

Creationism Views and Its Adherents

Restituto C. Bualoy, MA-R

Adventist University of the Philippines

rcbualoy@aup.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

Creationism encompasses a range of beliefs about the universe's origin, Earth, and life, primarily grounded in the Bible. This paper explores various creationist perspectives, including Young Earth Creationism, Old Earth Creationism, Theistic Evolution, and Intelligent Design. It examines their historical development, theological foundations, scientific arguments, and the implications of these views for the broader discourse on science and religion. By analyzing historical development and contemporary debates, this paper aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the diverse creationist viewpoints and their significance in the context of modern scientific and religious discussions, it helps in understanding how the views leave an eternal consequence in the life and faith of a person.

Keywords: Creationism, Young Earth Creationism, Old Earth Creationism, Theistic Evolution, Intelligent Design

INTRODUCTION

The doctrine of creation cannot be ignored by Christians because it is the “cornerstone of the Christian faith” (Geisler, 2021). While there is much discussion concerning the time of creation, evangelicals agree on the fact of creation with the following essential components” (1) There is a creator God; (2) Creation was *ex nihilo* (“out of nothing”); (3) God created all living things; (4) Adam and Eve were created special; and (5) the Genesis account of creation is historical, not mythological (Ibid).

Due to increasing scientific evidence that supports the supernatural creation of the universe, widely sharp debates about the time and the exact method of creation continually exist among creationist groups. All strongly maintain their position to uphold a divine creator if not the Genesis account of creation as authoritative.

The fast-soaring challenges from scientific evolutionary theory create a different interpretation and re-interpretation of the Bible among theologians and philosophers. It also creates

various creation supporters who are continually forming different ministries to combat evolution. Furthermore, this speedy development of creationism advocacies is never resting in promoting their view.

This paper provides an analysis of the major creationist groups or views such as: (1) Young Earth Creationism (YEC), (2) Old Earth Creationism (OEC), (3) Theistic Evolution (TE), and (4) Intelligent Design (ID). It explores the core arguments, historical development, theological foundations, and scientific arguments. It does not include any “secular” theory that does not believe in an infinite-personal God as the responsible being who created the universe (Grudem, 1994). Accordingly, the “big bang” theory or any related theories that excluded the Scripture and God are not incorporated.

In addition to analyzing the creationist views, this paper addresses the practical implications in the life of a Christian who believes in creation theory, particularly in the life of a Seventh-day Adventist church member. The study is significant because (1) it will help students (particularly those coming from public institutions) understand and weigh their options/worldviews as being affected by scientific biological evolution. (2) It will also enlighten church members and thus make them more critical of accepting teachings coming from a creationist point of view.

CREATIONISM

Arand describes the terms “creationism” and “creationists” as “do not refer primarily to the doctrine of creation and theologians who focus their study on the doctrine of creation. Nor do they refer mainly to scientists who study the world as scientists. Instead, they refer to positions and proposals that seek to reconcile or show the harmony between faith and science on the matter of origins” (Arand, 2018). It means that creationism is a belief system that embraces the Bible as the basis of the origin of the universe, the Earth, and all life forms, who believes in a divine being or higher power who is called the creator. This perspective contrasts with evolutionary biology, which explains the origins of life through natural processes such as natural selection and genetic variation over billions of years. Creationism typically emphasizes a literal or near-literal interpretation of sacred scriptures regarding the origins of life and the universe. Furthermore, while accepting the biblical creation account, it does not undermine the great responsibility and blessings of scientific processes and evidence to enlighten us of our origins. Hence, it maintains a good blending of science and the Bible.

The emergence of the modern creationist movement, which was primarily focused on North America during the 20th century, deserves much more investigation. The movement did not progress automatically in a vacuum, its historical development was not only the result of a great conflict between religion and modern scientific theories, but even the US legislature and public educational policies have a significant contribution to its vociferous commencement.

From Galileo Galilei (1564–1642) who is called the father of modern science who provoked the seventeenth-century scientific revolution, down to the advances of physics in the twentieth century, the heated tension between science and religion had never quenched even

though both sides had given their best apologetics explanations. Hence, there is no doubt that the rise of modern science in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has brought a great challenge to the biblical creation tradition embraced by the early Christians.

