

# GOD WHISPERERS PODCAST

with LCMS Pastors Rev. Bill Cwirla and Rev. Craig Donofrio

EPISODE 345 - October 17, 2018

## "Evolving Certainties"

-- TRANSCRIPT --

<https://podcasters.spotify.com/pod/show/craigdonofrio7/episodes/345EvolvingCertainties1d3rjg>

[Quoting an external source] - *"Our God has been so wild lately. He doesn't seem to listen. He doesn't obey my commands. And we can't even bribe him with treats. He's gotten so out of hand, he may even have to be put down."*

God is not the problem here. The problem is the people who want to be the leader of the pack. We reintroduce God. We retrain people. You're listening to The God Whisperers. Hey, welcome to the world famous God whispers. I'm Craig D'Onofrio. I'm Bill Cwirla. And we've got a special guy on the Skype. On the Skype. On the Skype. On the interwebs. And that would be Reverend Terry Defoe, retired, although whoever really retires, right? Retired Lutheran pastor of the Lutheran Church in Canada, currently living and serving in Regina, Saskatchewan. Terry, welcome to the GW.

**Thank you very much,**

Canadian Prairies. Canadian Prairies, flat. You live in one of the sunniest places in Canada, don't you?

**Yes, and it's a place that gets kinda cool in February.**

I've been there in February. I've been there.

**It's a dry cold.**

Bitter. [LAUGHTER] Bitter. Bitter cold. Oh, man. To the core cold. It was supposed to be a warm day. It was like 10 below Fahrenheit or something. Use that other scale, don't you? Celsius. That's like minus 3,000, I think. Yeah, yeah. It's just about at zero Kelvin. It evens out at minus 40. [LAUGHTER] But boy, was it sunny. The sky was blue. I was wearing sunglasses. There was snow on the ground. It was amazing. But you guys get a lot of sun up there, a lot of sun.

**We do, it's great.**

It's beautiful. You know, if the wind isn't blowing, it doesn't normally feel as cold. But once you get past a certain temperature, it's just cold no matter what. Just brutal. So the reason, and I should really, this is a special Science Desk edition today. Get out your pillows. It's gonna be a good one. Popcorn too. Science! It's poetry in motion. It's poetry in motion. She turned her tender eyes to me as deep as any ocean. Yeah baby, Shatner. It doesn't get any better, right? The reason that, uh, can we call you Terry since we're all pastors here anyway?

**For sure.**

I'm going to call you Ted at least once, so I'm getting it out of my system now. But uh, we have... He calls all Canadians Ted. I do. It's, it's, it's so easy that way. Ted Pasztuka and his brother Ted. And of course there's... We know a lot of Canadians. The good ones. Terry's a good one. Terry has written an amazing book called *Evolving Certainties*, am I correct in saying it's self-published?

**That's correct.**

Self-published, available on Amazon for a lot of money. What is it, like 25 bucks? Did you drop the price on that?

***Working on it.***

Working on it, all right. Lot of pages though, so you know, the price per page is pretty good. I'm looking at what, about 300 and what, 25? About 325, 26, lot of pages, over 325 pages. So if you figure price per page, it's not that bad a deal. But the book explores the relationship and the sometimes tumultuous relationship between science and faith, science and religion, science and scripture, however you want to kind of put it. How would you kind of frame the whole premise of the book?

***Trying to see where different Christian groups have come across in terms of their struggle with Darwinian evolution.***

So evolution is kind of really front and center, although you explore lots of other scientific stuff, age of the earth, cosmology.

***I do. You know. Yes, kind of building a background to it.***

Now do you have like a background in science or is this like a hobby? How'd you get into this?

***I have no background in science at all. I'm a pastor since 1982 in Lutheran Church Canada, But I've had an interest in science since I was as far back as I can remember.***

So this is kind of an avocation thing or it's just a side interest. Oh, does it, did it have anything to do with your pastoral work? Um, you know, just in terms of talking with people about this stuff?

***No, you know, early on in my ministry, I, you know, I know our LCC comes from a same position or similar position to the Lutheran Church of Missouri Synod. And young earth creationism is built into the system. And I was always uncomfortable with it, just in the sense that there's gotta be more to this. I need to, at some point in my ministry, take some time and check it out.***

So this is kind of a personal quest then, right? You were just trying to make sense of things even though the church body's kind of dogmatically settled. The science is settled in our church body. But it wasn't settled in your mind, right?

