science. The emphasis was how the Adventist faith tradition should address various scientific issues and theological issues associated with Creationism. The General Conference of the Adventist Church has also spent literally tens of millions of dollars over the last 30 years supporting the Geoscience Research Institute (GRI), now located in Loma Linda, California, adjacent to, but not affiliated with, Loma Linda University. The GRI has a mandate to study the questions of origins and related topics and come up with scientific answers to challenging theological problems about how the Adventist tradition should view the opening chapters of Genesis.

Why is the Adventist Church in the 21st century still in the midst of controversy over this issue? Why are these articles in the Adventist Review attacking “Adventist Darwinism” and Adventist “Theistic Evolutionists”? Why is this topic being debated in the pages of and on the web sites of Adventist Today and Spectrum? What is the current argument all about?

If we all agree that all Adventist Christians confess that God is the Creator, may I submit that the current debate is about details of how and when God did it? It’s about what processes were used by God in creating the world and life forms. It’s also about how long it took for God to create the world and living organisms. Young Earth Creationists (YEC) and Young Life Creationism (YLC) are sometimes contrasted with Old Earth Creationism (OEC) and Old Life Creationism (OLC) as summarizing important aspects of the debate.

“WHY IS THE ADVENTIST CHURCH IN THE 21ST CENTURY STILL IN THE MIDST OF CONTROVERSY OVER THIS ISSUE?”

In this contrast, “young” means less than 6,000 to 10,000 years, and “old” means much, much older than 10,000 years, e.g., millions and billions of years. One might also suggest that from an ecclesiastical perspective, the argument is about power and authority and who, in the end, should have the final word in the institutional Adventist Church about how much freedom its theologians and scientists have to pursue truth wherever it leads. But a discussion of this question needs more space and a separate venue.

Mary would probably react to the suggestion that it’s about details by objecting that the “truth” is in the details. To which, others might respond, “Which truth?” And then things would rapidly get complicated and all kinds of issues would be brought forward.

In light of this, may I offer a simple suggestion? While our faith community continues to grapple with the larger topic, might we avoid creating another problem? This problem would ensue if we create another Adventist shibboleth over this issue. We recall what the original shibboleth as described in the Old Testament Book of Judges was all about. It was a code word, a special linguistic password which defined who was in and who was out of the group.

In this case, we would create an Adventist shibboleth which would define what would be considered the “true” or “correct” Adventist position on Creationism. Since the 2010 General Conference session, there are now a number of influential Adventist administrators who publicly are calling for the advancement of an Adventist shibboleth on this issue. This shibboleth would be a single word, but a phrase. That phrase would be something similar to: “Creation in seven recent consecutive contiguous 24-hour days.” Regrettably, some are advocating the placement of some version of that code phrase into the statement of Adventist fundamental beliefs. If successful, this action would only create and foster even more polarization in our faith community.

We can hope that institutional Adventists and scientists might not avoid creating additional unnecessary problems for itself while our faith community continues to dialogue on the details of how and when God created the physical world including all living things.

Dr. Ervin Taylor is a professor emeritus of anthropology at the University of California, Riverside. He is one of the founders of the journal Adventist Today.

This question attempts to bring to light differing beliefs about when or if dinosaurs existed. Young Earth Creationists believe that dinosaurs existed along with humans. This question asks Young Earth Creationists to either deny the existence of dinosaurs or explain their place in history.

The results show that a large group of respondents say that they do not believe in a young earth but do believe dinosaurs existed along with humans. This shows that this answer and the belief in an old earth are not mutually exclusive.
...from its list of colleges that decided to withdraw La Sierra would not receive accreditation to ensure its professors were that some professors at La Sierra last year’s La Sierra controversy. Review, this specter: the General old Adventism have entered A specter is haunting Adventism...
THE FLOOD

This question tries to find out what people believe about the flood account in Genesis. Some believe that the flood in Genesis was an account of what the pre-deluvians perceived to be worldwide but was actually localized to their known world.

The majority of respondents take the account literally. Respondents are more comfortable taking the flood story literally than the creation account.

GENESIS

This question focuses on Seventh-day Adventism. The survey asks whether the respondent believes that Seventh-day Adventism, as a faith and ideology, necessitates a belief in a strictly literal six-day creation week.

The results of this question are a clear indication that the average respondent believes that Seventh-day Adventism is compatible with alternative understandings of creation. However, 38.6 percent is not a negligible percentage; there is a significant number of students who responded that Seventh-day Adventism is only compatible with belief in a literal, six-day creation.

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM

This question asks the respondents to identify the options they believe are compatible with Seventh-day Adventism. Respondents could select multiple options.