Since the introduction of Darwinian evolution, the abundance of substantial debates about the interpretation of natural history and the role of divine intervention in the origin of life has become the focal point. The believers of creation immediately objected to it based on religious beliefs. Buskager (2012) rightly accentuates “*how* God created the universe is a point of contention and mass division for Christians rife with theological, philosophical, and scientific concerns” (p.155). Thus, the defenders of creation theory consistently convey the message that evolution is wrong because it goes against the teachings of the Bible. Creationist beliefs and groups appear either to defy or to support scientific understanding of origins but generally to abandon evolutionary theory. Reiss exactly emphasized that many consider evolution and cosmology to be religious issues since they appear to contradict the stories of origins (inorganic, organic, and human) presented in the Jewish, Christian, and Muslim scriptures (Reiss, 2008).

The triggering factor of the creationist movements for more aggressive and determined promotions is the introduction of the theory of evolution in the classroom. It became a requirement in public school when George William Hunter's “A Civic Biology” (1914) book was published in Dayton, Tennessee and later used in biology courses. In 1923, William Jennings Bryan became successful in convincing the legislatures of Oklahoma and Florida which led to the first anti-evolution bill. This effort to ban evolution instructions in public schools was highlighted during the well-known Scopes Trial (July 10-21, 1925, Dayton, Tennessee), known as the “Monkey Trial” of a high-school teacher, John T. Scopes, charged with breaching state law by teaching Charles Darwin's theory of evolution. It affects temporarily the evolutionary teaching until it was revived when the U.S. Supreme Court (November 12, 1968) invalidated the Epperson versus Arkansas case—prohibiting the teaching of evolution. Creationists did not surrender their advocacies but instead made strategies by promoting “creation science” (1970), and then “intelligent design” (1991), but despite its efforts to attack and discredit science, creationism did not gain many followers. (See Timeline, 2008)

According to Ruud the pillar of creationism was “flood geology” as exposed in the book *The Fundamentals of Geology* (1913) which is an expanded version of *Illogical Geology* (1906) written by George McCready Price, who is a Seventh-day Adventist (SDA), although his influence at the time was not fully acknowledged (Ruud, 2024, Timeline, 2008). As a devoted member SDA church, Price was influenced by the writings of Ellen G. White (the Adventist movement's prophet). Almost five decades later, John Whitcomb and Henry Morris author of the book *The Genesis Flood* (1961) took Price's ideas and popularized them (Ruud, 2024).

Nicholas J. Matzke an active evolutionist describes the ripples of creationism as, “like McDonald's, creationist movements are spreading around the world along with the influence of American culture” (Matzke, 2010). He continues that the American-style Protestant biblical fundamentalism became the foundation of organized creationist movements, and they will appear anywhere in the world that is reachable by missionaries, churches, and sectarian media except those Islamic and war-torn countries (Ibid).

Matzke illustrated the three historical and major creationist movements as follows: “The First Creationist Movement: Banning Evolution (1920–1968), The Second Creationist Movement:

“Creation Science” (1968–1987), The Third Creationist Movement: “Intelligent Design” (1989–2005)” (Ibid). We can observe that these movements emerged as a response to the rapid advancement of biological evolution and its growing influence on the educational system. Some U.S. states tried to accommodate the two opposing views, Barbour (2000) describes

A law passed by the Arkansas legislature in 1981 required that ‘creationist theory’ be given equal time with evolutionary theory in high school biology texts and classes. The law specified that creationism should be presented purely as scientific theory, with no reference to God or the Bible. (n.p.)

Because of these compromises, other branches of creationism developed into a more accommodating spirit, accepting the creation account but removing the operational role of God in it just like in old earth creationism and theistic evolutionism. Thus, making the creator God impotent or irresponsible in everything that exists in the world.

YOUNG EARTH CREATIONISM

Young Earth Creationism (YEC) is based on a literal interpretation of the Bible, particularly the Genesis account of creation. This view emphasizes a literal six-day creation event, where God created the world in six 24-hour days about 6,000 years ago. Some proposed 6,000–10,000 years ago (Matzke, 2010), or allowing for gaps in Old Testament genealogies, this means that the universe was created between 10,000 and 20,000 years ago (Koperski, 2015). Furthermore, YECs claim that the geological data, including the fossil record, should be interpreted based on the worldwide flood described in the Genesis account (Ibid).

