00:22:42.000 --> 00:22:45.000
Your background for that.

00:22:45.000 --> 00:22:50.000
I grow in the Christian family and attend church since I was young. And, but I was born again when I was 16 years old.

00:22:50.000 --> 00:22:59.000
That was when I accepted Jesus Christ as my Lord and Sadian.

00:22:59.000 --> 00:23:06.000
Okay. And where did you get your college education in Singapore?

00:23:06.000 --> 00:23:16.000
Yeah, I studied, in Singapore and then, and, went on to study medicine at, National.

00:23:16.000 --> 00:23:17.000
Okay.

00:23:17.000 --> 00:23:20.000
Medicine, I see. So you have a medical. Medical degree.

00:23:20.000 --> 00:23:21.000
Yeah, that's my first degree.

00:23:21.000 --> 00:23:23.000
I see. Okay. So. Yeah.

00:23:23.000 --> 00:23:29.000
Yeah. And I will, yes, as a doctor.

00:23:29.000 --> 00:23:41.000
Excellent. Okay, so you're a practicing physician. Any specialty or just general practice?

00:23:41.000 --> 00:23:42.000
Okay.

00:23:42.000 --> 00:23:46.000
Well, I was on the way training to be. A specialist in internal medicine. But halfway through, I found myself, be more interested in philosophy and theology.

00:23:46.000 --> 00:23:51.000
So I didn't compete, the training, I, I stopped that and went on to.

00:23:51.000 --> 00:23:59.000
Biola University to study philosophy of religion and then, to King's College London to study a PhD in theology.

00:23:59.000 --> 00:24:00.000
Yes.

00:24:00.000 --> 00:24:06.000
So you, so, and who did you work under at King's College?
Yeah, if, who later took up the post on as the professor of science. And religion at Oxford University.

Okay. And so you got your.

Yeah. Hmm.

PhD then with, Alistair Mcgrath as your advisor.

Yeah.

Yeah, that's right. Although my PCs works not in SIGN, S, it was on the incarnation is titled, Defence of the Incarnation.

And yeah. So that this is eventually resulted in the publication of 3 books, published by Kbridge University Press and Route.

Defending the historical basis and the coherence, the conceptual coherence of the doctrine of the incarnation.

Okay. Very good. So after you got the degree, where did you, what kind of position did you move into?

Yeah, I've got my degree. Work for a period of time as. Missionary to various parts of East Asia before I was invited to take up a position at the University of Hong Kong as a research assistant professor.

And then later on as assistant professor at Hong Kong Baptist University. Yeah, I eventually got my tenure and so, yeah, I'm currently associate professor at the Department of Religion and Philosophy at Hong Kong Baptist University.

I see. So that's your current position then. So, excellent. So I believe you've published a number of different books by now in theology and what was it that turn your attention to this particular topic on the origin of humanity and evolution.

Well, I've been very interested in the creation and evolution issue. I can quite quite controversy. Right, for many years, ever since I became born like in Christian when I was 16 years old and I went to study I was like I was starting tripsones biology physics and chemistry and then on to do met medicine.

And you guys, so I've been very interested in this whole issue about science and religion for a very long time.
Who argue that population genetics. Have shown that it's no longer plausible to believe in.

Oh, he's sorry for Edin. And so I was very intrigued by his arguments.

And so when I look into the details. I find that contrary to what he says, we can construct.

Genealogical at a model. Which shows that so Adam Is the common ancestor of everyone today, even though he may not be the only ancestor.

Right, and then later on, Josh, S, he sent me an email and told me that, so he has, published a paper with PSCS.

This topic. And so it's kind of like both of us actually work out this independently. Yeah, but we later got in touch and then we collaborated on a lot of things and he also offered very helpful advice on the writing of this present book.

And yeah, so, so that's how it, you know, eventually, written and published.

Okay, that's very interesting. That's very helpful. Thank you for sharing that background and how you how you came to this work.

So. With that in mind as you know doubt are aware that this audience has. Has approached this particular topic many times. It's been a favorite topic for probably 15 or more years here in ASA.

And so we've had Bill Craig on the program. We've, Josh, Slyibidas has contributed, in different ways and, been on the program.

So, Most of the audience here is familiar with with their work. So could you just kind of summarize because I know the book wasn't accessible to everyone at this stage.

And so could you kind of just net out concisely? How your view is differentiated from.

So, Venomas, Craig and others in the field.

Yeah, so my boy is different from many of us because very much deny a historical editor inverse I perform a historical item and it is Different from somebody does.

In the sense that's now somebody does he defended a number of possibilities in his book So one of which is that, you know, he find the possibility that Adam maybe the first got's image power or he may not be.
But I think that's his defense of the view that Adam may not have been the first course image, but I think that is problematic.

I think that is problematic because I think that seems to be contrary to what the scripture firms.

I saw my model different from some of us in the sense that I don't defend. The second possibility that he defended.

Right, I think I defend the first possibility you said, Adam is the first one to bear the image of God. The first anatomical homo, right, to bear the image of God. So that's the viewer defend.

And I develop this in greater detail. Compared to what you will find in So, it does book. And as for my difference with Dr.

Okay.

Craig. No, I agree with Dr. Quick. So, let me, let me review each other that Adam is the first one, right?

So, but, but Dr. Quick, he dated, he, I don't know, long time back, right?

You know, as a homo heighter against this. And the reason why Dr. That's that is because He tries to follow the characteristics listed by anthropologists like Bertie and Brooks.

So, so, METIs, and Brooks, they argue that, so modern humans are characterized by ability to have abstract thinking, use or simple, body language, deep planning, innovativeness.

And so these are the list of characteristics. And then daughter things that we find these characteristics in the homo hidogensis and therefore Adam would be somebody who leave during what would be a I don't overheard against is who leave around 700,000 years ago.

No, I, no, so my difference to Craig lies here because when I read the scripture.

It seems to me that the script says, in, implies that, being got image very being somebody who best image God And that's.

A capacity to be aware of got the creator Right, so got the creator, And then the commander, Adam.

To rule and subdue. Right, so at the movie somebody who is aware of the creator and who stood the mandate right to
rule and subdue the world on behalf of the creator.

00:31:24.000 --> 00:31:29.000
So. Yeah, but this consideration is absent from Betty and Brooks, right?

00:31:29.000 --> 00:31:41.000
They didn't consider whether, former hydrogens, for example, whether do they have the capacity to be aware that of the creator God that the universe is created by God.

00:31:41.000 --> 00:31:54.000
Are they able to draw their inference? Do they have show any evidence of religiosity in that sense? At this moment time, we have not find any, we have not found any evidence yet that the Hobble Hybrid Gases had that kind of capacity or function.

00:31:54.000 --> 00:32:05.000
Well, what would you say would constitute such evidence? So what would you look for? To to determine that from the fossil record or whatever.

00:32:05.000 --> 00:32:08.000
Yeah, that's a good question. And I think now first of all, I think the burden of proof will be on Dr. Craig, right?

00:32:08.000 --> 00:32:18.000
And if he wants to argue that I don't must pass this so long ago. Then he will need to provide evidence of that.

00:32:18.000 --> 00:32:24.000
Right? So in order to exclude more reason, add the models, which I also defend in my book.

00:32:24.000 --> 00:32:28.000
Right, so if you want to escort man, although he tries to that click, it's good right here.

00:32:28.000 --> 00:32:34.000
I'll use it, my bottom. He will need to provide evidence of that. Right. And I suppose one can.

