

God's Creation of Adam and Eve

Jonathan Wells

December 11, 2013

In “God’s Physical Development of the Human Being” (November 29, 2013), Henry Christopher wrote:

By 15 million years ago, God developed hominids out of the apes. They were the forerunners of Homo sapiens—Homo habilis, Homo erectus, etc. These creatures began to look and behave more humanlike, as God continued to engineer their physical make up, as He further developed the functioning of their five senses, their ability to make and use tools, speech, and so forth. In this way, God finally developed anatomically modern humans from archaic Homo sapiens in the Middle Paleolithic (the Stone Age when Homo sapiens made tools from stones), about 200,000 years ago. Modern humans, Homo sapiens, the scientists say, evolved in Africa from around that time, and then migrated into the Middle East around 125,000 years ago. My guess is that it was at this time in history, that God chose a Homo sapiens male and female, and when they gave birth to a boy and a girl, He breathed the eternal spirit and soul into them, and Adam and Eve, the ancestors of humankind were born. [1]

Henry also wrote: “I am neither theologian nor scientist.” I am both, though that doesn’t necessarily mean that my views on this topic are more correct than Henry’s. Nevertheless, I have studied and thought about this topic for over 35 years, and I would like to add my two cents.

My first cent: As a scientist, I would urge people not to put too much faith in what scientists say. This may sound like an “Everything written on this blackboard is false” kind of statement, but it’s not.

The story of human evolution that Henry tells is the standard Darwinian view—what some have called the “consensus” view. But a “consensus” in science is only a poll of current opinion that excludes the opinions of those who disagree with the majority. And the scientific consensus is notoriously changeable: In 1600, the consensus among astronomers was that the Sun revolves around the Earth (rather than the opposite); in 1750, the consensus among chemists was that things burn by giving off phlogiston (rather than by combining with oxygen); in 1900, the consensus among physicists was that atoms are like little solar systems (rather than quantized energy states).

To evaluate the current “consensus” about human evolution one must look beyond the current majority opinion to the evidence. And the evidence does not support the Darwinian view (“Darwinism,” for short).

Darwinism is not about minor changes within existing species; people have been observing such changes for centuries. Darwinism is about the origin of new species. Darwin argued that minor changes within existing species eventually produce new species under the influence of natural selection, but no one has ever observed the origin of a new species by this process—even though thousands of scientists since 1859 have tried very hard to do so. (Some plant species have been observed to originate through chromosome doubling, but this is not what Darwin had in mind and it does not explain the open-ended divergence needed for Darwinian evolution.)

Modern Neo-Darwinism assumes that genetic mutations make it possible to escape the boundaries of existing species. But there is no evidence that genetic mutations can do this. Fruit fly embryos have been mutated in every way (biologists call it “saturation mutagenesis”), but always with one of only three outcomes: a normal fruit fly, a defective fruit fly, or a dead fruit fly. (Saturation mutagenesis has also been used in roundworms, zebrafish, and mice, with similar results.)

So the evidence indicates that natural selection and mutation can produce nothing more than minor changes within existing species. The origin of species remains a mystery. [2]

People have found fossils of animals with features that are intermediate between apes and humans, but the fossil record of such animals is fragmentary and inconsistent. That’s why every few months the news will proclaim that some new fossil overturns current ideas about human origins.

Indeed, the problem goes deeper than that. If I were to find two human skeletons buried in my back yard, I would be unable to tell—without written records or (in some cases) DNA—whether one was the ancestor of the other. The problem is aggravated by fossils of different species that are widely separated in time and space. As Nature science writer Henry Gee wrote in 1999, “No fossil is buried with its birth certificate,” so “it is effectively impossible to link fossils into chains of cause and effect in any valid way.” According to Gee, “To take a line of fossils and claim that they represent a lineage is not a scientific hypothesis that can be tested, but an assertion that carries the same validity as a bedtime story—amusing, perhaps even instructive, but not scientific.” [3] (Gee is not a creationist but an evolutionary biologist—though his faith in Darwinian theory is not based on fossils.)

