

# ACT Kairos Seminars 2009

Location: Redeemer Presbyterian Church at Hunter College, New York

Time: 12.10 – 1.00 PM

Check updated details at [www.actministry.org](http://www.actministry.org)

## Handouts

1. Jan 25: Q1. Origin of the Universe - Where Did Anything Come From?
2. Feb 01: Q2. Origin of Life - Why Did Life Live?
3. Feb 08: Q3. Origin of Man - How Did Humans Arise?
4. Mar 08: PS1. Philosophy & Christianity in Plain Language
5. Mar 15: PS2. Science & Christianity in Plain Language
6. Mar 22: PS3. Charles Darwin & Christianity in Plain Language
7. Mar 29: PS4. Evolution, Evolutionism & Christianity in Plain Language

### Jan 25

#### Q1. Origin of the Universe - Where Did Anything Come From?

Cosmogony: Origin Of The Universe

Scientific investigation is premised on methodological naturalism and serves as a powerful tool to infer what happened in the past. Investigating any singular historical event demands a logical rather than a statistical inquiry and unverifiable assumptions are unavoidable. With classical and quantum physics, scientists probe the origin of the universe. Available scientific models are shaped by philosophical commitments and inevitably tread on theology. The Christian doctrine of creation includes the natural world (universe) and the non-natural realm (supernatural refers only to God). Can inferences from the sciences be reconciled with a theological explanation of a *creatio originalis ex nihilo*, which undergoes *creatio continua*, and anticipates a final *creatio nova*? This is the subject of our inquiry in Q1.

**1. Goal:** *Is the Christian teaching about divine creation a coherent belief in the light of contemporary philosophy and science?*

**2. Origin, Creation, And Nature:** Origin refers to a beginning in a physical and importantly, measurable reality, from pre-existing energy-matter. Creation refers to an emergence of physical and metaphysical existence, from nothing. It requires an intentional will of the creator. Nature refers to all material entities extended in space and time, and perceptible to human observation either directly or by inference. Thus, while

the sciences consider the origin of the universe as the emergence of measurable reality, Christian theology describes divine creation to include the emergence of the universe as the origination of measurable energy-matter as well as the emergence of non-measurable immateriality such as spirits and other heavenly beings. Divine creation is therefore not synonymous with, but includes scientific cosmogony.

**3. Philosophical Speculation** tests hidden assumptions of our commitments in both science and theology. We shall test the philosophical coherence of the Christian belief that the universe is not eternal but was created by a cause that is not a part of the universe. We ask if there is any philosophical ground to deny the Christian belief in creation by considering the speculations of philosophers of religion, Richard G. Swinburne and William Lane Craig.

**4. Scientific Inference** concludes that the universe had a temporal beginning. Classical physics offers the Big Bang Model (BBM) as the best explanation for the origin of the universe but is plagued by many unsolved problems, especially the notion of singularity in which  $t=0$ . Quantum physics mathematically describes the world of very small objects and offers a very different reality from what we appear to experience. However, its 'solution' contradicts the very thesis of the BBM. Both classical and quantum physics offer no scientific ground to deny the Christian confession of the doctrine of creation.

**5. Theological Reflection** of the Christian Trinitarian faith offers a view of reality in which the emergence (creatio initio) and maintenance (creatio continua) of energy-matter conversions is teleological, i.e., with a purpose of an intentional will - the will of God. The ongoing working of nature is the continuing work of God and ought to concern the Church. What is the relationship between the sciences and the revelation of God? In the natural sciences, we discover divine disclosure (DDD). Advances in new frontiers of the sciences understood in the light of scriptural teaching and models of kairic and chronic time offer bases for a fresh understanding of theological creation. I shall advance the claim that the Christian Scriptures support the idea of creation from nothing, creatio ex nihilo, but one in which creation has not ceased but what we call divine providence is in fact the continuing work of God in a creatio continua.

**6. Conclusion:** The Greek word 'kosmos', from which cosmology and hence, cosmogony is derived, had a moral significance ('good order'). Anaxagoras, a Presocratic philosopher who first speculated on the origin of the universe, said 'it is Mind which imposes order on all things and disposes each of them as it is best for it to be' (Plato's *Phaedo*, 97c).<sup>1</sup> The origin of the universe is a scientific notion and the creation of the universe is a theological notion, but since a discussion of the exciting new interdisciplinary postfoundational convergence of the two fields of inquiry is beyond the scope of this effort, we shall limit ourselves to a consideration both the scientific origin and the theological creation, of the universe, as separate concerns. Our aim is to ask after the coherence of the belief in the Christian theological doctrine of creation. The emerging field of 'origins' studies helps us to better understand what God discloses by our discovery in the natural sciences.