Historical Development

The Jews and Christians accepted the Bible as authoritative, predominantly in the understanding of the origin of the world. The first five books also known as the “Torah” composed of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy describe the history of the world and the existence of men. This historical framework of beginnings has been widely known and accepted as early as the birth of Judaism in the 20th – 18th century BCE (when God made a covenant with Abraham) and remained flourishing even at the inception of Christianity in the middle of the first century CE. Since Islam also shares this Abrahamic heritage, these three major religions share the same belief in creation. Hence, from ancient times until the nineteenth century, there has not been so much clash in recent creation theory or origin-related issues.

With little scientific evidence to dispute a recent creation, Scripture and tradition were the only known sources of the genesis question. Around 1800, a tremendous transformation occurred in the scientific world; geology came into the focus of a distinct study because a new finding emerged among fossils in geological strata. By the middle of the century, an old-earth perspective had gained traction. In 1852, one American critic claimed that one-half of the Christian people had come to accept that Genesis did not require a young-earth interpretation (Koperski, 2015).

By the early twentieth century, YEC had become a minority group with few faithful advocates where only the SDA denomination maintained it in their fundamental doctrine. This was sustained by George McCready Price in his book *The Fundamentals of Geology* (1913). Aside from the SDA church, a fundamentalist movement occurred when a project called “The Fundamentals”, was produced by the Bible Institute of Los Angeles (now Biola) between 1910 and 1915 as a response to those who rejected traditional Christian doctrine of creation. Fundamentalism became successful; however, they were not unanimous in dismissing evolution as a means of creation and there was no denial of scientific evidence indicating that the world was far older than 10,000 years. (Giberson, 2012). After World War II, only a few conservative groups (SDA is the only consistent group) had adopted the idea, but later it was revived by seminary professor John Whitcomb Jr. and civil engineering professor Henry Morris’ book *The Genesis Flood* (1961) influencing the broader Christian world. This paved the way for YEC to gain popularity among evangelical Christians and later integrated into the theological statements of several churches, seminaries, and independent ministries (Buskager, 2012; Koperski, 2015), making it a “powerful antievolutionary force” (Buskager, 2012. p. 155.) confronting modern scientific reasoning.

Some active Protestant organizations supporting young Earth creationism are the following: Answers in Genesis (AiG) under the leadership of Ken Ham, Institute for Creation Research (ICR) most likely the largest organization started by creationist pioneer Henry Morris but now directed by his son John Morris, Creation Research Society (CRS), Carl Baugh's Creation Evidence Museum in Texas, AiG's Creation Museum and Ark Encounter in Kentucky, Creation Ministries International, and Kolbe Center for the Study of Creation is a recognized Roman Catholics promoter of creation is run by lay apostolate.

Theological Foundations

The YEC believes in a literal six-day creation that culminates on the Sabbath rest of the seventh day as written in Genesis 1:1 – 2:4. The Bible is silent or does not discuss the exact date of creation. The most famous who assumes the exact date of creation is James Ussher (1581-1656) archbishop of Armagh pointing to October 23, 4004 BC. His works were published in Dublin in 17 volumes as edited by C. R. Elrington and J. H. Todd (1847-64). The *Annales* (almost 2,000 pages) in volumes 8-12 contain the chronology from creation to the New Testament (Barr, 1985).

Horn (1979), while making some analysis of Old Testament events, made an explicit statement regarding chronological accuracy:

While there are numerous ‘chronological statements’ in the Bible pertaining to the periods from Abraham down through the ages, not a single ‘chronological statement’ can be found in the entire Bible which helps us to date any of the earlier events, whether it be the building of the Tower of Babel, the confusion of tongues, the Flood, or Creation. (p. 18).

In this case, Horn strongly retains that the 6,000-year suggestion cannot be proved by the Biblical chronology but is purely based on the statement from Ellen G. White (Horn, 1979). Here the issue being addressed is not a denial of the suggested year of creation, but the basis of a six thousand years assumption which does not warrant a million or billions of years. The key point here is that the history of life in our world is much shorter than the naturalistic view of billion years.