00:32:34.000 --> 00:32:47.000
Save for example, evidence of paintings or cave drawings or whatever that shows the cosmos of stars and then the Creator God, you know creating this or things like that or even better written language there is going back so far away.

00:32:47.000 --> 00:32:56.000
Now of course that a reason right I mean so far as you know the written language is only a few 1,000 years.

00:32:56.000 --> 00:32:57.000
So, yeah.

00:32:57.000 --> 00:33:05.000
Well, what, wouldn't you then need to similarly provide evidence that there wasn't God awareness?

00:33:05.000 --> 00:33:06.000
Okay.

00:33:06.000 --> 00:33:17.000
Wouldn't you also need, similarly. Need to show that there wasn't a capability for God awareness before Adam.

00:33:17.000 --> 00:33:21.000
Oh, oh, wasn't, before Adam.
Yeah, yeah, if you ask if you ask him to provide evidence that there was don't you also need to show evidence that there wasn't.

No, because on my model, Adam by definition is the first one to have this. So, yeah, so it must have started somewhere in fine and we do have evidence that it exists a few dozen years ago for example right we have clear evidence of that people starts to worship a creator got in the in the ancient India eastern text for example and and so yeah so we do have clear evidence that it started somewhere in time now but of course the evidence now of course the evidence that we have right now is incomplete right so I'm open to the possibility that people may discover evidence further back in time in the future.

Right, so what I'm arguing basically is that we need to be open to possibilities, but I think that Dr. Craig is closing down the possibilities to, you know, we've already put more, so that's my concern with double the case model.

Okay. Okay, so that's a nice, summary in a nutshell of kind of where you are and I think that helps us all all get started.

So at this point Becky, I'd like you to open the microphones and again let me remind people that speak when you're called upon and if you'd like to say something we will start with a question submitted in advance and after that if you go to your reactions icon in the bottom and you might have to click on more the 3 dots and more before you might have to click on more the 3 dots and more before you can see the reactions icon. You might have to click on more the 3 dots and more before you can see the reactions icon.

But when you click on And that will signal to me that you'd like to say something and I'll call on you in order.

So that's how we're gonna do it. And to start the discussion, let me first of all introduce the author of the book review that we published.

Seth Hart, say hello to this group.

Hey, I know quite a few of you, it's great to be here.

Yeah. Yeah, that's good. Now since you were the author of the review, did you tell us fairly quickly here?
I think a number of members may not know you just very quickly how you came to the ASA, a little bit about where you are and then how you came to review this particular book.

Oh, quickly, yeah, sure. So Professor Luke and I actually go back quite a ways, 5 or 6 years.

Really? Aha. So you have a close connection. You're biased.

I was actually his TA for a summer class he taught on science and religion. Yeah. Yeah. Slightly.

Well, it was also him who suggested that I go work with Alistair McGrath and it was at his sort of push.

I didn't think I had the capacity to that I ended up actually going to Oxford and working with out of Democrats.

So I have a lot to thank him for. Yeah, and I got, so, associated, you know, back at the time, I was just a lowly grad student.

I still am, but Professor Luke has risen up through the world, so it's great to see.

Okay. Yeah. All right. So how'd you get into reviewing this book?

Just because of that?

Yeah, so It was, I just, Professor Lok and I and Joshua Swami Doss who I also count as a friend would always have these sort of discussions, favorite professionally.

I've done a little bit of work on this, nothing like what they had done, but it just sort of generated conversations.

And one day, Joshua Swamidov says, hey, I'll recommend you to do the book review.

I think you do a decent review. I'm not sure if he was correct on that but lo and behold I did do the review so and that was Yep.

Okay, alright, that's great. Well, I'm glad you could join us here so that we have both the author and The author of the book review, we can't always work that out.
I'm glad to happen. So with that I will give you the honor of asking the first discussion question of Andrew.

Sure, absolutely. So this is my question. Professor, look, we've discussed this a little bit.

So I've tried to nuance it a bit. Is it theoretically possible that an anatomically modern homo sapien exists today without the image of God?

On page 115, you forestall this objection by interpreting Act 17 as stating that all nations came from one man, Adam.

However, this meets with 2 possible problems. The first is it's highly debated, whether or not the term from one God made all the nations of the world, whether that's actually referring to Adam.

And number 2, the term earth there, gay, in verse 26, can also seem to refer to a land or a region.

It doesn't necessarily mean the entire globe. These interpretive uncertainties seem to at least open up the possibility that there are homo sapiens that are not human.

Is there more confidence that we can have beyond this one controversial verse?

Oh, thank you so much, Seth, for your question. But before that, thank you for your review.

Thank you so much for your personal review and it's good to talk to you on this program. So, your question is a great one and it's a relevant constant.

So as you note that I address that concern in on page 15 my book. By arguing from X chapter 17.

And your question here is that, firstly, you mentioned that it's highly debated whether the voice is referring to No, I have look at many commentaries by political scholars and I think the only I think most of them would say that the first it's referring to Adam actually you know from one he make all right the one is referring to that I think it's quite clear.

Say for example, Craig Kina, Probably the top expert on the book of X in the world today, right?

He says that and add an illusion, right, is, consistent with the contrast in, extra to 17 plus 29 between, Bingos offspring and human meat images.

And so. No, it has support from the context. No, but even if even if that's, versus not referring to Adam.

The only alternative the only plausible alternative I think is no no one right so John Walton has argued that you know
the from one he made all nations the one Maybe referring to Noah, right, and, and John Auton tries to argue that from the table of nations in Genesis chapter 10.

00:39:24.000 --> 00:39:31.000
But, my response is that even if it refers to Noah, It doesn't affect my argument at all, right?

00:39:31.000 --> 00:39:43.000
Because I, from that, I also, that Noah is. You know he's like got's image baron he'd be best image or god and all nations that came from him And so I think the key issue is the second part of your question, right?

00:39:43.000 --> 00:39:51.000
So it's not so much about whether that one refers to Adam or Noah. I think in either case is compatible with my model.

00:39:51.000 --> 00:39:56.000
Compatible, compatible with the view that all people today around the world are got's image barriers.

00:39:56.000 --> 00:40:00.000
And so I saw the key issues. It's a second point you raised. And so, I saw the key issues.

00:40:00.000 --> 00:40:09.000
It's a second point you raised about the term the earth, right? So you mentioned that, you know, the, the, in typical language, it doesn't necessarily, refer, it might not refer to the whole globe, right?

00:40:09.000 --> 00:40:17.000
So it may be just referring to a land or a region. No. Oh, however, I think we have to consider the context, right?

00:40:17.000 --> 00:40:30.000
So, I mean, yes, it's true that of me just before to land or region but then in some other context I think it clearly refers to the entire world.

00:40:30.000 --> 00:40:36.000
And I think that I think that is the case here. Why? Because now firstly, we're extra 17.

00:40:36.000 --> 00:40:44.000
I realize that so Paul while speaking, he was not speaking to the Jews, right? He was speaking to the Greeks.

00:40:44.000 --> 00:40:55.000
In Evans. And so, you know, so when he talks about the earth, you know, he is not just referring to the land of Israel but but the Jews.

00:40:55.000 --> 00:41:07.000
Or you know a particular region in Asia minor no he was in Athens right so someone else and so in the context And so the context doesn't suggest any limitation to a particular land or region, right?

00:41:07.000 --> 00:41:15.000
So that's the first point. And the second point is that, so when you reach the, Old Testament, for example.

00:41:15.000 --> 00:41:23.000
No, there are various passengers. Say for example in Isaiah 29 versus 6 where you know.