The Christian mandate to renew our minds to discern the will of God in Romans 12:2 inclines us to welcome the responsible use of the gift we call science. Both philosophy and the natural sciences are incompetent to answer the question regarding the origin of the universe, but merely what happened AFTER the Big Bang banged. Since neither discipline is competent to deny the proposal of the Christian doctrine of creation on philosophical or scientific grounds, we conclude that the Christian theological doctrine of creation is a coherent belief and forms the best possible explanation for the origin of the universe.

---

<sup>1</sup> R. M. Hare, *Plato*, Past Masters series, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 9.

Feb 01

## Q2. Origin of Life - Why Did Life Live?

### Biogenesis: Origin Of Life

When Charles Darwin published his theory of evolution in *The Origin of Species* in 1859, he deliberately left out how life came about. Today, this remains a mystery in science, forcing the collaboration of many disciplines. While life may be described in terms of its constituents, this cannot explain the cause that makes a pile of organic stuff sense, react, reproduce, and die. The Christian doctrine of creation teaches that reproductive matter emerged from an intentional (teleological) exercise of divine will. Life is not accidental and its purpose has been declared. The origin of life lies in a *creatio continua* that anticipates a final *creatio nova*. This is the subject of our inquiry in Q2.

*Goal: Is the Christian teaching about divine creation a coherent belief in the light of contemporary philosophy and science? This is a report about the state of our current knowledge regarding the origin of life - one of the great unsolved questions in science.*

**Origin, Creation, And Nature:** Origin refers to a beginning in a physical and importantly, measurable reality, from pre-existing energy-matter. Creation refers to an emergence of physical and metaphysical existence, from nothing. It requires an intentional will of the creator. Nature refers to all material entities extended in space and time, and perceptible to human observation either directly or by inference. Thus, while the sciences consider the origin of the universe as the emergence of measurable reality, Christian theology describes divine creation to include the emergence of the universe as the origination of measurable energy-matter as well as the emergence of non-measurable immateriality such as spirits and other heavenly beings. Divine creation is therefore not synonymous with, but includes scientific cosmogony.

### 6 Questions About Biogenesis

*Let us begin with a quick overview of this essay following a journalist's litany of prime questions - the who, what, when, where, why and how. Three of these questions can be attempted by the natural sciences while three more fall into the purview of philosophy and theology. The two questions that fall strictly outside the scope of the natural sciences are the questions: **Who** originated life, and **why** life lived?*

#### **1. What is Life?**

*There is no scientific definition for life. The dividing line between nonlife and life is blurred. Viruses for example, exist as nonlife until it finds itself inside an appropriate host.*

#### **2. When Did Life Begin?**

*This is even more vexing. Our oldest record of life is found in rocks. Weathering and damage remove these records forever. This sets a limit to how far back in time we can definitively say how old the oldest life form is. While we can say how old the oldest fossils of life forms found in the oldest rocks are, we do not know when life first began. All we know is that it happened just once: biologists call this The Big Birth!*

#### **3. How Did Life Begin?**

*Until the 1953 experimental breakthrough announced by Stanley Miller that marked the start of origins of life research, this question was the exclusive territory of theologians. However, after over 50 years, this great mystery is as yet unsolved by the natural sciences.*

#### **4. Where Did Life Begin?**

*We know that life exists on earth, and since 1984, we possess evidence that life existed extra-terrestrially.<sup>2</sup> What we do not know is where did life first appear in the universe.*

### **5. Who Caused Life to Exist?**

*History and science comes up short as a source to answer this question because the cause of the first life form had to be a nonlife form. How can nonlife 'cause' anything? One possibility is to think beyond the box and remove the assumption that non-material life can exist. Can the cause of life be a different order of life? The Christian tradition specifically answers the question: God, maker of heaven and earth, caused life to exist. Now comes the tricky part. Since science is the most manicured form of rationality we know, it is the function of theology to describe this revelation in language that bridges the gap between metaphysics and physics. We turn to philosophy for help and construct a theology of nature.*