Scientific Arguments

YEC proponents frequently question widely accepted scientific conclusions, such as radiometric dating, the fossil record, and geological evidence, all of which point to an Earth that is billions of years old. They contend that the apparent age in the geological record can be explained by factors like the global flood recounted in Genesis. YEC faces significant criticism from the scientific community, which argues that YEC interpretations are inconsistent with extensive evidence from multiple scientific disciplines, including geology, astronomy, and biology. The ongoing debate between YEC and mainstream science highlights broader tensions between religious beliefs and scientific methodologies.

OLD EARTH CREATIONISM

It is not easy to describe Old-earth creationism (OEC) in terms of its views because of its diverse understandings regarding the age of the earth, the origin of humans, and the origin of all living things. Some referred to OEC with its alias term “day-age” or “progressive” creationism. YEC and OEC are equally rejecting the evolutionary theory, correspondingly upholding the Bible as inspired, that it is infallible and inerrant Word of God. They both accept that the Genesis creation account is an accurate narrative and there is a literal creation *ex nihilo* that happened in the past by a Creator God. Following these similarities, however, is not enough because of existing obvious contradictions. The conflict occurs in their approaches or interpretation of the Hebrew text.

OEC always considers Genesis 1 and 2 as a historical account and should be taken literally. But because “the text does not provide all the details of exactly how God did everything. We can speculate about the missing details only if we approach the text with the respect it deserves, neither minimizing the message nor twisting it to promulgate our personal views” (Moore, 2007). From this statement, the Bible text is open to any speculation. Hence, the various authorial assumption concludes the six-day creation stories as literally six extended periods. Norman Geisler (2021) observed the following propositions: (1) placing the long periods before Genesis 1:1 (making it a recent and local Creation); (2) placing the long periods between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 (called “gap” views); (3) making the “days” of Genesis 1 long periods; (4) allowing long periods between literal twenty-four-hour days in Genesis 1 (called “alternate day-age” views); or (5) making the “days” of Genesis to be days of revelation of God to the writer, not days of Creation (called “revelatory day” views). From this observation, the OEC initiated various independent models in depending on a million- or billion-years creation theory.

Although OEC accepts the traditional biblical account of creation, scholars observed that contemporary scientific methods, specifically the standard geological science regarding the age of the Earth and the universe (Matzke, 2010) must be considered in supporting creation theory. Arand (2018) concurs that typically, it is more compatible with the scientific consensus on the issues in geology, and the age of the Earth by pursuing different theories like the “gap-hypothesis, the day-age hypothesis, the framework hypothesis, the pictorial-day hypothesis, and the analogical-day

hypothesis.” From this idea, the Genesis creation assumes that all living things were created through supernatural methods and accepting scientific evidence about the age of the world and the universe. Greg Moore (2007) as an OEC defender encourages Christians not to be afraid regarding old-earth science, he asserts that the realities of the natural world will consistently align with the teachings of the Bible. For him when we diligently explore both science and the Bible, we can discern that the revelation of God in creation harmonizes seamlessly with the revelation of God in scripture. This view is sometimes referred to as “concordist,” a perspective that seeks agreement or “concord” between the Bible and scientific dating (Grudem, 1994). Consequently, science and Scripture can be seen in a complementary relation instead of opponents.

Historical Development

Traditionally, OEC became strong during the nineteenth century, though there are views that date back to Augustine during the fourth century (Geisler, 2021). Some believed that many of the early church fathers held to an old earth view, like Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Origen, and Aquinas to name a few. However, all these names above were refuted by James R. Mook (Mortenson, & Ury, Eds, 2008),

We have shown that most of the fathers held to the six days as being literal 24-hour days. At the very minimum, they all believed that creation was sudden. . . . The oft-used counter examples of Clement, Origen, and Augustine, best understood through the lens of Alexandrian allegorical hermeneutics, all held that the creation had been fully completed in an instant (p. 50).

This was complimented by Frantz (2014), although some church fathers held non-literal day interpretation, “while the early church historical figures held varying views on day-age they overall staunchly held to the earth being young in age” (p. 11).

Some proponents of OEC among the theologians during the 19th century were Charles Hodge (A.D. 1797-1878) and Benjamin B. Warfield (A.D. 1851-1921). During the 20th century were Gleason Archer and R. Laird Harris (co-authors, *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*), James Montgomery Boice (Chairman of the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy). Some contemporary theologians and apologists are John Ankerberg, Bill Bright, C. John Collins, Norman Geisler, Wayne Grudem, and Walter Kaiser. But the most prominent contemporary defender is astronomer Hugh Ross, the founder of “Reasons to Believe” an international and non-denominational old-earth ministry.