00:41:23.000 --> 00:41:42.000
The nations and the ends of the earth know they are used together right so for example Isaac for the 9, 9, 6, 6, it's, it's a, got's promise there, which says that God will mick the Messiah a light for the nations that my salvation be reached the end of the earth.
Right, so I think that's when, when Paul preached at Evans, so I think that this is what he has in mind when he talks about nations, a man inhabited the earth, right?

I don't think he's referring to any particular land or region, but I think he is thinking about the whole scope, the whole earth.

So, in light of that background, I think that is the most plausible interpretation of the Pax and which gives us good reasons to believe that.

Yes, I mean, Paul is of a mean that all people's knowledge of all nations around the earth are descendants of.

Either Adam or Nova, which means that they are, they are, they are God's image various.

Okay. Alright. Very good. Thank you, Seth.

So, next on our list of people who submitted questions in advances David Wilcox. I saw you over there somewhere.

The data suggests that modern cognition I sort of. A collaborative cognition dates back to about 70.

1,000 years ago. Does that fit with your model? What is the image of God?

Yeah, so, thank you for your question, David. Oh, as I mentioned earlier on, the image of gods.

First to The but primarily the function of being able to be aware of got the creator and to represent him.

Right to rule and subdue the world. I think that's what the Genesis text is trying to say.

No, S 2 as to how How long ago? I don't live, right? Where is it?

70,000 years ago or 12,000 years ago or several 100,000 years ago as not a quick space.
Seth, for example, as somebody who is able to, take care of agriculture, for example.

And, you know, but, then, yeah, other difficult scholars. Such as John Collins.

Who is, Old Testament scholar, I cited him. In my book. And so in chapter 7 of mentioned that, Collins, you know, he argues that Good portrayal of Seth.

As as an agriculturalist, As far as the portrayal of other details, right? In, in, you know, JS.

Tax. These details. May just be an atronistic. Description, which is that so the autoogenesis may be using terms they are familiar to his If you're an audience and using anachronistically to Talk about people a long time ago.

How long ago? We don't know. Alright, but, that's called his argument, right?

He's saying that. So, this, It may not be literally, right?

Aquaculture as we know it today, right? But it may just be far more simpler, growing up plans, or production of food or other 2 kids, right?

That's, but it doesn't, it's a, it, it may be any 26 and it's called anachronistic discussion we do find in the Genesis text itself so for example many many Old Testament scholars have argued that, when we reach the G of Eden for example.

About the portrayal of Adam and Eve and also you know the cosmic temple view which John Walton talks about.

Now many many critical scholars have argued that now those those are imagery you know that are taken from imagery they are familiar to the Jewish readers.

Right, on which, the book, Genesis was written to the Jews. So is using imagery, they are familiar to that and, you know, anecdotally talking about long time ago in the past, right?

But this doesn't have to be interpreted literally in that sense. So that is, John Collins argument and I think, it is a plausible argument from the, from the political point of view.

And therefore, so, in, in summary, I don't think that there's any passage in the Bible that explicitly identify the ER in which Adam lives.

So,
Yeah, because of the how many technical issues that the colleagues raised. Yeah, so, for myself, I'm open to various possibilities, as I said just now.

Because I think that, what the Bible does clearly say is that Adam is someone who is aware of got the creator and it's able to represent him. Right?

So I think that that is quite clear. As to the as to the other details, I'll be about architecture and other things.

I don't think that is. No, I think that those, minor details, those descriptive details can be understood.

And economically as colleagues, audio. Yeah.

Okay. Alright, thank you. So, so basically saying you're not tying yourself down to a specific timeframe for Adam.

Yes.

Yeah. Okay. Alright, fair enough. Thank you, Dave.

Tom Rogers. Tom, I see you there. You could, unmute yourself.

Go on.

Alright, so. I had written a

Okay.

Right. Yeah. Sorry, something happened there.

Okay. So this is a question from Genesis 2 7. It states that, The Lord God formed the man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils.

The breath of life and the man became a living being. So for my research, Is it not true that we humans today are still made of the dust of the ground?

Then the same atoms from our foods are precisely reassembled. To make ourselves and us. Is that, is that true?
Does that make sense? We are actually made out of the dust in a two-step process. Dust atoms in the soil to make our foods.

The same amount for our foods to make ourselves. I make sense.

Well, thank you for a question. Now, first of all, we need to, when we interpret the Bible, we need to think of how the ancient Jews who have understood this passage, right?

So obviously the ancient Jews know they are not thinking this passage, right? So obviously the ancient Jews know they are not thinking about atoms and molecules.

They are not making that sense. But however what they are trying to say is not incompatible with what we understand by modern science.

Okay, so what they are trying to say is that human beings, human body is made of materials to which we will return after we die, right?

So from dust to dust. So we define this in Genesis of the tree for example when after Adam's sin, but God says that you're not gonna die and after you die you return to dust because from thus you'll meet right so So what's the ancient Jews who have understood is that human bodies are, of the material from the ground, right, which know, they're taken from and they'll return.

And I think that's what the Greek authors is trying to say. Now of course, today in modern science we understand that the material in the ground do contain Where is chemicals which you mentioned just now that those that consider open body and and that's fine yeah but so we also understand that after Adam was So, from, from the desk, I was, and got breath into him, the graph of light, and then he became

a living thing. And then, and then he became a leading bin and then, and then he, reproduce, right?

They had descendants and so after he has become a living being though he already had line that's the cells in his body already aligned and the leading cells can reproduce and that's how his descendants would also be leading subjects.

And so we don't need got to keep on breathing, again, right, into his descendants, right, because the descendants who have descended from the the leading person from from Adam.

Yeah.

Can I add this the second part then is in response to what you said and that is that. These atoms from the dust.
That our foods are made out of. Okay, and then we're made out of the food those atoms Do not have life of their own.

So that life has to be added. For each individual, for every cell in fact. The life has to be added to the atoms.

And when that life is removed, the breath of life, if you will. When that life was removed, the cell no longer lives.

So our point is that. We are still made from the dust in a two-step process. And we still need that divine breath of life.

Added to the atoms that we are made out of because atoms do not have life of their own. That makes sense.

Yes, I understand what I'm trying to say. But as I said just now, yes, I mean, I, I, agree that atoms by themselves do not have life, right, but after they are organized into cells, then the cells are living, right?

So, I'm trying to say is that after God created Adam and briefing to him the Graph of Light as the Bible described.

So, I don't become a leading person, you know, and his, sales, live, right?

They are me of item, but they are already alive, in Adam's body. And then these cells are able to reproduce, right?

So I don't and if they are able to have children at the stone of Adam and the, you know, they met me together and from a new, from the descendants, Kane, Abel, Seth, right, and Seth, and passed on the leading bodies and yeah, so that's how we can think about reproduction of things.

Okay.

Okay, can I add one more thing and that is. Is there any scientist in the world?

That can make even one living cell. Out of elements.

Yeah.

Yeah, so, that's a good question. So that that question relates to the origin of the first life.

Right, so we're not talking about even before I don't eat, right? So I don't know the first slide.

And I agree that so at this point in time, scientists, you know, they do not have this ability.
Like, so to create the noble account life. Now, I personally think that's the original life.

Now, I personally think that the original life is a good evidence that there is, interference by the creator.

I personally think that the original life is a good evidence that there is, interference by the creator. I believe that there is, interference by the creator.

I believe that there is, interference by the creator. I believe that there is a designer who design, I think that's, interference by the creator.

I believe that there is a designer who design, I think that's, the, It's not contrary to believing in evolution. Why?

