

The Bible brings us the Christian faith in a very practical form, without much theology. Theology and philosophy tend to cloud over the Christian faith and will eventually change it into something like the Hindu religion. The Christian faith has to be lived in real life and not become a mental exercise. The content of *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* is slowly losing true science and the actual teachings of Jesus as well.

Daniel Heinrichs  
 CSCA Associate Member  
 1107 - 333 Vaughan St.  
 Winnipeg, MB, Canada R3B 3J9.  
 danielhe@mb.sympatico.ca

## Are Dangerous Animals a Consequence of the Fall of Lucifer?

David Snoke in "Why Were Dangerous Animals Created?" (*PSCF* 56, no. 2 [2004]: 117-25) ascribes to God the creation of "violent and ferocious creatures." Snoke argues against Christians who believe that all natural evils arose as a direct consequence of the Fall of Man. In addition, Snoke disagrees with Christians who believe that "demons created all natural cruelty in nature." Snoke selectively considers the views of some Christians but ignores the belief of many that the real source of evil and aberrations in nature is Satan. This omission seems strange since Satan plays such a central role in the woes of Job whose book is the main source of Snoke's view that God created the dangerous species.

God created the laws that govern all of the workings and actions of his creation. God created creatures with free will that eventually disobeyed him. The consequences that followed were an integral part of the created entities. God did not create evil, evil is a result of disobedience. Evil results from the abuse of free will by rational creatures.

Animals are sentient beings that have no consciousness. C. S. Lewis writes: "From the doctrine that God is good we may confidently deduce that the *appearance* of reckless divine cruelty in the animal kingdom is an illusion, and the fact that the only suffering we know first hand (our own) turns out not to be a cruelty will make it easier to believe this. After that, everything is guesswork."<sup>1</sup> Lewis indicates that: "Man was not the first creature to rebel against the Creator, but that some older and mightier being long since became apostate and is now the emperor of darkness and (significantly) the Lord of this world."<sup>2</sup> Also, "The Satanic corruption of the beasts would therefore be analogous, in one respect, to the Satanic corruption of man."<sup>3</sup> And, finally, "Man is to be understood only in his relation to God. The beasts are to be understood only in their relation to man and, through man, to God."<sup>4</sup>

Lewis speculates: "I do not doubt that if the Paradisal man could now appear among us, we should regard him as an utter savage, a creature to be exploited or, at best, patronized. Only one or two, and those the holiest among us, would glance a second time at the naked, shaggy-bearded, slow-spoken creature: but they, after a few minutes, would fall at his feet."<sup>5</sup> Curiously, this description of Paradisal man before the Fall is reminiscent of Chance the Gardener, played by Peter Sellers in the movie *Being There*.

In this state, Paradisal man may have had eternal physical life, which he lost at the Fall and was prevented from regaining it by eating from the Tree of Life.

Humans were created in the image of God and animals are subordinate to them. The physical death of humans was a consequence of the Fall. Must that not automatically affect animals? Can superior human beings die whereas inferior animals not die? Therefore, animals were either already affected by the Fall of Lucifer or else the Fall of Man affected animals so that they would always be different in kind from humans. Hence, it is more logical to attribute animal pain and death to Satan and not to an omnipotent God. The millennium reign of the Messiah will be characterized by the restoration of the harmony in the whole of creation (Isa. 11:6-9) that was broken not by the sin of Adam and Eve but by Satan (Rom. 8:18-22).

In closing, Snoke's analysis may be partially successful in casting doubt that the Fall of Man gave rise to the viciousness and death in the animal kingdom. However, Snoke does not even mention the Fall of Lucifer (Isa. 12:14) and so his inference that such features of the animal world were created by God leaves much to be desired.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>C. S. Lewis, *The Problem of Pain* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1971), 129.

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, 134.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, 135.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, 138.

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, 79.

Moorad Alexanian  
 ASA Member  
 Department of Physics and Physical Oceanography  
 University of North Carolina at Wilmington  
 Wilmington, NC 28403-5606  
 E-mail: alexanian@uncw.edu

## From Whence Evil?

The explanation offered by David Snoke (*PSCF* 56, no. 2 [2004]: 117-25) for the fact that nature is red in tooth and claw is inevitable only if one accepts the fundamental premise of Calvinism: God, from all eternity, did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely, and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass. Arminians believe the character of God, which emerges from the Bible taken in its entirety, is inconsistent with Calvinism and, consequently, with the conclusion that God created nature as we know it today.

According to Scripture, the universe was originally good and the glory of God is still evident in it (Rom. 1:20). But something else—something frightfully wicked—is evident in it as well. Of their own free will, Satan and other spiritual beings rebelled against God in the primordial past and now abuse their God-given authority over certain aspects of creation. Satan, who holds the power of death (Heb. 2:14) exercises a pervasive, structural, diabolical influence to the point that the entire creation is in bondage to decay. The pain-ridden, bloodthirsty, sinister and hostile character of nature should be attributed to Satan and his army, not to God. Jesus' earthly ministry reflected the belief that the world had been seized by a hostile, sinister

lord. Jesus came to take it back. This explanation of evil in nature is persuasively set forth in Gregory Boyd's *Satan and the Problem of Evil* (InterVarsity Press, 2001).