Within OEC sub-groups or types exist such as Gap Theory, Day-Age Theory, and Literary Framework view. The *Gap Theory* posits that the universe was created as described in Genesis 1:1. They believed that there was an untold length or prolonged period of billions of years, commonly referred to as a gap between Genesis 1:1 and Genesis 1:2. Some refer to this view as “restitution theory” (Waltke, 1975), “ruin and reconstruction theory” (Ham, 2009). In Genesis 1:2, God only re-created the earth within six 24-hour time periods, which had already existed for billions of years when God created the universe in Genesis 1:1 (Davis 2012). In other words, this world and all current living creatures are only a few thousand years from the second creation.

The Scofield Reference Bible, which was initially released by Oxford University Press in 1909 became the ignition key among conservative Protestants in the English-speaking world that set ablaze the gap theory (Davis, 2012). Here, it was proposed that after the original creation (Gen 1:1) there was a massive destruction that happened during God’s judgment leaving fossils of that pre-Adamic world. And those fossils that are vestiges of the pre-Adamic world are not a record of evolutionary history (Ibid). In this line, geologists can propose any age of the earth. Therefore, this view can match the present scientific geological understanding of billions of years of age of the earth. They believe this is an effective approach to dealing with biblical and geological evidence. For them, the indefinite gap theory is a good solution to harmonize Science and Scripture.

The *Day-Age* theory is another type of OEC that seeks to harmonize the Genesis creation account with contemporary science by proposing that the creation “days” were not ordinary 24-hour days but rather extended over long periods or periods of indefinite length (hence the term day-age, suggesting that each “day” lasted for an age). In this perspective, the order and length of the creation “days” could be compared to the scientific consensus on the age of the earth and the universe. The basis for this view is that the Hebrew word “yom” (day) does not necessarily a literal 24-hour day because they assert that the Hebrews used the same term when referring to a long period of time (Davis, 2012). This claim is still believed to be a literal interpretation of the text, thus upholding the day-age view.

Another justification for using a long period of time for the term “day” is the numerous events that occurred during the sixth day. For example, God's creation of Adam, the placing of Adam in the Garden of Eden to till and keep it, the giving of directions regarding the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, the naming of animals, finding a helper fit for Adam, the deep slumber and the medical operation of Adam's rib and the creation of Eve. These would require a much longer period than just a single day.

The *Literary Framework* view suggests that the six days described in Genesis 1 do not necessarily represent a chronological sequence of events. It was written to serve as a literary “framework” through which the author communicates God's creative work. This framework is carefully crafted so that the events of the first three days mirror those of the second three days, thus the method demonstrates a parallel construction. Here, the intention of the author of Genesis 1 is not to provide a literal account of the chronological sequence of days nor the specific order of creation, nor to convey exact information about the length of creation (Grudem, 1994) but to provide a way to remember and recollect God's creative power for each day culminating the creation of humankind. That is why McGee (2019) observed that this view proposes to reclassify Genesis 1 as poetic literature instead of historical narrative literature, making it possible to insert billions of years into Genesis 1 without causing hermeneutical harm.

Theological Foundations

Generally, OEC accepts the scientific consensus on the age of the Earth and the universe but maintains that God played a role in the process of creation. OEC proponents accept that the Earth is approximately 4.5 billion years old. However, they interpret the Genesis account as

compatible with this extended timeline, suggesting that the “days” of creation could represent longer epochs or periods

Scientific Arguments

OEC reconciles the scientific evidence for an old Earth with a belief in divine creation. This view acknowledges the validity of scientific findings related to geology, astronomy, and paleontology while maintaining that God's guidance was integral to the process of creation. OEC proponents often advocate for a framework that integrates faith with scientific understanding

OEC faces challenges in balancing scientific evidence with theological beliefs, particularly regarding the process of evolution. Some OEC adherents accept microevolution but reject macroevolution, arguing that species were created in their current forms rather than evolving from common ancestors. This nuanced position aims to bridge the gap between scientific theories and religious doctrines.

