



## Creation Clarifications, Doubts, and Debates

### Clarification to Fall Issue

IN THE 2009 FALL issue of *Spectrum* I read "In the Eye of the Storm: an Interview with La Sierra University President Randal Wisbey" by Bonnie Dwyer and noticed a few things I felt should be clarified. She writes:

*Debate over that event ended up on the internet and then a website was created that attacked La Sierra fairly specifically, even taking the university's name as part of the website name. Was legal action taken by La Sierra over the use of its name? The website changed its name to Educate Truth.*

While it is true that La Sierra took legal action, it wasn't till after [LaSierraUniversity.net](http://LaSierraUniversity.net) had been shut down for six-days due to reasons unrelated to LSU. The site was shut down June 2 and the legal papers served June 8. Which makes Wisbey's response to Dwyer interesting:

*Our General Counsel did write to the individual associated with the website, noting that they did not have permission to use the university's name, and the name of the website was soon changed.*

While [LaSierraUniversity.net](http://LaSierraUniversity.net) shared similar content to [EducateTruth.com](http://EducateTruth.com), they were not owned or run by the same people. There has been a misconception that I was the one who created and ran [LaSierraUniversity.net](http://LaSierraUniversity.net).

There are two things I want to make clear:

1. LSU legal counsel was made aware June 8 that I was not responsible for the creation, purchase, or content of the domain [LaSierraUniversity.net](http://LaSierraUniversity.net).
2. LSU legal counsel had no influence with the naming of [EducateTruth.com](http://EducateTruth.com) as it was created five days before LSU sent the letter from their legal counsel.

Thank you.

SHANE HILDE, Editor, [EducateTruth.com](http://EducateTruth.com)  
Via the Internet

### Response from Bonnie Dwyer

To be clear, Wisbey stated in his response to my question that (as of that time) no legal action had been taken by La Sierra University. Perhaps noting that there is a difference between a letter from a lawyer and legal action clarifies this misunderstanding.

### Doubt

I CAN IDENTIFY with various *Spectrum* staff (writers) who also have had doubts, not only of our "beliefs" but about what was considered "reality."

A good beginners book is "Zero" by Charles Seife.

Science vs. religion is a 4,000-6,000 year old struggle. It is riveting, if you still remember high school mathematics. The history of such nonsense is still alive in sermons that equate the center of the universe coming to earth. Geocentricity is still not totally dead. Aristotle's thoughts still linger for reality. How long will it take to realize:

1. The antiquity of the universe
2. The antiquity of earth
3. The antiquity of life
4. The antiquity of mankind

And this antiquity is verified by

- a. The continuity of Egyptian dynasties
- b. The 15,000 tablets of Ebla
- c. The continuity of cuneiform writing predating Abraham to 50 AD
- d. The 6400 year-old civilization of the city states like Brak in Northeast Syria
- e. The early European civilizations in Romania and surrounding areas
- f. Neanderthal cave paintings
- g. Counting stones

# More Listening In...

Some recent and upcoming events at  
**San Diego Adventist Forum**  
*Recordings are available on CDs or audio cassettes*

- Michael Scofield August/09  
*Adventist Higher Education: Which School Shall Close First?*
- T. Joe Willey, Ph.D. September/09  
*Science Falsely So-called: Can Modern Science Establish the Supernatural in the Nineteenth Century Health Writings of Ellen G. White?*
- Lourdes Morales Gudmundsson, Ph.D. October/09  
*Embracing the Stranger: Toward an Adventist Theology of Migration*
- Arthur Patrick, Ph.D. November/09  
*The Re-parenting of Seventh-day Adventists? Reflections on the Historical Development, Substance, and Potential of Ellen White Studies*
- Andrew Howe January/10  
*The Intersection of Faith and Film*
- Gary Chartier, et. al. February/10  
*What's at the Center? University Students Explore the Integration and Evaluation of SDA Belief Systems*
- Doug Hackleman March/10  
*Filthy Lucre*

**\*CD or Audiocassette Format — Please specify!**

Mark your choices and send with check, \$9.50 (domestic) or \$10.50 (international), per selection to:  
**San Diego Adventist Forum • P.O. Box 3148, La Mesa, CA 91944-3148**  
**619-561-2360 • ak-jk@cox.net**

\*\*\*\*\*

To be included on the monthly newsletter announcement mailing roster without charge and/or to receive a listing of all recordings available, please send a postcard, e-mail, or make phone call to one of the above providing your name and address.

- h. Bone counting notches
- i. Ice cores
- j. Erosion rates
- k. Volcanic fingerprints
- l. Mountain lifts
- m. Continental drifts
- n. Atlantic rift

My intensity on the matter probably comes from the fact that I have been “hoodwinked,” misled, lied to and asked to “just have faith.”

MICHAEL PESTES  
 Sierra Vista, AZ

## Creationism/Evolution Debate

SINCE I DO NOT have a university education, I have to use a simpler language than the professor I quote here—from Bryan Ness’s article on Creation, Evolution and Adventist Higher Education. On page 48 in the Fall 2009 issue of *Spectrum* he writes: *Evolutionists currently have no tenable theory for the origin of life by purely naturalistic processes so this is the easiest point to make.* In my opinion this

is a kind of a rhetoric trick, because real and true science shall not look for that kind of evidence. If it does, it is not true science. Here in Europe it is obvious for most ordinarily educated persons, but SDAs repeat this fictitious argument over and over again, and young pupils and students believe it is a valid argument against evolution. There is an insurmountable difference between natural science and faith by divine revelation. Why? Because God cannot be investigated by science, and every attempt to do that is futile and even presumptuous.

He continues: *More difficult, is finding scientific evidence that supports a recent creation; and I am honest about this too, pointing out that creationist scientists are continuing to search for evidence in this area.* If that kind of “science” is to continue, it is not science at all, and will never be acknowledged by the scientific community. Bryan Ness and other creationists know that, but they blame the scientific community for atheism and working against Christian faith. This is all wrong. On this side of the Atlantic most Christians know that, and it is not a discussion which find much interest here, because this is so obvious.

And he still continues: *Creationists, on the other hand, invoke a supernatural cause for the origin of life and exercise faith in divine revelation that someday we will understand how to harmonize this with scientific evidence.* What does he mean by “supernatural”? If this “supernatural” phenomenon was possible to investigate, and that investigation was successful, the “supernatural phenomenon” would no longer be supernatural. Does this make sense?

Science knows that knowledge of the laws of nature is limited and steadily increasing. Science also knows that everything happens according to the laws of nature. Science and anybody know that it is legitimate to say that the number of the laws of nature must be infinite. That opens for “anything” to happen.

I am myself an SDA and active in my local church. Opinion in my church is differing, but a debate on this topic would be detrimental to our loveable fellowship and unity. God has created all the laws of nature. He never breaks them. He has never regretted any of them, because they are perfect. Not only science says that they cannot be broken, the Bible also does.

How long shall this irrational debate continue?

KRISTEN FALCH JAKOBSEN  
 Via the Internet