### **6. Why Does Life Live?**

*While this may appear to be a biochemical question, it is not. We are asking the teleological question of intention and purpose. Did life come to be because of an accidental confluence of conditions or did someone will it so? The eminent paleontologist Simon Conway Morris of Cambridge argued in his *Life's Solution: Inevitable Humans in a Lonely Universe* that the odds are too great for a reasonable belief that life was not planned by some intelligence. A promising research program now underway in both science and theology is the philosophical tool called the **emergence of complexity**. In one form, it argues for the emergence of mind, and the one to which we are closest to is the human mind, the subject of the third seminar in this series.*

---

<sup>2</sup> Paul Davies, *The Fifth Miracle: The Search for the Origin of Life*, (London: Penguin Books, 2000), ix. Meteorite Allan Hills 84001 or ALH84001 was formed some four billion years ago on Mars. It escaped as a consequence of the shock from the impact of a body striking the planet and embarked on the 16 million-year journey through space to arrive 13,000 years ago on a glacier in the Antarctica.

Feb 08

### Q3. Origin of Man - How Did Humans Arise?

Anthropogenesis: Origin Of Humans

Are *Homo sapiens sapiens* unique in the living<sup>3</sup> world? The similitude of our DNA with other life forms fails to explain our unique ability, e.g., grammatical speech. The ‘symbolic species’ is able to pass on information through time (by writing), possess insight (to guess how things work), and contemplate the future (with imagination). The Christian doctrine of creation describes us as made in the image of God (*imago Dei*). This does not rest merely in our capacities or physiology, but in our relationality with God. Although we share a biological continuity with the rest of nature, the origin of our humanity calls us into fellowship with our creator as ‘the praying animal’. We are self-reflective, morally conscious beings who worship and live in expectation of the *creatio nova*. This is the subject of our inquiry in Q3.

*What is man that you are mindful of him, and the son of man, that you care for him? You have made him little less than God and does crown him with glory and honor Psalm 8:4-5*

**1. Human Uniqueness:** The question of whether humans are unique is no longer important. One can always define any category to mark it as unique. Rather, we must ask after the implications of being human; the what, the how and the why.

**2. What Is Man?** The natural sciences used to consider physiological marks of distinction but have recently focused on cognitive faculties. Theology used to explain humans in terms of mystical relationality but can no longer avoid the inescapable question regarding the biology of biblical Adam. The question before us is “Was Adam a *Homo sapiens sapiens* or was Adam *Homo sapiens sapiens*?”

**3. How Did We Come About?** Science points to the common ancestry of primates and hominids (which include modern humans) from fossil evidence suggesting a physiological continuum. Theology suggests the formation of a hominid couplet or race endowed with specific moral cognition of divine revelation. Can an interdisciplinary approach expose the presuppositions of each field of inquiry, and reconcile these two fields of inquiry?

**4. Why Did We Emerge?** Science cannot explain ‘why’ because it cannot know the ‘who’ who willed a why. Theology describes humans as created for everlasting fellowship with God.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Linnean classification gave us an artificial dichotomy of life with the plant and animal kingdoms. In 1937, a new classification system divided life into two domains, prokaryotes and eukaryotes. There were four eukaryote kingdoms (plants, animals, fungi, and protists). Prokaryotes are single celled nuclei-free life forms. Advances in molecular sequencing techniques by Carl Woese in the late 1970s divided terrestrial life into three domains, archaea, bacteria, & eukaryota. None of these include viruses because we cannot agree on whether they constitute ‘life forms’. All of these, viruses included, arise from a universal common ancestor (or UCA) that is not even the first life form (FLF). The FLF may have become extinct before the current life forms evolved. See Paul Davies’ *The Fifth Miracle*, 54. For information about archaea research, check out <http://www.ucmp.berkeley.edu/archaea/archaea.html>.

**5. Conclusion:** Knowing who we are helps us develop a worldview to guide how we ought to live. Science describes human existence as a marvel of fortuitous chance. Yet for many, life is a harsh existential reality. So we turn to ethics for a morality to ease the vicissitudes of life. Theology describes human life as the result of a generous divine will. We who are made in the *imago Dei* are *morally cognitive beings, answerable to our Maker*. Christ's historical presence among us anticipates our everlasting existence when God will dwell with us. The universe will be renewed with a new heaven and new earth. A new Jerusalem (Rev. 21:10) will be created and the "wolf shall dwell with the lamb ... And a little child shall lead them" (Isa 11:6). This is the Christian hope of certainty.