THEISTIC EVOLUTION

The Theistic Evolution (TE) claims that God intervened in the creation process by (1) forming of matter at the beginning, (2) the development of the simplest life form, and (3) the creation of man. Aside from those points, they believed that evolution continues as discovered by natural scientists. For them, it was the process that God chose to utilize to allow all other kinds of life on Earth to evolve, they think that the random mutation of living things resulted in the evolution of higher life forms (Grudem, 1994). In other words, “God used the mechanism that Darwin discovered, natural selection, to evolve the flora, fauna, and human beings that are present on the earth” (McGee, 2019, p. 53). TE proponents “believe that deity(ies) directed the evolutionary process in ways that we may not fully understand” yet “they do not fully embrace naturalistic neo-Darwinian evolution” (Gurtler, JB. p. 91)

TE believes God committed at least one miraculous act, namely the creation of the physical universe from nothing (Geisler, 2021). Some contemporary scientists are combining theistic evolution with the anthropic principle, arguing that the Creator fine-tuned the entire universe during the Big Bang, then causing everything, including all life forms, to emerge by natural processes from that point (Ibid). Here, the role of the Creator is only to form the matter and then leave it on its own to evolve after its wishes.

Historical Development

Some persons and groups embracing the TE view are the Roman Catholic Church by the sanction of Pope John Paul II in 1996, Protestant denominations including the Presbyterian church, the Nazarene Church, the Anglican Church, the Episcopal Church, the Lutheran Church, the United

Church of Christ, the United Methodist Church (Gurtler, JB. p. 91), an evangelical scientist, and the American Scientific Association (Geisler, 2021) The most prominent example is Francis Collins, the geneticist who started BioLogos.

Theological Foundations

The TE, also known as evolutionary creationism, suggests that evolutionary processes are consistent with the belief in God. The Bible is viewed as a collection of writings which contains partially God's Word. While it needs to be carefully interpreted but must be revised to fit every period and circumstance, as it does not contain any final, authoritative truths. TE often contends that the Genesis account of creation was written to demonstrate “*that* God created life and not *how* God accomplished it” (Gurtler, JB. p. 90).

Scientific Arguments

TE supports many scientist who holds view on the Big Bang theory, evolution, and the age of the Earth. It acknowledges that genetic variation and natural selection played a role in the evolution of life. Proponents of TE contend that rather than refuting God's existence, evolution illustrates the complexity and magnificence of divine creation.

INTELLIGENT DESIGN

Intelligent Design (ID) is considered a scientific research program that investigates the effects of intelligent causes and at the same time an intellectual movement that challenges Darwinism and its naturalistic legacy (Gurtler, JB). Some observed it as a belief (according to scientists) or theory (according to its proponents) that “the deep structures of life” can be explained by some force of intentional design and not by natural selection and random (Binder, 2007, p. 549). Others have seen it as religion masquerading as science or “Creationism in a Cheap Tuxedo” (Dembski, 2004, p. 7).

Some proponents of evolution science did not consider ID as a scientific research program. While ID is asserting that they are biological science research because have not presented a research program that deserves serious consideration, they are seen only as a movement that is motivated by ideological intentions rather than by paying attention to actual scientific investigation (Peterson, 2002). Peterson continues that their ideology is deceptive because their approach is misguided, and it will only result in more uncomfortable public confrontations at the cost of religious traditions (Ibid.). Pennock (2003) resonates with the same argument that both “Creation science and ID are alike in that neither offers positive evidence for their belief that biological organisms were the result of supernatural intervention, but rely entirely on negative arguments against evolution” (p. 152). Hence, they are seen as a stumbling block in science and religion

dialogue. ID movement is viewed primarily as an attempt to gather young and old earthers together to confront their common enemy of evolution.

Historical Development

ID began in 1992 by Philip Johnson a trained law professor at the University of California at Berkeley. Michael Behe a Catholic Biochemist, from Lehigh University, wrote “Darwin’s Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution” (1996), he became the leading scientific spokesperson for intelligent design, and provided three significant examples of irreducibly complex systems that reportedly cannot be described by natural means. Another notable leader is William Dembski an evangelical mathematician and philosophy professor at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary (Geisler, 2021; Gurtler, JB. p. 91). In his book, “Intelligent Design: The Bridge Between Science and Theology” (1999), he underscores the role of intelligent design in providing a crucial link between science and theology.