Over 80 percent of the respondents do not believe that the Big Bang Theory is compatible with Adventism. This shows that there is either widespread hostility to a generally accepted scientific theory or at least discomfort with it.

ACCEPTANCE OF EVOLUTION

This question asks the respondent about the relationship between the theory of evolution and three related yet fundamentally different aspects of faith.

More respondents believe that evolution is compatible with a belief in God and Christianity. This is to be expected, yet it is interesting how large a percentage responded that evolution is not compatible with belief in God, creation, or being a Christian.

SCIENCE SUPPORTS

This question seeks to figure out respondents’ beliefs about scientific support. It tells us what theory or theories of origins people believe is or are supported by science. This is important because if one does not believe that science supports either evolution or creation, then there would be little reason to have one or the other taught in schools.

It is interesting to see that a large portion of respondents believes that science supports only one viewpoint. It is also interesting to see how many respondents say that science supports neither.

EVALUATION AT WWU

With this question, the survey asks how the individual believes the science program at WWU should approach the question of origins. Selecting “Evolution should be taught as a valid scientific theory” means that the individual believes that evolution should be presented as a valid argument for origins. Selecting “Evolution should be taught without a declaration of truth or error” means that the individual believes that evolution should be presented as a valid argument for origins without declaring it as necessarily valid or invalid. The selection “Evolution should be taught but declared untrue” suggests that the individual is comfortable with discussion about the theory of evolution, but feels that for the issue to be appropriately addressed, evolution should be declared untrue. The selection “Evolution should not be taught at all” indicates that the responder is completely opposed to the theory of evolution being introduced on campus.

The way in which the school approaches the issue of evolution sets the tone for the campus’s approach to origin questions; the results of this particular question illustrate this. Most respondents selected that “Evolution should be taught without a declaration of truth or error.” A very small percentage selected that evolution should not be taught at all.

The way in which the school approaches the issue of evolution sets the tone for the campus’s approach to origin questions; the results of this particular question illustrate this. Most respondents selected that “Evolution should be taught without a declaration of truth or error.” A very small percentage selected that evolution should not be taught at all.

Acceptance of Evolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IS EVOLUTION COMPATIBLE WITH:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO OPINION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BELIEF IN GOD?</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELIEF IN CREATION?</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEING A CHRISTIAN?</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECORD LENDS PRESENCE OF SPEAKING
limbs of a lungfish, either — it
limb-like fins. Not the simple fin-
neck, and most importantly,
looking for: a fish with a flattened
expeditions, he and his colleagues
Paddled into the cold waters of
of Chicago, set off for Greenland
paleontologist from the University
Shubin’s reasoning wasn’t
find it in northern Canada. The
idea that the four-limbed
descended from fish,
be right. We’ve got the truth.
Adventist beliefs and tradition.
and will include education in
from an Adventist perspective
students. In my opinion, if
education in alternative theories
it would only serve to confuse
they have mentally developed
frame of reference. By this time
education in alternative theories
of origins such as evolution.
the approaches than blindly
Evolution in the Adventist System

In 1999, Neil Shubin, a
palaeontologist from the
British Museum and Institute of
and northern Canada’s Ellesmere Island,
hoping to find a very
specific fish. After
searching, spread over several
expeditions, he and his colleagues
THE VERY PRESENCE OF SUCH A CREATURE IN THE FOSSIL RECORD LENDS CREDIBILITY TO THE IDEA THAT THE FOUR-LIMBED CREATURES THAT WALK ON THE EARTH MAY HAVE DESCENDED FROM FISH.

found exactly what they were looking for: a fish with a
flattened body, a tail that swished from side to side, and
maxillary-like fins. But the simple
features were not enough. The
seemed too familiar.

Life, it seemed, was built
completely of the same bones
as an upper arm, forearm, and
was like a human’s — “Yet it was
still definitively a fish — its fins
were indeed webbed, and it
did indeed have gills, as did its
cousin, the lungfish — but it was all
It was dubbed Tiktaalik.

on a superficial level, a fish with
brony limbs is remarkable
to find. The very presence
of such a creature in the fossil
record lends credibility to
the idea that the four-limbed
creatures that walk the earth
can be right. We’ve got the truth.

The cardinals, the bishops, and
the priests of the Catholic Church
were not alone in their concerns.
To this day, the debate over the
ages of the earth and humanity’s
creation remains as contentious
as ever. But the fact remains that
the idea of evolution, as we now
understand it, is supported by a
wealth of evidence and remains
a cornerstone of modern science.

It’s this very boldness that I find
so striking. It’s a reminder that
beliefs on the order of the
world are not immutable.