**Mar 08**  
**PS1. Philosophy & Christianity in Plain Language**

1. Why did Jewish Christians living under Roman occupation write in Greek?
2. The Hellenization of the Jewish Religion: Adoption and Adaptation.
3. The Doctrine of the Trinity: ‘Of One Substance’.
4. Plato (427-347 BC) The Necessity of Conceptual Tools.
5. Plato’s *Republic*. The 3 analogies for salvation. The doctrine of transcendence. Christianity offers the corrective doctrine of grace.
6. Plato’s *Timaeus*. From Plato’s imitative re-ordering of the world was adapted to the doctrine of divine *creatio ex nihilo*. From the ‘craftsman’ and the doctrine of imperfection was adapted the qualitative creator-creation distinction. Christianity offers the corrective doctrine of revelation.
7. Plato’s ‘World of Forms’ (The Likely Story): The concepts Perfection, Imperfection, and the Demiurge. The doctrines of God, creator, sin and redemption.
8. Plato’s *Phaedrus*. The preexistent and undying Soul is fallen and longs to return through the pathway of Love. Beauty awakens the soul to the memory of the Forms and helps the intelligence to control human appetites. The doctrines of ‘original sin’, the Fall from Grace, divine love, and the freedom of the will.
9. Plato’s *Meno*, *Phaedo* and *Symposium*. Featuring Socrates (469-399 BC): *Aporia* (puzzlement) and the achievement of wisdom by the recovery of knowledge. From *Meno* - The Midwife’s art of delivery. Actions have consequences and privileges bear responsibilities. The doctrine of the laws of God written in our hearts. From *Phaedo* - the doctrine of immortality. From *Symposium* (Drinking together) - The Form of Beauty is the final object of love. Beauty points to its source. Eros seeks God.
10. Platonism and Christianity. The concept of the *Logos*. “This world is not my home’. St. Augustine and the doctrine of original sin.
11. Aristotle (384-322 BC)
12. Aristotle’s *Categories*. The concept of substance (*ousia*), essence and accidents, and the doctrine of the Trinity.
13. Aristotle’s *Four Causes*. The concept of matter and change. God is pure act and has no potential, just potency. The doctrines of impassability and immutability.
14. Aristotelianism at the Council of Nicaea, AD 325 *Homoousias* and the doctrine of the Trinity. From almighty to omnipotence.
15. Implications for the view that Plato’s “Wise Men of Old” may refer to the Hebrew Bible!

**Mar 15**  
**PS2. Science & Christianity in Plain Language**

1. THE NATURAL SCIENCES in the West grew out of natural philosophy. The term scientist first emerged in 1844 and most of the great breakthroughs were accomplished by gentlemen naturalists, such as Charles Darwin. Today, scientific investigation is a field of human inquiry dedicated to the explanation and prediction of natural phenomena. Its method is empirical and its conclusions are necessarily pragmatic, tentative and provisional. It operated within the boundaries of naturalism and is incompetent to assess metaphysical truth claims. Indeed, J. W. van Huyssteen claims that “the why of it all, the ultimate explanation of existence, turns out to be unanswerable in terms of scientific methodology.”<sup>4</sup> In the twentieth century, the history and philosophy of science emerged to study the work and habits of scientists, analyzing the functional contributions of the fraternity, directing the focus onto the very epistemology of scientific practice itself.

2. CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY developed from the caste of clergy who reflected upon the received scriptures to systematize the knowledge passed on through the ages. Theological reflection is a field of human inquiry into the divine revelation of the scriptures to understand the nature and message of God. The universal claim of the Christian scriptures meant that theology could not be limited to metaphysical interests but expects to be informed by the provisional conclusions from all human fields of inquiry in its quest for wisdom through understanding knowledge. It was the emergence of philosophical theology that tempered extravagant claims of the church.

3. THE HISTORY SCIENCE AND CHRISTIANITY. Modern experimental science emerged during Christendom’s dominance over culture, education and philosophy. It was nurtured by the philosophical assumptions derived from the theological convictions of the Christian church. Several key assumptions were met:

- a linear view of time,
- an expectation of cosmic order, and
- the desire for progress through modernity.

Christianity also encouraged the goal of discovery to alleviate the burdens of the human race. The popular view of science and Christian theology as NOMA, mutually exclusive fields of inquiry, has been debunked by the incursions of the natural sciences into philosophical and theological territory.

- cosmology attempts to explain the origin of the universe,
- chemistry seeks to explain the emergence of life and
- biology inquires into what it means to be human.