Because you have people like say for example Anthony Flu. Who was on the who wasn't a world leading atheist who later converted and became, to believe that there is a God, right?

He wrote that book that there is a God. No, and he, I'll use that.

So, you know, that's the the complexity of the first of the cell, right, requires interference of a designer.

And so, internet flu, no, he accept the intelligent design, right, and believe in God. However, he still affirms macro evolution, right?

He so he argues that after the first life was created, this light reproduce itself and evolved into other living things.

And so, yeah, so in principle, I don't see an incompatibility between believing in intelligent design and bleeding in micro evolution in that sense.

Yeah.

Okay.

Okay. All right. Thank you, Tom. And let's go on to Del Coon.

Hey, Randy. Thanks and Andrew, appreciate your work and appreciate the approach you're taking to it.
I'd like to flesh out a little bit more about your image of God. And I'm gonna modify my question with some of what you've already said.

But I'm wondering what exactly, how we should look at the image of God and whether it's not kind of ill-defined.

You see you. You. Heavily seem to be heavily focused on if knowledge in God is a creator.

With a little bit of dominion over the world and I'll accept. Adam, oh, I'm sorry.

Kane, Abel and Seth, showing at least dominion with agriculture and their flocks, but I'd also like to wonder about the people who are contemporary with Kane after his murder of Abel.

Because they're presented as having enough morality not to countenance a murderer among themselves. And enough.

Awareness of God to recognize his pardon and be expected to honor his pardon of Cain. So I guess the question there is.

How should we think of the image of God and what's going to be added for the garden?

Thank you for that question, Dale. That's a great question. Now, so this question actually concerns about the people, the so-called people outside the garden, right?

Those people whom Ken was afraid of. Right. So now I, so when we meet, Genesis before, I think we have to be careful not to read too much into the text.

Why because when Ken was portrayed as being afraid No doubt the other people may kill him.

It is not clear in the texts. Those people may kill him because he was recognized as a murderer.

Right. So it's not clear to me that it's not, oh, those are those people outside the garden, they have a sense of morality and they do not accept the murder and therefore they were cated.

Rather it could it could also be due to it can maybe afraid because it could also be the fact that no this so-called be the fact that no this so-called people after the garden, they may be savages, right, brutal savages, who would suggest, you know, this so-called people outside the garden, they may be savages, right?

Brutal, they may be savages, right, brutal, savages, who would suggest, who queue those who do not belong to their group, right?

So, and so it could be that it's okay for a kid was aware, I don't that there, you were this, just around and that's what he
was afraid.

00:56:34.000 --> 00:56:40.000
And so not because they thought of him as another, but because they were just computing because he was just a lonely wanderer.

00:56:40.000 --> 00:56:53.000
You know, as for the, The other point about. Whether those people are wrong outside the garden whether they are aware of God or God given cordon as you mentioned just now.

00:56:53.000 --> 00:57:00.000
I think the reason why you mentioned the God human parties because the Genesis 4 mentioned that God will give a muck, right?

00:57:00.000 --> 00:57:07.000
We'll put a muck on K. No, however, when we read the commentaries, on Genesis.

00:57:07.000 --> 00:57:22.000
The old customer scholars argue that it's not very clear about what that mark actually is, right? I mean, it is a mark of that God will protect, okay, in a sense, but it's not clear that it's a mark that, okay, God has pardon KIN, right?

00:57:22.000 --> 00:57:43.000
Rather the word in the original Hebrew. You know it's used in other passages in the Old Testament say for something in Exodus you know it can be used as a sign of a proof or evidence of God's power so it could be that it's not God has bless, no, it could be that guy has put on Ken, a kind of a sign.

00:57:43.000 --> 00:57:59.000
That's, you know, that Ken would have some kind of, divided and dot power which will inspire fear right on people who try to approach we try to kill him and then we'll be afraid and and and having a sense that, okay, they'll be punished, right?

00:57:59.000 --> 00:58:03.000
If they would do a, right? So it could be something like that, right? As I said, no, the text is not very clear.

00:58:03.000 --> 00:58:14.000
And so, yeah, so I do, I do see a clear, that it's actually a, a map of pardon which will be recognized as such by the people outside the garden.

00:58:14.000 --> 00:58:24.000
Okay. All right. Thank you very much. All right, next we turn to Stephen Michael Lettinger.

00:58:24.000 --> 00:58:28.000
Okay.

00:58:28.000 --> 00:58:28.000
I don't know quite how you pronounce your last name, but, Stephen, unmute yourself and, ask a question.

00:58:28.000 --> 00:58:49.000
Yes, my question is, what, Mr. Loki, what's your, estimation of the view of Hey, theologians and scientists, regarding Genesis 2, it seems like there might be this view that Well, God can't.

00:58:49.000 --> 00:59:02.000
Or won't make man exactly as he did. Have the power to have the DNA appear in any way that he wants it to.
Okay.

I don't quite understand the question. Can you elaborate a bit more about making DNA and the way he wants to, what is it that?

Yeah, what I'm saying is a lot of the scientific research is saying that you know, Adam and Eve were made from Animal Man.

Okay.

Is based on DNA being certain ways. For example, in the out of Africa.

Study they use mitochondrial DNA to arrive at R ancestry. But if for example, God took a stem cell from Adam's rib.

And formed atoms from that. Then part.

From East. You're saying from, from, from.

Yeah, Eve would be taken, well, E would be taken from and, from Adam's rib, the stem cell of, in add or rib.

So does that, am I clear on my question?

Yeah, so, yeah, so thank you for your question. Now, my, model is not against this idea, right?

So I'm open to the possibility that, if is specially created by god from Adam as what the Bible says so i think that that video is not a problem for employment model yeah

Do you think that's the back follow up? Do you think that's a common? Tolerance among most.

Theologians or scientists.

Well, among the allergens, different illogen are different views. Some, some, 2, I think many, the,ologians, especially
those more conservative ones like myself, right?

Okay.

They would, agree on what I said just now, right? That's God created. If especially from Adam, there is no problem.

However, there are other technologies nowadays who, they, not so favourable. If you think about this view, they try to be more naturalistic in a sense, they try to explain things as naturally as possible.

And so they may not accept what I say, but I argue in response that what I say is actually not not inconsistent with.

The finding of science because I think the finance of size is I think science does not rule out the I think science does not rule out the possibility of miracle, right?

God can still do miracles. Yeah, so, and among scientists, I think that's so many scientists, I mean, of course, different scientists are different views as well, right?

So I'm not sure which group is in the minority right now, but, I'm not, I'm not, a, I'm on Kristians.

But I think most Christian scientists would also agree with what I said just now, which is that no science does not exclude the possibility of Marigo.

Yeah.

Okay. Alright, thank you very much. Peter, are you on Peter Bussy? You're next.

See Yeah, you're there, Peter.

Peter, can you hear me?

Can you unmute yourself?

Let's see. Yeah, there we go. All right, Peter. There you go.

All right.

Okay, There we go. Yes. Well, my view would be that there are pieces of Genesis chapter 2.
Which are really very difficult to take as they stand, like God walking in the garden. I had suggested Eve coming out of Adam's rib.

You seem to accept that, but I don't see how God can walk in the garden and given all that, we would have to sort of pick and choose a bit.

Those little passages that we think helpful and those that aren't. On what basis would you do that?

Well thank you so much Peter for your question and it's good to meet you here in this on this platform.

Yes, yes, yes.

I think we have interacted before on the Kalan customer. That's right. Yeah, I really appreciate Arthur on the column argument.