Paleoanthropologist Misia Landau noted in 1991 that accounts of human evolution tend to be “determined as much by traditional narrative frameworks as by material evidence.” A typical framework is a folktale in which a hero (our ancestor) leaves the trees, sets out on a perilous journey, and is finally transformed into a true human being. Landau concluded that “themes found in recent paleoanthropological writing... far exceed what can be inferred from the study of fossils alone and in fact place a heavy burden of interpretation on the fossil record—a burden which is relieved by placing fossils into preexisting narrative structures.” [4]

In other words, with Darwinism the story comes first, and fossils are used to illustrate it.

So, is Darwinism scientific? That depends on what one means by “science.” The problem is that the word is used in two different senses these days. In one sense, “science” means searching for the causes of phenomena by comparing hypotheses with evidence. Such a search never ends; all scientific hypotheses are tentative, and a true scientist (in this sense) is open to following the evidence wherever it leads. In the other sense, “science” means providing natural (i.e., materialistic) explanations for everything. Scientists in this second sense insist on materialistic explanations even when those explanations don’t really fit the evidence. Since materialism excludes mind, spirit and God, such explanations exclude creation by design.

For Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species* was “one long argument” against creation and design, but the argument was based less on evidence than on theology. For example, Darwin had no evidence for natural selection or the origin of species. Instead, he argued that a creator would not have made things the way we see them (a theological statement), and that the “scientific” (i.e., materialistic) alternative was “descent with modification” (his term for evolution). [5] So Darwinism is like Marxism—that is, applied materialistic philosophy. Marxism applies materialism to human history and economics; Darwinism applies materialism to biology.

My second cent: As a theologian, I would encourage deeply studying the doctrine that God created Adam and Eve in His image. The doctrine implies that God designed us from the beginning as spiritual and physical beings; we are not just highly evolved animals on which God chose to bestow spirits.

Then why did God make it look as though we are modified descendants of ape-like animals? Textbook-writer Kenneth R. Miller challenged critics of Darwinism to explain why we find “one organism after another in places and in sequences... that clearly give the appearance of evolution.” [6]

The answer is found in various traditions, including Christianity. “Far from denying life’s progression, tradition provides a reason for it,” wrote religion scholar Huston Smith in 1976. “Earth mirrors heaven. But mirrors, as we have noted, invert. The consequence here is that that which is first in the ontological order appears last in the temporal order.” Smith explained, “In the celestial realm the species are never absent; their essential forms or archetypes reside there from an endless beginning. As earth ripens to receive them, each in its turn drops to the terrestrial plane.” But “first a viable habitat must be devised, hence the inorganic universe is matured to a point where life can be sustained. And when living beings do arrive, they do so in a vaguely ascending order that passes from relatively undifferentiated organisms... to ones that are more complex.” Thus, “man, who is first in the order of worth on the terrestrial plane, will be last in the order of his appearance.” [7]

Unification Thought takes a similar position. According to Sang Hun Lee, “Prior to creating the universe, God first envisioned the image of the human being, which resembles God’s own image. Then, using the human image as the prototype, and in likeness to it, God formed the idea of the various things of creation... With regard to actual creation, however, the order of the universe was the exact opposite.” [8]

How, exactly, did God create Adam and Eve? In 1965, Reverend Sun Myung Moon said (according to an unofficial translation): “Adam and Eve were produced by exactly the same process as we produce a child. By strong love and energy of father and mother, a child is conceived and grows, first within the womb, then outside of it. In the same way, God created Adam and Eve. By his love and energy, a little thing was created which grew and grew and became Adam.” When asked whether Adam and Eve were born of God as we understand birth, that is, physiologically, Reverend Moon replied, “Through the power of God, Adam and Eve were created as a baby is created by humans today. Man was a special creation.” When asked whether Adam and Eve had earthly, physical parents, he said, “No! The source of creation is energy. You don’t need physical parents to be created. Adam was a special creation.” [9] Yet in 1999, Reverend Moon said that Adam had a navel and grew up in his mother’s womb, just as we do. [10]

These statements are enigmatic, even paradoxical. Adam and Eve were special creations who did not have biological parents—yet they began life the same way we did, as babies in the womb. How could this be possible? What follows is my speculation, but I think it resolves the paradox.