The three big questions of origins delve beyond the locus of experimentalism and right into speculative inquiry as they penetrate the boundaries of the natural sciences. In reality, the relation has been one of interaction. The sciences have begun to seek even the “why” questions in order to make sense of the “how” and “what” questions. Theology on the other hand, finds itself usually handicapped by its isolation from the frontiers of natural knowledge and is increasingly becoming marginalized both in the academy and at the workplace. Happily the emerging interdisciplinary field of science and theology, with philosophy as the heuristic tool to test the claims of scientific conclusions and coherence of theological reflection, is making progress for a true dialogue.

---

<sup>4</sup> J. Wentzel van Huyssteen, *Duet or Duel: Theology and Science in a Postmodern World*, (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998), 68.

4. PHILOSOPHY has the task of keeping both scientific conclusions and theological pronouncements intellectually honest. Neither science nor theology can be free from bias since both are influenced by human intelligibility and the fungibility of probabilism. This means that the Christian mind has to wrestle with the philosophical implications of both the natural sciences and biblical theology for a true understanding of reality. We need to rethink what we have inherited from the past with new insights from the present. Every past culture in history possesses a science of its age. We have to deal with ours. It is only with such a clear statement of belief that can we responsibly proclaim the gospel with intellectual integrity.

The scope of Christian doctrine includes scientific contributions for theological reflection to broaden the canvas of our intelligibility of reality. We make three claims:

- **Science does not operate in isolation.** It is in necessary dialogue with theology through philosophy. The celebrated scientific rationality is a function of presuppositional philosophy.
- **Strict scientism is an inadequate view of reality.** Science is a derivative and incomplete inquiry into the fabric of reality and discovery is contingent upon disclosure.
- **There is a Theological Mandate for a Doctrine of Science.** The relative rationality and incompleteness of science as a tool of inquiry means that Christian theology must incorporate responsible scientific learning as a complementary and legitimate form of general revelation from God. A theology without a doctrine of the sciences is an incomplete theology.

5. CONCLUSION: Christian theology through the Church ought to welcome responsible articulations of scientific knowledge as natural scientists within and without the Church discovers (investigates) divine disclosure (revelation). If science is discovery and theology is confessional, knowledge can only assume the status of wisdom when it becomes understanding. Mere knowledge shaped by wisdom provides true understanding.

For example, science alone explains the composition of the human material self so that we can maintain our lives but does not comfort our desire to find the meaning of life (so religion became the most persistent and consistent act of human culture). Theology alone teaches us that we were made from created dust for fellowship with God, but without science, we cannot maintain our existence for very long (if for example, we do not learn to abstain from poison or forget how to feed ourselves). The knowledge from science coupled with the wisdom of the scriptural theology helps us understand why we exist as we do at all, carbon-based auto-poietic reproducing pods of chemicals which cognize.

The Christian commitment to its convictional confession (CCC), must lie at the center of any discovery of divine disclosure (DDD), which includes both the natural sciences and the non-natural sciences. From such an integration of knowledge ('what, why and how' questions) springs forth the resources for wisdom ("why" questions) to announce the Good News that Christ has come, Christ has risen, Christ is Lord indeed.

Mar 22

## PS3. Charles Darwin & Christianity in Plain Language

**1. SCIENCE AND GOD IN THE 19TH CENTURY:** Science was closely linked to religious views dominated by the Christian Bible. Geology was on the rise and challenged the common view of a 6000 year old earth. It was a battle for the mind, between revelatory reflection and observational inference, between literalism and metaphorism within the Church and between gradualism and catastrophism within the emerging profession of science.

**2. CHARLES DARWIN:** An amateur naturalist who studied divinity, BA (Cantab) and before he accept a position as a country parish minister, embarked on a five year circumnavigation of the world aboard the *H.M.S. Beagle*. This gentle, gifted observer of nature shaped the way we understand the world by articulating a worldview which denied the necessity for God.

**3. THE VOYAGE OF HMS BEAGLE:** The three year circumnavigation of the world became an almost five year voyage. But Darwin himself spent only eighteen months on board the ship. His observations concerning adaptations and the human condition in the tip of South America led to to adopt the notion of natural selection as the engine for biological evolution.

**4. THE ORIGIN OF SPECIES:** This articulated a theory of biological evolution by means of natural (v. artificial)selection in which life has no purpose and competition determines survival.

**5. THE DESCENT OF MAN:** This completed the theory of human evolution which posits the physiological continuity of humanity with all animals. God is not deemed a necessity.

**6. NATURAL SELECTION & SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST:** Terms of reference to indicate the ateleological driving force behind evolution. Even apparent altruism is an adaptive advantage.