I have cycling in my own books in my own publications on the column. So yeah, it's good to, direct view on that and to see you here.

And thank you for your question about the interpretation of Genesis 2. And so yes, I agree that not all details in Genesis Tax should be interpreted literally.

I think we need to consider the principles of interpretation. Some of which I mentioned earlier on, right, so principles such as considering how the ancient Jews will have thought of such such details right so we have to think about, their geological background.

Yeah, call true background and that's what you want to go background. I think the ancient Jews do think of God as a spirit, right?

A spiritual being. This, this, this is a problem both in the Old Testament and also in the New Testament, right?

Jesus says that God is a spirit. And so as a spirit, I don't think God can literally walk in the garden, right?

As, say, Spots rather is a way, a kind of aative expression of fanological expression to talk about how God relate to human beings using languages.

Using expressions that the audience would be more It'll be easier and you'd be more understood easier for the audience, right?

To more striking for the audience. Now, however, as for other details, No such as refrain, those referring to human
beings, not that.

01:04:45.000 --> 01:05:01.000
So if was created of Adam. No, I do think that God is trying to make a theological point there, right, to show that, you know, if is somebody right close to Adam and Adam should treat if.

01:05:01.000 --> 01:05:12.000
As his dear wife, know that somebody very close to him. HI, I think that that, that, that, that, that, that, does, require, some, LITTLE, EGG, ONE GOSPI, HAR, right?

01:05:12.000 --> 01:05:22.000
So, so saying that it's a theological point doesn't exclude that. You know, we got actually did something to make the chaotic point right and the thing that got did was the creative of Adam's week right so and so I think that's, that is the most possible interpretation of the text.

01:05:22.000 --> 01:05:37.000
Yeah, so we have to look at it case by case and to consider the background. Con and also the reception history of the text, which is how the early readers understood the text.

01:05:37.000 --> 01:05:44.000
And I think, and it seems to me that the early readers of Genesis do understand if to be specially created.

01:05:44.000 --> 01:05:59.000
I don't see any evidence to suggest otherwise. And so, yeah, so on the basis of all these humidity principles, I think we can arrive at this conclusions.

01:05:59.000 --> 01:06:00.000
Okay.

01:06:00.000 --> 01:06:01.000
Okay, thank you. That's clear enough. I'm not sure whether we agree on everything, but you've indicated your answer to my point.

01:06:01.000 --> 01:06:02.000
Thank you.

01:06:02.000 --> 01:06:03.000
Okay.

01:06:03.000 --> 01:06:07.000
Thank you, Peter. It's not clear that any 2 of us will agree on everything. But, stop. Thank you.

01:06:07.000 --> 01:06:14.000
All right. So that ends the list of questions submitted in advance. And so I'd like to throw it open to.

01:06:14.000 --> 01:06:23.000
A discussion among all of us. So again, go to the icon called reactions and raise hand and we already have one from Steve.

01:06:23.000 --> 01:06:37.000
Good to see you again. Go ahead and unmute yourself and ask your question.

01:06:37.000 --> 01:06:38.000
Okay.
Well, thank you for, Steve. I appreciate the DSA and the crossroads of faith and science, and your work, Dr. Lowe, in that. I call them 2 scholarships, faith in science that pass one another in the night and don't go to the same ports or call conferences.

So there's a lot of work and understanding. Science people usually don't speak Hebrew and vice versa.

Hebrew people don't often know much about science. Give a series of 3 interconnected points really fast and then get your comment on them and it focuses on who is Adam and how early.

Who is Adam and the image of Adam? And I should say the image of Adam can maybe be first look at, Genesis 5 2.

And in verse 2 says male and female created he them and blessed them. And called their name Adam. In the day that they were created.

Here the perils used for one person, Adam. And then this genealogy goes and looks at the singular atom and continues.

I'd like to look back at this plural, call in them, Adam. By going to chapter one and verse 25 in Genesis.

Up until that time, the earth. And ground has had the Hebrew word, and at 25 something changes and it's in day 6 where we have 2 parts of day 6 first rudimentary animals or higher animals really.

Rudimentary came in day 5 and and then the second part of day 6 is atom. Male and female.

And I think there's a connection. I just don't know if people are aware of this and it says that God made the beast of the earth that is a rats after his kind and the cattle after their kind and everything that creepeth.

Upon the earth after that earth is the first time Adam shows up it's the ha Adam, the ground.

And after this earth. Odama, after his kind. Associated to the creeper. The word eretz is used continually again until 2 5 which is the second creation account which I take focuses on Genesis, Creation Day 6 in more detail.

Well, basics has 2 parts. And so I'd like to consider that. The atom has something to do with the creeper and in language it's very important to look at roots especially genesis we get so much For example, the Miami, the waters become the Shah, Miami, same route. They become the heavens.
The heavens came from the waters and it happens throughout Genesis. So we should look at this and then that's the second point.

The third point is to connect to this that there are 3 events of Barra usage in Genesis one.

And we talk about his soul in spirit. Some people do not believe in that trilogy.

Trinity. But on the body, soul and spirit, the body come material day one heading Genesis one God created.

For all. Then in day 5 around verse 20, I think it is there's the NFH and that uses bra for the second time and then Day sex second half.

Of day 6 for Adam and Eve, we have a bra, again for spirit. Well, okay, can understand the material.

I can understand the soul for day 5 because rudimentary nervous systems came in with Nedarians or jellyfish or all these Animals swarming in the oceans.

In the day 6 I can hire. Perhaps attach that to higher cognitive abilities that can have relationship with God and carry out His kingdom.

Being the spirit of God, the Nishima breathed into us. So they're both very they're all very physical and descriptions of material and rudimentary systems in day 5 and then higher cognitive systems.

But I'm pushing the the boundary for Adam back to 1 25 as a creeper who becomes.

A higher cognitive in day 6. Any thoughts on that?

Okay, thank you for your. Questions and So I think what you have said just now is not contrary to my model as far as can understand if I understand correctly.

So you're talking from the usage of the Hebrew terms and the Hebrew roots and I think my model is compatible with that.

However, I think I'll be more cautious about the use of the wood bar because I think there is some disagreement among Old Testament scholars about what is the significance of the use of their words.

But however, I'm I must confess that I'm not an Old Testament scholar myself, right?
So I do, site. I do try to refer to their work. When it comes to key shooter relevant to my model, but as to the final details, I think that you'll be better to, for you to consult the Old Testament scholar and to us for their opinion scholar and to us for their opinion.

01:12:18.000 --> 01:12:25.000
So I think a good scholar to us will be our opinion. So I think a good scholar to ask will be John Collins whom I cited for my work and so perhaps you can ask John Collins to comment on what you said.

01:12:25.000 --> 01:12:30.000
Thank you. As to Baron, I think a good lead there would be Alan Dewald.

01:12:30.000 --> 01:12:31.000
Okay.

01:12:31.000 --> 01:12:39.000
Who has had a lot of critiquing of her work. So it's good discussion and she calls Barra to separate.

01:12:39.000 --> 01:12:49.000
God separates from the very beginning from a chaos to higher order every day. And the last separation on demand, really continues in day 6.

01:12:49.000 --> 01:12:50.000
With that so that's the idea there No.

01:12:50.000 --> 01:12:55.000
Okay, Steve, I think we need to move on. The purpose here is to ask ask questions here.

01:12:55.000 --> 01:13:01.000
Not, to convey your whole point of view, but you've given a lot of good information there.