Though the latter was certainly
theologically charged, the idea
that the earth is millions of years old
requires complicated analyses
and arguments against heliocentrism
and old-earth evolutionists.

May have descended from fish,
and used this understanding to
make that claim is ridiculous,
that sufficient evidence has
not been brought forward,
just that it’s a theory.

As new discoveries
continue to be made,
and some may argue
that the evidence
is not conclusive,
we must continue to
question and
explore the
possibilities


Since his days as a graduate student,
 Joe Hughan has worked
with investigators on the
always-engaging topic
of evolution. We brought
his superior intellect and
scholarly rigor to the
texts for the week, so that we
could see what it really said.

If we want to know more
about evolution and
nature, we need to
continue to learn and
understand the
truths of these
wonderful
creatures.

I've seen disobedient children
with the absolute certainty of
the word "theory," is a framed
text that has been passed down
as the major controversy
of our time. It's a theory
That the earth is millions of years old
is not evidence of evolution
that can be ignored.

We've got the truth.
Adventist elementary school,
and will include education in
alternative theories of origins
such as evolution.

If we want to know more
about evolution and
nature, we need to
continue to learn and
understand the
truths of these
wonderful
creatures.

As we study these topics
together, we can share our
findings and experiences
with each other.

I’ve seen disobedient children
with the absolute certainty of
"theory." It's a theory
That the earth is millions of years old
is not evidence of evolution
that can be ignored.

We've got the truth.
Adventist elementary school,
and will include education in
alternative theories of origins
such as evolution.

If we want to know more
about evolution and
nature, we need to
continue to learn and
understand the
truths of these
wonderful
creatures.

As we study these topics
together, we can share our
findings and experiences
with each other.

I’ve seen disobedient children
with the absolute certainty of
"theory." It's a theory
That the earth is millions of years old
is not evidence of evolution
that can be ignored.

We've got the truth.
How species have adapted and changed via natural selection or evolution was one of the main topics presented in the class. Lectures discussing the theory of evolution and its impact on medicine were presented. The class syllabus for Biology was being addressed in a biology class taught at La Sierra University in Riverside, California, and continues to support and refine Darwin's original ideas. According to the statement, the resignations were nothing theoretical about the evidence supporting evolution and that while many conservative leaders do not believe there is a mischaracterization of the worldview of the creation and evolution are based on anti-God, there is no one who will be coming to an end rather than that most are without a doubt. But why? What do I want to be when I grow up? If you can answer that question, then you'll be happy about it. The other day I overheard someone exclaim at a basketball game, “It’s good to have confusion on many of the topics presented in the class. We continue to take steps to fuse the two events into one.

In June of that year, the three faculty members on the recording were asked to resign because their teaching was unacceptable for students of the La Sierra staff. Because the two events appeared at the same university, and within a two-year period, they did fuse the two events into one. When the resignations were announced, the board also issued a statement that the resignations were an outgrowth of a biology issue. However, because one of the faculty members assigned to resign was Gary Bradley, professor of biology at La Sierra, there was speculation that they were two in fact related.

In November 2009, the LSU Board of Trustees released a statement in which they upheld the importance of LSU’s Board of Trustees and the fact that they are not dealing with beliefs. “In June of that year, the three faculty members on the recording were asked to resign.” According to the statement, the teaching of evolution takes place within the LSU’s Board of Trustees regarding creation and the belief that God created the world in six literal days. This obsession with an apocalyptic future is curiously in that I was asked about the origins of life. I'm not sure what I want to be, after what I want to do. When I was a small child, I wanted to be everything. I can only conclude that the end of the world is more important than the beginning, because almost no one talks about it. Maybe it’s humanity’s longing for meaning now, the narrative is somewhat fuzzy. We’ve had wars, natural disasters, mass figures, huge population growth, and evolved to be the creatures that we are today. For many students, the course was an important question. Where we come from is, of course, an important question. It determines how we view the world and how we make decisions. So the week before the pool evolved into a new species, it would be by divine intervention or a nuclear weapon or both. The week before the pool evolved into a new species, it would be by divine intervention or a nuclear weapon or both. **IF MANKIND’S HEルド AT LSU MEETING WAS 2011, A BOARD MEMBER, Larry Darnell, sent it to several people including other faculty members and Spectrum Magazine.**

