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The single most important thing that I heard in class on Monday is that divine revelation is given by God to humans; humans are interpreters and they have reason. Humans use both interpretation and reason to make sense of the revelations that they have been given.

Growing up in a Christian household, I was constantly surrounded by the belief that God is the Creator of the universe, with little to no scientific explanation needed. As I have grown in my faith and become more independent from my parents, I have naturally begun to question whether or not these beliefs are entirely true. I have now come to accept that the idea of God causing a big bang is not all that far-fetched or impossible; however, I still have my doubts about evolution and many of the scientific explanations for the formation of the Earth. Currently, I am more prone to think on the side of divine revelation than human reason when it comes to the creation of the Earth and evolution. In fact, there were a few things written by Karen Strand Winslow in “The Earth is not a Planet” that I do not agree with at all. Things such as the flood not being universal and the earth being millions of years old do not sit well with me.

“The Earth is Not a Planet” brings up many good points which I believe are due credit; others, I think, have missed the mark. For instance, the mention that the term “’earth’ is the English translation of the Hebrew *eretz* or *ha-aretz* in the Bible (Winslow, 13)” is essential to the proper understanding of Genesis 1. It is important to know that this Hebrew term meant something very different to the original readers of Genesis; it meant land and not an entire planet. I understand this very well and I think that it is important to note; however, I think that, in some cases *ha-aretz* was actually supposed to mean the whole earth. The argument claiming that the flood only occurred in the region where the people who wrote Genesis resided does not make a lot of sense to me. Even if there is no evidence to support that the flood was worldwide, I do not think that there is evidence to prove the contrary either. Karen Strand Winslow even states that “*Ha-aretz* can refer to where one stands, bows, or lives. It can refer to the site of individuals or people groups, the countryside, or the entire expanse of land believed to exist.” For me, this is enough to believe that the flood was universal. I think that if the writer of Genesis believed that the whole earth was covered in flood waters, we should take this at face-value. I want to accept the Bible as truth without qualifications.

As it pertains to creation or evolution, I hold much the same view for these topics as I do for the account of the flood. I believe that creation happened as it says that it did in the Bible; I believe that God spoke the earth into existence and that He carefully and lovingly designed every living thing. I think that this is one main reason why it is hard for me to accept the theories of evolution or the big bang; I believe that God would not just cause random acts to come together and create the world and His people as if He were so far-removed and uninvolved. I like to think that God was, and still is, deeply involved in the creation process and getting His hands dirty, so to speak. It shows a deeper amount of love on God’s part and it also shows His commitment to the human race.