01:13:01.000 --> 01:13:02.000
Thank you. Next person with their hand up was Del Coon.

01:13:02.000 --> 01:13:07.000
Thank you.

01:13:07.000 --> 01:13:21.000
Yeah, thanks, Randy. This might be a little bit out of the flow. The discussion, but I'm wondering about the transmission of the image of God, whether we should think of it as a biological transmission through the progeny.

01:13:21.000 --> 01:13:28.000
Or more like a social transmission as a meme and whether that even managed to model. And again, thank you.

01:13:28.000 --> 01:13:36.000
Thanks again for your work and I'm looking. I'm probably gonna get my answers when I get the book and read it from cover to cover.

01:13:36.000 --> 01:13:40.000
But thanks to watching them for your feedback and for your question. No, it's a great question, right?

01:13:40.000 --> 01:13:53.000
So, how should you understand the transmission of the image of God. No, in my book, I argue primarily that this transmission is to the transmission to Adam's descendants.
Through the transmission of the capacity in the soul which enable the descendants to perform the function of knowing what and representing God.

Right, so in the history of Christian thought, you'll find that, They are different origins who put the different views about the transmission of the soul.

Right. So for example, there are individuals who do traditionalism, traditionalism, which is not the soul of the solish potentials of Adam and E, they will pass down to the descendants.

However, there are other telogens, the creationists who argue that, It's not so much about the translation of the solace potential, but rather that got kicked tracks, right?

Got, got, keep track of the descendants of identity and whenever, whenever the descendants, the mate and have offspring, got specially create a soul and in part that into the the offspring, right?

So. So in the history, for example, there are this 2 different views. And I personally argue in, I mean, I'm more in favor to the traditionalist view because I think that that is closer.

To, I mean, that, provides a better explanation of the transmission of the corruption. That was passed down from identity.

And that's how I understand original sin as account corruption. But I don't, I don't rule out the creationist model.

So my model is also, so my model is compatible with either way, right? No, we either, traditionalism or creationism.

Now as to the question we better could it have transmitted as as a mean, right, as you know, for example through social communication.

No, I don't see create evidence of that, but however, my model straight speaking, my model is not incompatible with that possibility.

Right, so for example in the future if some people do discover that. The ability to be aware of God and represent God, right?

This can be communicated to other, creatures also the garden for example. So what I'm saying is that it could be possible for, you know, that, God has already created those other anatomical hormone outside the garden.

We've already with the account potential right for this kind of awareness and, representation of God is not to represent God, but it's just that this potential are not activated yet.
You know, they are not activated under, you know, say somebody communicate, you know, to those other features and then it become activated and they are able to exercise this awareness.

Of God and to represent God. This function right so so yeah so my model is not ruling out that possibility although I don't see any clear evidence of that yet so I think that to be open right to various possibilities.

Yeah.

Okay, alright, thank you on that. Stephen, Lunninger, we are here again. Yes, go ahead.

Yes. My belief is that scripture is very scientific, biologically scientific. And I conveyed to the idea that both dust. And salt are referring directly to DNA. Now, pretty much all biologists know that the DNA is assault.

That was, you know, made clear in the, in the Watson and their article in 1953.

But dust requires a different side. To understand that it's also DNA. And that comes from the definition of dust from geology.

Geology being the combination of 2 or more minerals. And you know one being a metal and one being a phosphate. So. So now we can tie together the Genesis 2. When he talks about the desk of the earth. And then we can also also skip over to lots wife.

Who is. Termed as being becoming a pillar of salt. But if you look at all the materials that the scripture describes.

Nothing there could be classified as a salt. Only the DNA can be classified as assault. What are your thoughts on my hypothesis?

Thank you for sharing your thoughts. Now the first thing I've mentioned is that, I'm concerned about the, the accusation of concordism, which is that the worry that maybe reading modern science into the ancient scripture attacks.

Because as I mentioned just now, when we interpret the Bible, we have to be aware of the He's still got background and concern of the difficult authors.
Is it what they are trying to say? Right? Is it? That they are trying to talk about DNA or the relationship with geology and other things.

Now I don't see the evidence that that was about the ancient authors. We got us are trying to say.

So, yeah, but on the other hand, I do agree that it's not there's no incompatibility right between what they are trying to say and what modern science discover.

So I agree that there's no incompatibility, between what they are trying to say and what modern science discover.

So I agree that there's no incompatibility. But that doesn't mean that they are trying to talk about other things, right?

So it's one thing to say that they are trying to talk about modern science. The other thing is saying that what they say is not incompatible with modern science.

So these are 2 different issues, which I distinguish very clearly in my book. Right, so I mentioned that there are different tasks of the, when we approach this issue about video science and Christianity.

We need to distinguish between the firstly interpreting the Bible. Secondly, showing that, the Bible is true and the third, you know, showing that there's no incompatibility, between, by the, and what science says.

So these 3 tasks are distinct. They should be distinguished. They use different methodologies, right? So, when we interpret the Bible, we have to go by the genre, the context.

And also to consider the reception history. I think that's important as well. And also the background of the Asian authors.

Yeah.

So, we look at the reception history, right? There's no indication that the early readers of the genesis text understood anything like DNA or that the early readers of the Genesis text understood anything like DNA or that the text is from top of that, right?

So yeah, so I'm cautious of that.

Okay.

Oh, can I add a clarifying point and maybe I could even say a proof that My interpretation is correct.
That in Scripture, We are all made from dust. As repeatedly said, you know, not just Adam and Eve, but all of us are made from best of the earth.

So. If Jim and Jane beget Jack. And the question could be, okay, well, where did Jack get his dust. And the answer is there's only one place that he could have gotten his dust. Which is a fertilized cell. And the only thing in that fertilized cell that they classify it as dust is DNA.

Well, as I said, that is, not incompetent. As I said, what science discovered about DNA and how that is passed down from the parents.

This is, yeah, this is consistent with what the Bible says, but I don't think the Baba is telling us about, you know, the, Yeah.

You're welcome.

Alright. Okay, thank you, Stephen. Tom, you've got another question.

No, you have to unmute yourself. We're not hearing you.

Yeah, let's try again.

Yes, sorry. Andrew, this is about the, second part of the title of your book.

That's evolution. And. What is just recently occurred to me?

Is that because it's pretty well established that mutations and that was evolution is based on various mutations.

If the majority or more or bad. You mutations, then good.

I think that's generally agreed on that, lots of mutations, some are neutral, some are good, but more or bad, I'm good.

But I'm, but as you are speaking, I, I was reminded of what, Owen Gingrich had to say about this, right?
So I think, Owen Gigree was a Harvard, astronomer, we said, Eventually, a Christian and he, I think he also said something like, you know, most mutations are harmful, right?

But Perhaps some inspired ones are not. Could it be that God has inspired some of this, mutations so as to prevent extinction for extinction, for example.

So, GIGGERIC, OVEN, DIGRICK, he, he's artistic evolutionist, right?

If I'm not wrong, I think that's, he's artistic evolutionist, right?

If I'm not wrong, I think that's, he believe that got used evolution to create and he thinks that that doesn't brew out the possibility that there could be some In the, all the way, right, to bring about, yeah.

Yes, I.

Bye.

Yeah. Yeah, I think, I think, Tom, you have to recognize that while it may be true that most mutations are harmful, they're also quickly selected out.

And within the generation. So the ones that actually appear our are not the harmful ones. So I don't think that's an issue on evolution, but let's move on.

Hi, thank you for your. You're talking. And the review and so on. I detected in some of your answers sort of a A body soul dualism.