Evidence suggests that Satan, not the Christian God, is the author of evil (1 John 5:19; Rom. 8:20–22; Isa. 13:11; Pss. 5:4; 97:10; Job 34:10). Perhaps Isaiah 11:6–9 reveals a true reflection of God's character in nature.

Bruce McLaughlin  
ASA Member  
Associate Professor of Physics and Mathematics  
North Greenville College  
Tigerville, SC 29688  
bmclaughlin@ngc.edu  
www.christianapologetic.org

## Cold Facts about the GISP2 Ice Core and the Flood

Derek Eshelbrenner's letter (*PSCF* 56, no. 2 [2004]: 156–7) regarding my paper on the GISP2 ice core suggests that some clarification is in order. I called my paper the "ultimate proof" against a global flood not because it is an absolute proof in a mathematical sense but because compared to other evidences that the Flood was not global, the GISP2 ice core offers the most direct and most difficult evidence for a YEC (Young Earth Creationist) to refute, making it particularly valuable for addressing the YEC illusion.

Eshelbrenner may have a legitimate complaint that I did not present enough evidence to remove the possibility of the Greenland ice sheet having floated at the time of Noah's flood but not floated away. One reason I did not spend much time on that possibility is because YECs are generally agreed that there was no ice sheet on Greenland or anywhere else before the Flood. And, from a scientific point of view, glaciologists are agreed that the Greenland ice sheet is indigenous.

When I asked Richard Alley, one of the world's leading glaciologists, about the possibility of the ice sheet having floated in a flood, he answered, "Highly unlikely!" for "lots of reasons." He mentioned the absence of "marine ice," which I mentioned in the paper and also said:

If it floated free and then sat back down, we should either see sea water that soaked into the margins, or that froze on the bottom, or else if you suppose really warm waters, then it would have melted off the old basal ice that is there.

I did not ask for other reasons, but if anyone is interested I am sure he or other glaciologists could convert "lots of reasons" into specifics.

The scientific evidence is that the Greenland ice sheet was neither covered by a global flood nor made to float as Gen. 7:19–8:4 virtually demands. Its untouched and long-time presence on Greenland testifies, therefore, that there was no global flood in the time of Noah. Eshelbrenner, however, is not ready to say science has proven there was no global Flood, only that such a Flood "appears naturally improbable." But, this is too weak a conclusion. Indeed Eshelbrenner seeks to sustain his conclusion by implying that Noah's flood may have been not only supernaturally

caused (which I in no way deny) but so unique that despite its unprecedented dimensions, it left neither sediment nor erosion behind it as it drained away! He would thus save the possibility of a global Flood by absolving it of any need to leave behind the most probable naturally expected evidence. It is an approach which virtually removes the Flood from history in order to save its historicity.

It should be added that in addition to glaciology and geology testifying that there was no global Flood, archaeology testifies that there were people all over the world and even in Mesopotamia in the time of Noah who were undisturbed by a supposed global Flood.<sup>1</sup> Yet only a global Flood could get an ark into the mountains of Ararat in such a way that all surrounding mountains were covered with water (Gen. 7:19; 8:3–5), and the consensus of Old Testament scholars is that Genesis is describing a flood that covered the entire earth.

I think we must conclude that the Flood was a local event, which we know was described by the Sumerians as destroying all humankind yet covering only cities in southern Mesopotamia, later described by the Babylonians as destroying all humankind and covering all of Mesopotamia, and finally described by the writer of Genesis 6–9 as destroying all humankind and covering all the world he knew, the entire Near East. He thus adapted traditional materials in order to communicate more effectively theological lessons to his generation.

The writing of the Flood story is thus similar to Jesus using traditional materials to say the kingdom of God is like a mustard seed, which "is smaller than all other seeds; but when it is full grown, it is larger than the garden plants, and becomes a tree, so that the birds of the air come and nest in its branches" (Matt. 13:32). The statement is not scientifically accurate: the mustard seed is not smaller than *all* other seeds, it does not become a *tree*, and although birds light on it, they do not build *nests* in it. The description is scientifically inaccurate because Jesus was using traditional materials in order to communicate more effectively theological lessons to his generation.

The purpose of the divine revelation in Scripture is to guide us in the area of faith and morals. The Bible's history and science are inspired in order to teach faith and morals, but this does not make its history *qua* history or its science *qua* science a divine revelation. Inspiration guarantees the inerrancy of the divine purpose for which Scripture was given, nothing more.

### Note

<sup>1</sup>The earliest possible date for Adam because of his Neolithic culture is c. 10,000 BC, and the probable date for Abraham is c. 2000 BC. The genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11 both place the Flood in the middle of that 8,000 year difference, thus, roughly at c. 6000 BC for the earliest possible date. I believe Carol Hill and Dick Fischer are correct that the actual event was a local flood around 2900 BC.

Paul Seely  
ASA Member  
1544 S.E. 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Portland, OR 97214  
Phseely@aol.com

[www.asa3.org](http://www.asa3.org)