Adam and Eve were born as children are born today, with navels, because they developed as embryos in the wombs of animals with features that were intermediate between apes and humans—such as those

found in the fossil record. But Adam and Eve were not the biological children of those animals; instead, they were created by God—complete with spirits—in the wombs of surrogate parents previously created to bear them. The animals that gave birth to Adam and Eve nourished and protected the babies until the latter were able to fend for themselves, then that species went extinct. [11] As Sang Hun Lee wrote in 1978, the intermediate species was like “a scaffold” that is dismantled “after a building is completed.” [12]

Did things really happen this way? I don't know. It's a story. Unlike the Darwinian story, however, it is rooted in Jewish, Christian and Unification theology. It regards human beings from the moment of their creation as spiritual-physical wholes, not as physical descendants of ape-like animals on which God chose to bestow spirits. God's creation of Adam and Eve is inconsistent with materialistic “science,” but (I would argue) it is not contrary to evidence-based science.

Notes

1. Henry Christopher, “God's Physical Development of the Human Being” (2013) www.utsalumni.org/news/gods-physical-development-of-the-human-being-by-henry-christopher-uts80-9415/
(I have slightly edited the formatting.)
 2. Jonathan Wells, “Why Darwinism Is False” (2009) www.discovery.org/a/10661
 3. Henry Gee, *In Search of Deep Time* (New York: The Free Press, 1999), pp. 32, 113-117. See also Jonathan Wells, *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Darwinism and Intelligent Design* (Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing, 2006), Chapter 2.
 4. Misia Landau, *Narratives of Human Evolution* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991), pp. ix-x, 148. See also Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution* (Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing, 2002), Chapter 11.
 5. Jonathan Wells, “Darwin's Straw God Argument” (2008) www.discovery.org/a/8101
 6. Kenneth R. Miller, *Finding Darwin's God* (New York: Cliff Street Books, 1999), pp. 127-128.
 7. Huston Smith, *Forgotten Truth: The Primordial Tradition* (New York, Harper & Row, 1976), pp. 129, 139-140, 142.
 8. Sang Hun Lee, *Fundamentals of Unification Thought* (Tokyo: Unification Thought Institute, 1991), pp. 59-60, 82-84. See also Sang Hun Lee, *New Essentials of Unification Thought* (Tokyo: Unification Thought Institute, 2006), Preface. www.unification-thought.org/neut/nEssentials.pdf
 9. Sun Myung Moon, “Master Speaks on Creation.” Transcript of tapes made during sessions with members and guests at church centers in the United States (March-April 1965). www.unification.org/ucbooks/SMMSpk/MSTRSP-5.htm
 10. Sun Myung Moon, Speech in Tarrytown, NY, 1999, reported in the Japanese Blessed Family magazine, No. 15 (1999), translated by Akifumi Otani. See also Sang Hun Lee (ed.), *From Evolution Theory to a New Creation Theory* (Tokyo: Unification Thought Institute, 1996), p. 70. www.tparents.org/library/unification/books/evoltheo/0-Toc.htm
- Donna Ferrantello reports that Reverend Moon said in 2007, “Adam and Eve were created as twins, like two peas in a pod.” They would then have been “fraternal” or dizygotic twins. (“Identical” or monozygotic twins develop from the same fertilized egg and are either both male or both female.) Personal communication from Donna Ferrantello, December 9, 2013.
11. Jonathan Wells, “Evolution and Unification Thought,” *Journal of Unification Studies* 12 (2011): 115-142. www.journals.uts.edu/back-issues/volume-xii-2011/113-evolution-and-unification-thought
 12. Sang Hun Lee, Letter to Jonathan Wells, February 23, 1978. Excerpt reprinted in Jonathan Wells, *Evolution and Unification Thought* (Chung Nam, Korea: Unification Thought Institute, 2008), pp. 172-174.