And that and I, you know, I think it's probably. Relatively unpopular to speak in those terms in the ASA these days, but I'm I'm an unapologetic.

Substantial dualists. Myself and I think that one I don't know that I want to call an easy solution, but, a view that I think is is consistent with scripture on on this is that the image of God is actually associated with and that.

You know, anything that happened before Adam. Was You know, physical manifestations, you know, neurological brain function manifestations of some of those same things.

But the essential. Image of God. Is and and the capabilities associated with that image of God come with The soul and the soul is something that gets added to if you if I can put it in those terms to the you know the physical human body.
At the time of Adam and Eve and all of his and her descendants. And so, you know, I guess.

That's kind of summarizing. Some of my perspective on that. I just wondered if if I'm hearing that sort of viewpoint in your comments and the way you're attacking this problem in. You know, biological ideas and evolution.

Yes, thank you so much, Perry, for your comments. And I'm glad to hear that there's a fellow substance deal is here.

Okay.

So yes, I'm a substance to this and I'm glad that you hear that you are too.

Yeah, I'm rather sad to hear that substance,ism is not so popular nowadays among ASA members.

I'm excited to hear that. I, I think that's one reason maybe because a lot of people nowadays, they, They try to be as naturally as as naturalistic as possible in their understanding of humanity.

And so that's kind of mindset may. Make substance dualism less popular, right? However, I think that's, I encourage more people, to check out.

The works of philosophers of religion such as, Jpmolan, for example, and, you know, he recently published a book, a written book published by Wiley Blackwell, which is a leading academic publishing on substance, the defending substance, dualism, right?

It just came out and it's a 400 page huge point where he, argue, using philosophical arguments that substance, is actually the most plausible view and it's not inconsistent with science.

Right, so, so that is from the scientific and philosophical perspective. And as for, as, as, do regards to the political perspective, other, there are many other public schools who have argued contrary to some like Joel Green for example who is Monies right there are other difficult scholars such as Craig you know I mentioned in just now and others we have argued that in fact we look carefully at The early reception history of the Old Testament text in the second temple literature for example. Now, this, the Ottasmanitex are understood as forming a kind of substance dualism.

Right? It is due this and I think that is also the best interpretation of the biblical text as well.
And so, so yes, I would personally agree with you that I think the most The best view at this point in time is to say that there are these potentials in the souls, right, which got specially endowed with that allow Adam and his descendants to perform the function.

Right and I think that's also the Roman Catholic view as well as the the Roman Catholic view as expressed by into this commonly, human is generous right he talks about this view that he popped up so the cathic pop argue that the human body could have evolved from simpler life forms but the souls are specially created by God, right?

And so that could end out Adam and his descendants with the capacity for function. So I think I personally hold to that view as the best view, I think.

But however, as I said just now, I'm not excluding the possibility that in the future, right?

So even if in the future, some, some people discover that's not there are some other ways which the function Maybe pass on, say for example, by, you know, communicate, or whatever.

I don't think that even if scientists discovered that, in the future, that the Bible is never refuted, right?

Because as I said, the Bible doesn't exclude other possibilities as well. Yeah, so, yeah, so I hope one is clear.

Yeah.

Okay, thank you, Terry. And now I have an opportunity to raise my own hand. I don't get that very often.

So, Kerry. I should probably start by saying I'm not a substance dualist, but you and I are still good friends.

Yeah.

So it still does work that way. I would, I would say I'm more of an emergentist, the soul emerges from the body. But whatever.

My question to you, Andrew, has to do with the I guess it's called the subtitle of the book, Science and Scripture in Conversation.

That sounds great, but what bothers me? Not just about your work, but that of. Craig swam Midas and others.

I don't see the conversation. What I see and what bothers me is that the the program from all of you.

 Seems to be, let's pick out some particular interpretations of of Genesis. And let's test it.
Bye, seeing if any of these views are not inconsistent with science. And the criteria seems to be. Does science, 100% disprove this?

Now, that bothers me because it's not how science works. This isn't science. Science doesn't 100% disprove or prove anything.

Really? I mean, there's some things that are pretty close. But in general, science isn't.

In the business and nor can it. Go to 100%. Pr so if if we're thinking about this as Adam and Eve being.

Historical ancestral progenitor. And okay, what characteristics can we attribute to them.

So that it isn't 100% ruled out by science.

That's not science and scripture in conversation. So what I would like to see from you all is a different conversation that says What does science actually say?

If we take it at face value. If we basically start from science. What do the data really tell us without putting on biblical filters or any other preferential treatments.

And kind of the same thing with with scripture. Well, what would you see in my opinion and and many of you can correct me.

Is that if I just look at scientific data of human ancestry, the first thing you note is that it's all population based.

You really, see population from all aspects from. From the anthropological data going way, way back, genetic data.

Evolution is population based and our history. Population based. And I think all of you would it would kind of agree that everyone kind of seems to say whoever Adam and Eve were, they did have contemporaneous peers.

And I think you, state that and you're all okay with that. But you go on and say that there is this special couple in that population called Adam and Eve.

Now from the science point of view You don't derive that from the data. Because whether you analyze the genetic data or whether you analyze the genealogical mathematics that Swami does is proposed.

Both paths say that it doesn't take all that many 1,000 years. Maybe 3 or 4,000 years or so.
And everyone alive now is a descendant of everybody who lived back then. Genealogically and genetically.

And that there's no way of distinguishing or favoring one couple over any other. And so it becomes a truly non-scientific method. To try to assign one of those couples as being Adam and Eve and then declaring, aha.

We have found something that is not inconsistent with science. And so now we have conversations between we've had a conversation between science and scripture.

I don't see that. Because I think what we need to say, what is science saying as the most okay, that's.

And that is simply that there's a continuum of populations of ancestral humans. You know, without a clear single. You cannot get anything finer than that, I believe. Well, for me, from Biblical, I'm a scientist.

I'm not a Theologian, but if I step back and take a high level view of Genesis one and 2, it's pretty clear that Genesis one has no has no pretense of offering any natural history.

It's not clear to me that there's any basis for thinking Genesis 2. Teaches us anything but theology.

And so when I listen to all of you. So hard. To try to match a particular historical interpretation.

A genus 2, I said. This isn't this isn't the real conversation between science and and between the science and scripture.

It just I just find all of it. Very, non compelling. So anyway, any comments?

But thank you for your, your comments. So, no, so your comments, actually a methodological point, right, concerning what is the meaning of conversation and how do we go about that.

No, address this issue in great detail in chapter one of my book. So I'll encourage you to be in my book.

I didn't you told me just on that you haven't read it yet. Yeah, that's right.

No, I have not. It will be available soon.

So, Yeah, hopefully, go back. That's right. So in chapter one, I provide a very in depth analysis of the methodology
which is absent from some of us and also from CREATE actually.

Yeah, so, so I, yes, but I can only give a very brief summary here.

But I encourage all of you, the audience to read the book for details. Right, so what I mean by conversation, which I explain in chapter one is that now first of all, It's not the case that we just select some interpretation and try to make it fit the signs.

I mean, that's what you say just now, but that's not what I'm doing, right?

So what I'm doing is that, okay, as I said just now, we need to distinguish between a few tasks.

So at the at the first level. Which I call task A is that we need to interpret the Bible.

And signs according to the methodology. That is proper to both. So in the case of integrating the Bible, we need to consider the genre, the context, the word meaning, the historical background of the author, right, and the reception history, or which I mentioned early on, right?

So we need to get that right first. So it's not just picking and choose anything. We have to go by these principles.