**7. CHARLES, EMMA AND GOD:** Charles grew up in a Christian household and believed in the literal interpretation of the Scriptures. Emma was a devout Anglican her entire life. Charles' serious doubts about the existence of God after his voyage caused them both anguish.

**6. CONCLUSION:** The success of Darwinism as a theory is essential a battle of the sciences and a philosophical argument for shifting the burden of proof. Can a geological and biological theory be made in the absence of chemical and physical evidence to come?

Darwinism exposes Christianity's weakness in keeping up with the growing scientific knowledge. We use the fruits of scientific technology and blissfully ignore its implications for a contemporary and comprehensive biblical worldview. We ought to (i) Learn the basic idea behind the theory, (ii) make informed judgments about what it entails, (iii) assess its impact on Christianity, and (iv) construct a biblically faithful comprehensive worldview which accounts for the growth of scientific knowledge.

Mar 29

## PS4. Evolution, Evolutionism & Christianity in Plain Language

1. **DARWINISM & EVOLUTION: MEANINGS & IMPLICATIONS.** The claims of Darwinism and the principles of evolutionary theories are often confused with its implications, resulting in unfair caricatures. Biological evolution is a scientific fact which Darwin's theory of natural selection seeks to explain. beyond what the science means lies what they may imply. The theological implications concerning the existence of God are at the center of the heated debate between Darwinists and Creationists.
2. **EVOLUTION AFTER DARWIN.** Darwin's morphologically- based observations has proved to be less than conclusive, especially in the light of Mendelian genetics and inheritance. Attempts to adapt the theory include the assumption that changes in conditions brought about sudden changes in species development: Stephen J. Gould's 'Punctuated Equilibria'. These corrections are not based on verifiable 'scientific' evidence according to the the inductive<sup>5</sup> scientific method of investigation, a problem Darwin himself was guilty of. Atheistic neo-Darwinists claim that natural<sup>6</sup> selection is a purposeless<sup>7</sup> process while theistic evolutionists argue that God can employ primary and secondary creation, the latter expressed as biological evolution. There are many post-Darwinian evolutionary models and they offer both theistic and atheistic models.
3. **THE PHILOSOPHICAL CHALLENGES FOR CHRISTIANITY.** Darwin suggested that there is no scientific evidence to support the existence of God. That is correct! This also means there is no scientific evidence to *deny* the existence of God. Science can discover evidence to suggest the existence of something but cannot suggest the non-existence of anything. Theology on the other hand, explains the revelation of divine disclosure but cannot prove the existence of anything. It is not the scientific fact of biological evolution but the philosophical ideology of Darwinism that poses the triple challenge of atheism, amoralism and immoralism.
4. **HUMAN UNIQUENESS: MIND v BRAIN** The imago Dei rests in the metaphysics of the mind and not the physiology of the brain. They turn up in fields of inquiry such as psychology, philosophy of power, mass media studies, etc.

---

<sup>5</sup> Inductive reasoning (inferring general rules from evidence of particular or specific instances) Deductive reasoning (by the process of reasoning alone, in the absence of evidence)

<sup>6</sup> The term 'natural' is attached to phenomena that observers conclude as common and explicable without resorting to nonsentient explanations. Any claim to exhaustive observations of all phenomena is a dogmatically unscientific statement. It is better science to claim agnosticism.

<sup>7</sup> We cannot definitively know the purpose of another organism purely by observation, short of *mind-reading*. All scientific conclusions about the behavior of organisms are constantly being corrected for errors as the sampling of observations increase and abnormalities are taken into account. The statement '*There is no purpose*' is not a scientific but a theological statement.

5. **EVOLUTIONARY PSYCHOLOGY?:** Evolutionary psychology is a prime example of how evolutionary principles can be abused. Its explanatory power to fool people into making judgments about human behavior is based on bad science masquerading as legitimate science.
  
6. **CONCLUSION: DIVINE SELECTION?** Christians today argue that the fine-tuning of the universe suggests the existence of God (Richard G. Swinburne) or an intelligent designer (Intelligent Design Movement), or an intentional designer (Diogenes Allen). However, it is in fact divine selection that takes place in nature. God's intention in the context of creaturely free will kenotically given explains an indeterministic world in the care of a sovereign God. This paradox of free will under sovereignty is not so much a problem (no necessary solution) as it is a puzzle (a mystery which has a solution). This leaves us with an imperative for a Christian theological doctrine of science to use the gift of observational inference to understand the universe that God has created. If Darwin's mechanism makes an erroneous theological implication, it is up to Christians in science to offer a more robust explanation for the fact of biological evolution.