

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

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

Are Dangerous Animals a Consequence of the Fall of Lucifer?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Notes

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

²*Ibid.*, 134.

³*Ibid.*, 135.

⁴*Ibid.*, 138.

⁵*Ibid.*, 79.

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

From Whence Evil?

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

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