To try to understand what is it that the political authors are trying to say. Okay, so that's for the Bible.

And as for signs, we need to go by proper scientific methodology, which, which you mentioned just now, right?

To get a data, for example, right? And you do that. Okay, so that's the first step.

And then after we do this. Nope, we then think about whether this 2 set of information is Contrary to each other.

Or could it be that? No, there is a possible model which We can be formulated to show that it's not they are in fact not contradictory.

And I mean, and the reason why we need to think about models in the first place is because there is some overlap.

You know, between some of this, do this difference of information. They are not entirely complementalized, right?

Because if they are componentized then there's no need to think about it at all. But because there are some overlap.

And this overlap is what I need by conversation, right? Because no, The Bible, the critical authors, you know, they do
intend to tell us something about human beings, right?

01:38:11.000 --> 01:38:16.000
I agree with you that it's not all about natural history. There's about a lot of theology there, definitely.

01:38:16.000 --> 01:38:28.000
But however, this technology does want to say something about God and us, right? So it does want to say about God creating human things and have a and then from these human things the image barriers of the senders.

01:38:28.000 --> 01:38:32.000
I think that's what the Genesis text is trying to say. You're using the toilet.

01:38:32.000 --> 01:38:37.000
Dot formula for example. No, it is trying to say that there is a literal, a real atomic.

01:38:37.000 --> 01:38:48.000
So, and so that. It's the critical data, properly the treated. Right. And, and this, information is open.

01:38:48.000 --> 01:39:10.000
With what signs the data that science is trying to tell us about population about this descendant descending right and the gina's sugar ancestry in the articles population nature which somebody does cycled for example.

01:39:10.000 --> 01:39:11.000
Right.

01:39:11.000 --> 01:39:14.000
Right, so there is some overlap here. Which is what I mean by conversation, right? So they can talk to each other and to see whether there is conflict or there is no conflict.

01:39:14.000 --> 01:39:15.000
Yeah.

01:39:15.000 --> 01:39:18.000
And so I formulate a model to show that there is in fact no conflict. And so that's how the methodology proceeds.

01:39:18.000 --> 01:39:21.000
Yeah, so that is real conversation in that sense.

01:39:21.000 --> 01:39:26.000
Yeah, right. No, no, I appreciate that. I think.

01:39:26.000 --> 01:39:37.000
It's a fair point, you know, I I don't find it compelling because you're looking at the far edges and and not where the science is directly, but that's okay.

01:39:37.000 --> 01:39:44.000
I mean, that's something we have to do. We're running out of time. So Seth Hart still has a question.

01:39:44.000 --> 01:39:45.000
So

01:39:45.000 --> 01:39:46.000
Yeah, Okay. Okay.
Yeah, thanks so much. I feel the need to, even though Professor Locke and I disagree on some elements, I feel that need a bit to defend him here and to say that he isn't looking at the edges either of theology or of the science there.

I think he's right in the center. What he's doing is very similar to what it and his historian would do when they look at geological data.

Geology and history are not the same field. They have their own methodologies, but if we have a historical record of say an earthquake and then we could look at the geological data.

We can then come up with a more compelling stories when we put these 2 different methodologies in these 2 different fields into conversation with one another.

We're not trying to look at the edge and trying to force fit 2 different fields together. We're using the best data.

You know, there's linguistic analogies with history. There always will be with hermeneutics.

That's what we have that field. There always will be with geology. Multiple models can interpret same geological data.

And, of course that will always happen but it doesn't mean we can't do it and thus come up with a more holistic stories by bringing these into conversation.

But I have to ask a question to Dr. Locke. So to him, I just want to return to my point, if I can last.

The Act 17, how you interpret Earth there. And you say you, you favor the model that it's preferring to the whole earth.

I would agree. I would absolutely agree. I guess my question then comes if I can sort of press this to maybe and I guess my question then comes if I can sort of press this to maybe an extreme, if I can sort of press this to maybe an extreme is, is let's say we're 90% certain of that interpretation is, is let's say we're 90% certain of that interpretation that Adam is the father of the whole human race, right?

That still leaves a 10% ambiguity, right? That still leaves a 10% ambiguity, which is probably a bit more than we want to say.

Yeah. That still leaves a 10% ambiguity, which is probably a bit more than we want to say. Yeah, it's certainly possible.
You know who don't bear the image of God that aren't really, sorry, homo sapiens on earth that aren't truly human, if I can put this as provocatively as possible.

So I guess my question to you is, is there a way you can shore up this possibility unless we live with a sort of, you know, angst that there are homo sapiens who aren't really human on earth today.

Okay, thank you for. Your question, your point. So now I wouldn't frame it in terms of, probability of the certainty of the text and then says that while there is a 90% probability of that's a 10% uncertainty, a 10% probability of some human beings of some hormone today who are not.

Gossip is various i don't think we should frame it that way Okay. No, when it comes to the text, I think that's okay.

We also need to consider the reception history as well. And I think that's when we look at how the early church fathers read the text.

I also, we can see that and they are trying they are they do try to understand they they are understanding is as saying that not Adam is you know the ancestor of all you know human beings today and no day is and so get XA deal extra evidence, right to how we should understand the Texas thing and also the whole history of.

And also that he's like a background as well, the second temple Jewish. Background also understand Adam to be the first human being who is the father ancestor of others and so yeah so I think we do have quite a lot of evidence to think that Adam is the ancestor of people around the world, right, to today as what?

This is how he has been traditionally understood. Good.

Okay.

Do you do you take the reception history the tradition is authoritative?

I think the reception history is a good indication of how the text is understood. Right, so I'm not taking it as authority, but as an of how the text is, and the text is indicated.

It the text is authoritative. The text itself. Yes.

Alright, we've got like a minute and a half left. So, this has been a great discussion.

Andrew. What is it that you would like all of us to remember from your book?
Thank you, Randy. For this closing question and So, it's been great discussing this with all of you here in audience.

And what I hope you all remember is that Well, I hope you all will take a look at chapter one on my book, which is the methodology part because I think that is the main thing which I think some, this is a platform you here is not so, so clear about.

And so, so I hope that's, you will, the, message is to, is to focus on the methodology.

I do have a clear understanding of what's myself, Somi does and thought the quick, what we are trying to do.

And once this is understood right then, you can see that. So this is actually a, it provides, helpful and compelling way to show that there is no conflict right because neither science nor the Bible is intended.

No, the Bible is intended to tell us everything, right? So the, the, the, the, the, the, the, the, the, the, the, the, the, only tells us a limited set of, the parts of linear self-information.

And at this moment, time science is also not comprehensive in the sense. My size is not able to tell us everything yet, about the universe and about human things.

And so, so we need to bet this in mind as well. And so with this in mind, we can see that, actually, you know, and also after considering the model represented, right, you can show that there's actually no conflict between science and Christianity.

And I think this is very important. Why? Because many people today, including where I come from in Asia in in Hong Kong, China.

A lot of people today, they think that science is incompatible with. The Bible, right, science is on my percentage and that costs a huge obstacle for people to come to do faith, but to come to embrace Jesus as a lot and save it.

So my heart and a passion is that we need to. Address this issue in a reasonable way and to remove a necessary obstacle so that people can come to receive Christ as they’re not in safety.

Yeah, so that's the main point on the emphasize and that's what I want to leave.

You're with. Yeah.

Okay, thank you so much. We appreciate your overcoming jet leg and being here. I guess in the LA area with us and I thank all of the rest of you for good discussion.

And wish wish you all farewell.
Thank you