Theological Foundations

Unlike the YEC and OEC who considered the Biblical creation in Genesis 1 and 2, ID proponent ignores its historical account. Even the Biblical God of creation is not even important. For them, the intelligent designer could be a personal or impersonal God, a loving or cruel deity, a non-divine-created being, or it could be an extraterrestrial life species (Gurtler, JB. p. 91).

Scientific Arguments

ID are consistently opposing the naturalistic evolution; conversely, they are neither young earth nor old earth creationists. Geisler (2021) summarizes ID arguments in what they are planning to accomplish: (1) to form a unifying “wedge” that will destroy the bulwark of naturalistic evolution around the academic community, (2) Attack the Achilles heel of evolution by revealing its naturalistic philosophical commitment and thereby destroy its plausibility and privileged position in the academic community, (3) Provide a scientific alternative to naturalistic macroevolution that is free of the trappings of biblical and religious language, (4) Provide an umbrella under which young-and old-earth creationists can work against naturalistic evolution. (Geisler, 2021)

Gurtler suggested two common arguments used by ID: (1) *The irreducible complexity argument* – The biological cell is irreducibly complex, as it contains thousands of important biochemical components that anyone cannot be removed without disrupting its function. If a biological cell is irreducibly complicated, it cannot evolve naturally over millions of years by gradually adding important biochemical components. (2) *The programmed information (or coded information) argument* – This argument addresses the molecular level of organic life and the

genetic code found in all DNA/RNA of all living organisms. Some claim that the complexity and sophisticated arrangement of genetic information cannot be explained only by randomness or natural selection (p. 93).

IMPLICATIONS FOR FAITH AND PRACTICE

The various creationist viewpoints have important consequences for the interaction between science and religion. Each worldview provides distinct approaches to integrating religious beliefs with scientific findings. Subsequently, the impact of each distinct view does not only affect the science and religion controversy but more so the individual faith and practice. Every viewpoint has an impact on religious teachings and also plays a role in determining how followers participate in current scientific dialogues and schooling systems, molding both their perspective and real-life implementation of their beliefs.

YEC emphasizes interpreting the Bible’s creation story literally, which can breed doubt in scientific theories like evolution. OEC accommodates scientific discoveries by supporting a longer timeline for Genesis’ creation account, promoting a holistic view of science and religion. TE believes that a divine being uses evolutionary theory to create, showing how science and religion can coexist. ID does not necessarily acknowledge the God of the Bible, although an intelligent designer is needed in creation.

OEC, TE, and ID harmonize science with faith, thus promoting a more unified perspective on science and religion. It reflects a more flexible approach to interpreting the Bible in light of scientific discoveries so that the Bible can be misused. Consequently, the Bible can be treated unfairly, its authority can be questioned, and the biblical truths can be trampled. Even with good intentions, these views distort Scripture and undermine the foundation of biblical teachings which is the foundation of ethical practices. Morality can be defined now subjectively leaving man as the absolute standard.

The only best preference a Seventh-day Adventist can take is the first view. The Bible is seen as the revelation of God, the sole authority and the absolute standard in all matters of ethical procedures. It sees God as the omnipotent Creator, the transcendent and immanent God, the loving Savior and the Sovereign Ruler of the Universe. The specialness of man, the purity of marriage, the sacredness of the Sabbath, the enormity of evil, the efficacy of the plan of redemption, and the sure promise of recreation can be valued with awe and gratefulness.

CONCLUSION

Creationism encompasses a range of beliefs about the origins of the universe, Earth, and life, reflecting different approaches to interpreting religious texts and scientific evidence. YEC, OEC, TE, and ID offer unique perspectives on these issues, contributing to ongoing debates about the relationship between science and religion. However, it is sensible to promote the view that



11th ISC 2024 (Universitas Advent Indonesia, Indonesia)

“Research and Education Sustainability: Unlocking Opportunities in Shaping Today's Generation Decision Making and Building Connections” October 22-23, 2024

highlights humans as the crowning act of creation, a precisely designed product of a purposeful Creator, and made in the image and likeness of a benevolent God.

