

## Author Response

Yes, there are many points of development that are argued as to when we should start to recognize the presence of a fellow human being. Magner has cited the line enforced, for example, by the government of the United Kingdom. If it is not yet biologically settled whether there are one, or two, or more souls present, then no one soul is present.

Caveat emptor, the usual theological response to this argument from those who advocate the full presence of a soul from the meeting of the egg and sperm, is that God knows the future and assigns the proper number of souls to the initially single embryo, for the number of physical individuals who will eventually result.

James C. Peterson  
Editor-in-Chief, *PSCF*

## Did God Guide Our Evolution? It from Bit?

The question of how to reconcile events in our spacetime with God acting in his creation is a very difficult and profound one (J. B. Stump, "Did God Guide Our Evolution?," *PSCF* 72, no. 1 [2020]: 15–24). In the attempt to uphold both the science of evolution and Christian theology, J. B. Stump makes two claims:

- C1. Evolution is the best scientific explanation for the origin of *Homo sapiens*.
- C2. God intentionally created humans beings in God's image.<sup>1</sup>

Stump reconciles these claims by viewing the same situation with scientific or theological glasses, a sort of cognitive dualism. Even though Stump did not use the term complementarity, introduced in quantum physics by Niels Bohr, nonetheless in response letters, Randy Isaac associates the notion of cognitive dualism with complementarity.<sup>2</sup> Isaac actually considers God as working through the random mutations inherent in evolution as a way to reconcile Stump's two claims. On the other hand, Chris Barrigar emphasizes that his three strategies for reconciling science and theology does not lead to deism.<sup>3</sup> Stump retorts that his position is not exactly the same as complementarity as implied by Isaac and that he actually does not reject the three strategies of Barrigar but rather that Barrigar's account is sophisticated and subtle, and definitely worth further consideration.<sup>4</sup>

More recently, Peter J. Bussey argues that Creation took place in three stages of inclusive cognitive

dualism: physical with the Big Bang, mental, and spiritual—in concordance with the biblical notion of body/mind/spirit—with the Big Bang containing the seeds of life.<sup>4</sup>

A strict evolutionist claim would consider only Bussey's physical stage in explaining all that exists, disregarding the mental and spiritual stages as arising actually from the physical. On the other hand, a strict theological claim would consider the account in Genesis 1:1–26, which may have actually been an inspiration for the theory of evolution, to give a temporal account of creation from the simple to the complex. The apex of creation is life in unfallen or Paradisal Man via the breath of God. Therefore, according to Christian theology, the present state of all that there is, including modern man, would be a consequence of the Fall of Man.

How then to reconcile these two disparate claims? J. A. Wheeler is one of the staunchest advocates of the idea that information is more fundamental than anything else in physics, an idea summarized by his slogan "it from bit."<sup>6</sup> Wheeler claims that existence is an information-theoretic entity. However, the notion of existence is not in the realm of physics but in that of metaphysics and theology,<sup>7</sup> which notion Wheeler contests with his Four No's and Five Clues. Accordingly, a strict scientific depiction of all that exists is thus untenable.

The presence of God in our spacetime is in the person of Jesus, God Incarnate, that is, the self-existing Word, which also upholds all things by the word of his power: that is, he created *ex nihilo* and sustains the existence of his creation.

The study of man on Earth is a historical science akin to forensic science and is best conducted with the truth of scripture in mind. Surely, this approach is quite consistent with Bussey's argument since the presence of God is needed in our spacetime to create not only life and mind but also human beings in God's image.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup>J. B. Stump, "Did God Guide Our Evolution?," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 72, no. 1 (2020): 16.

<sup>2</sup>Randy Isaac, "Does Complementarity Explain Anything?," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 72, no. 2 (2020): 126.

<sup>3</sup>Chris Barrigar, "The Agape/Probability Proposal Is Not Deist," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 72, no. 2 (2020): 126–27.

<sup>4</sup>J. B. Stump, "Response to Randy Isaac and Chris Barrigar," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 72, no. 2 (2020): 127–28.