In November 2009, the LSU Board of Trustees released a statement in which they upheld the importance of LSU’s Board of Trustees and the fact that they are not dealing with beliefs. “In June of that year, the three faculty members on the recording were asked to resign.” According to the statement, the teaching of evolution takes place within the LSU’s Board of Trustees regarding creation and the belief that God created the world in six literal days. This obsession with an apocalyptic future is curiously in that I was asked about the origins of life. I'm not sure what I want to be, after what I want to do. When I was a small child, I wanted to be everything. I can only conclude that the end of the world is more important than the beginning, because almost no one talks about it. Maybe it’s humanity’s longing for meaning now, the narrative is somewhat fuzzy. We’ve had wars, natural disasters, mass figures, huge population growth, and evolved to be the creatures that we are today. For many students, the course was an important question. Where we come from is, of course, an important question. It determines how we view the world and how we make decisions. So the week before the pool evolved into a new species, it would be by divine intervention or a nuclear weapon or both. The week before the pool evolved into a new species, it would be by divine intervention or a nuclear weapon or both. **IF MANKIND’S HEルド AT LSU MEETING WAS 2011, A BOARD MEMBER, Larry Darnell, sent it to several people including other faculty members and Spectrum Magazine.**

From the statement, the resignations were an outgrowth of a biology issue. However, because one of the faculty members assigned to resign was Gary Bradley, professor of biology at La Sierra, there was speculation that they were two in fact related. According to the statement, the teaching of evolution takes place within the LSU’s Board of Trustees regarding creation and the belief that God created the world in six literal days. This obsession with an apocalyptic future is curiously in that I was asked about the origins of life. I'm not sure what I want to be, after what I want to do. When I was a small child, I wanted to be everything. I can only conclude that the end of the world is more important than the beginning, because almost no one talks about it. Maybe it’s humanity’s longing for meaning now, the narrative is somewhat fuzzy. We’ve had wars, natural disasters, mass figures, huge population growth, and evolved to be the creatures that we are today. For many students, the course was an important question. Where we come from is, of course, an important question. It determines how we view the world and how we make decisions. So the week before the pool evolved into a new species, it would be by divine intervention or a nuclear weapon or both. The week before the pool evolved into a new species, it would be by divine intervention or a nuclear weapon or both.
THE TRUTH ABOUT LIFE ON EARTH

In this Origins Special Issue, several important questions have been raised. These questions are sometimes obvious, but they don't often have obvious answers. When and how did life on Earth originate? Did humankind evolve through macroevolution and natural selection into the dominant creatures they are today? Did some higher power create us? Was it some form of creation that was made and left to develop on its own? What consequences do these different theories have on the way we should live? When faced with questions like these, I feel pretty small. I have a set of beliefs about the origin of life on Earth and a creator God that I hold as my own and that I believe to be true, but there are billions of people in the world who believe very strongly in things which are different from and sometimes even contrary to what I hold as truth. So who has the real answers? Who knows more of the real truth? Honestly, I don't know. I think that in my search for God and for answers, I have found more truth than some who have not yet gone looking. And yet, in my encounters with my friends, professors, and often with people I don't get along with very well, I have been shown enough wisdom to realize that I don't actually know very much at all about what it really means to live. In this issue you can see that a lot of people disagree about a lot of things. However, I don't think I'm overstepping my bounds when I say that there is one thing we can all agree on: No matter what someone believes, and no matter how ridiculous those beliefs might seem to me, I have a responsibility to treat them with respect. Any human being that I encounter has as much inherent worth as I do. ... This has been a serious little Other Cover discussion, but I'd like to leave you with one last, difficult question for you to consider. I'd like to know what your thoughts are on the subject: "Pete and Repeat were sitting on a fence. If Pete fell off, who would be left?"

IF YOU COULD PUNCH ONE CARTOON CHARACTER, WHICH ONE WOULD IT BE AND WHY?

"It would be that whale, Pearl, from *SpongeBob SquarePants*. The world would be a better place without her. I might break my fist, though; her head is huge."  
*RIVER DAVIS, FRESHMAN NURSING*

"Probably Garfield. I love him, but he's such a big jerk."  
*AUSTIN ROBERTS, FRESHMAN THEOLOGY/HISTORY*

"I'd punch Moe, the bully from *Calvin and Hobbes*. He's so mean."  
*CLARISSA CONSTANTINESCU, FRESHMAN PSYCHOLOGY*

"Probably Daria's sister Quinn. She's so shallow and unfeeling."  
*REBECCA BROTHERS, JUNIOR ENGLISH*

VERBATIM

"I wish French people talked as slowly as they work."  
*BRIAN GADD*, while struggling to understand a question in French class.

"Two witches hung? Not bad. Par for the course."  
*BEVERLY BEEM*

"He was traveling at least 60 miles an hour, which, in those days, could only be done with a broom."  
*TERRIE AAMODT*

"It's like the Greeks said, 'Moderation in everything.' Except chocolate chip cookies. And pizza."  
*TERRY GOTTSCHALL*

HIGHLIGHT: The Living Room opens up this Friday night. Go get your pray on!