REFERENCES

- Arand, C. P. (28 Feb, 2018) A Travel Guide to the Evangelical Creation Debates: What is Old Earth Creationism?. Retrieved from <https://concordiatheology.org/2018/02/a-travel-guide-to-the-evangelical-creation-debates-what-is-old-earth-creationism/>
- Barbour, I. G. (1997). Religion and science: Historical and contemporary issues.
- Barbour, I. G. (2000). When science meets religion: Enemies, strangers, or partners?.
- Barr, J. (1985). Why the world was created in 4004 BC: Archbishop Ussher and biblical chronology. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 67(2), 575-608.
- Binder, A. (2007). Gathering intelligence on intelligent design: Where did it come from, where is it going, and how should progressives manage it?. *American Journal of Education*, 113(4), 549-576.
- Buskager, K. (2012). Young Earth Creationism: An Evolution of Myth.
- Davis, T (19 June, 2012). Old-Earth (Progressive) Creationism: History and Beliefs. Retrieved from <https://biologos.org/series/science-and-the-bible/articles/old-earth-progressive-creationism-history-and-beliefs>
- Dembski, W. A. (2004). The design revolution: Answering the toughest questions about intelligent design. InterVarsity Press.
- Frantz, C. (2014). An Examination of the Old Earth View of Creation among Evangelicals.
- Geisler, N. L. (2021). Systematic Theology:(in One Volume). Bastion Books.
- Giberson, K. (2012). Adventist Origins of Young Earth Creationism.
- Greene, J. W. A Biblical Case for Old-Earth Creationism. Retrieved from <https://www.scienceandfaith.org/old-earth-creationism>
- Grudem, W. (1994). Systematic theology: An introduction to Bible doctrine. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Gurtler, J. B. Creationism, Theistic Evolution, and Deistic Evolution.
- Ham , K. (6 Sept, 2007). What About the Gap & Ruin-Reconstruction Theories?
- Horn, S. H. (1979). Can the Bible Establish The Age of the Earth?. *Spectrum*, 10 (3), 15-20.
- Koperski, J. (2015). Creationism. In *Science, Religion and Society* (pp. 410-418). Routledge.
- Matzke, N. J. (2010). The evolution of creationist movements. *Evolution: education and outreach*, 3, 145-162.
- McGee, David A., "Critical Analysis of Hugh Ross' Progressive Day-Age Creationism Through the Framework of Young-Earth Creationism" (2019). Faculty Publications and Presentations. 56. https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/sod_fac_pubs/56

- Moore, G. (10 Jan, 2007). Does Old-Earth Creationism Contradict Genesis 1?: A Rebuttal to Terry Mortenson's Article “Evolution vs. Creation: the Order of Events Matters” Retrieved from <http://richardkresse.net/youngearth/mortenson.html>
- Mortenson, T., & Ury, T. (Eds.). (2008). Coming to grips with Genesis: biblical authority and the age of the earth. New Leaf Publishing Group.
- National Center for Science Education (NCSE). (2016, January). Old earth creationism. NCSE retrieved July 31, 2024 <https://ncse.ngo/old-earth-creationism>
- Pennock, R. T. (2003). Creationism and intelligent design. *Annual Review of Genomics and Human Genetics*, 4(1), 143-163.
- Peterson, G. R. (2002). The Intelligent-Design Movement: Science or Ideology?. *Zygon*®, 37(1), 7-23.
- Reiss, M. (2008). Teaching evolution in a creationist environment: an approach based on worldviews, not misconceptions. *School Science Review*, 90(331), 49-56.
Retrieved from <https://answersingenesis.org/genesis/gap-theory/what-about-the-gap-and-ruin-reconstruction-theories>
- Ruud, N. (2024). George McCready Price and Seventh-Day Adventism’s Influence on the Rise of Modern Creationism. *Church History and Religious Culture*, 104(1), 118-130.
- Stewart, D. (24 Apr, 2007). What Is the Gap Theory? (The Ruin and Reconstruction Theory?). Retrieved from https://www.blueletterbible.org/faq/don_stewart/don_stewart_654.cfm
- Timeline: How Creationism Has "Evolved"(10/21/2008) accessed Aug 4, 2024. <https://www.peoplefor.org/report/timeline-how-creationism-has-evolved>
- Waltke, B. K. (1975). The Creation Account in Genesis 1: 1-3. *Bibliotheca sacra*, 132(525), 25-36.