***Well, back in 1989, I was a pastor in Vancouver, BC, and I was doing some work on the campus of the University of BC. Walked into the bookstore and picked up a book by Stephen Jay Gould called "Wonderful Life," where he talks about the Burgess Shale. And for some reason that got me started. I ended up pretty well reading everything he wrote. But that kind of opened the door to me. And it's interesting to look back at this point now at the marginal notes from 1990, 1989, 1990, and to see the questions I was asking and the kinds of issues I wanted to follow up on.***

I remember Gould, he was a contributing editor of Natural History Magazine, as I recall. That's correct. I think he's the originator of the Noma principle, the nonoverlapping magisteria.

***That's correct.***

So his approach would be to say science and religion, or however you want to put it, science and theology, let's say theology, are different magisteria. They talk about different things in different ways and they don't overlap. So just kind of keep them in their lane, right?

***Keep them separate, yeah.***

And so, but so it was his writings that got you going and you've been reading. I do have to say you've read a lot. Your book has more footnotes than like a sophomore year term paper. I mean, there's like a foot, there's like five footnotes per paragraph on this thing. Somebody counted them, over 1,700. See, it's worth the 25 bucks just for the footnotes. There you go. But it is really a good entree into the whole thing. I don't think, and I'm not being critical, I don't think you put forward anything new, but you bring everything together. And that's the value of this book is I don't have another book on my shelf, and I have a lot of them on this topic, that brings everything together kind of in one place. The bibliography is great. You've clearly like, you know, you're reading broadly as well as deeply. But it just brings everything all together into one place. So I think that's your contribution in this conversation.

***Yes, I'm a researcher. I love to do that.***

So this would be a good kind of resource for folks that want to dive into the topic and get a good bibliography in one spot. So I think what would be good here is to just kind of get an overview of the book and maybe talk about some of the implications. So it's like a three part book.

***Correct.***

Part one is history, the history of the interrelationship between faith and science. Part two is the way Christians have responded to the scientific revolution and advances in science. And then part three is really kind of for us who take the scriptures seriously and authoritatively, how then do we read the scriptures in light of what we know scientifically? Is that kind of a fair outline of the book?

***Yes, part three is really the summary, talking about an opportune time to get into some respectful conversation about this topic.***

Yeah, and I like that too. I just came back from a college retreat in Cedar Falls, a university of Northern Iowa, and the campus ministry there. And we talked exactly about this, and that is how do we as modern scientific people read the scriptures, and what are we drawing from them, and how do we apply them? So that's really part three. But first part one, what is the history of science and religion? Everybody kind of comes to it with this notion that they're enemies, they're antagonists, that they've always been at war, right? I've got a question on that. When you jump into this, one of the things that I'm curious about is, I know around the time of Ockham and Luther and others, even into Luther's age that theology was considered the queen of science, but now it seems that there's been a great divorce here. So if you would address that as well, if you've touched on that.

***Sure, there's kind of a conflict mode that most people assume is there. It certainly doesn't need to be there, and it hasn't been there in terms of the Church Fathers and so on. You know, I've looked at the background here, the scientific revolution, just in terms of the way things were at that time, and Copernicus and that type of thing.***

That came along at a time when Luther made some fairly negative comments about Copernicus, but it seemed to be willing to say, "Follow up on the studies, folks, "and we'll see where we go with this." You know, that Luther quote, and you mentioned the Luther, it's table talk, first of all, so we don't know who's sober and who isn't. That's right. 'Cause it's table talk. And second of all, it's transcribed, because Luther had these flunkies sitting around writing on napkins, like everything he said. be glad they didn't have digital recorders, or it would have been out of control. But that quote is really tough. I was helping Ted Peters track it down in the Weimar edition. And there's two different versions. One is less kind to Copernicus than the other. It's like Luther saying, that idiot, that Polack astronomer. But Luther says he wants to overturn all of astronomy. And then Luther says

something, but I stick with the clear words of Scripture, something of that nature. But I think that illustrates Luther's conservative mind. Copernicus was radical. Even astronomers didn't buy what he was saying. And so Luther's very conservative on that card. But curiously it was Melancthon who basically was tolerant of Copernicus. and allowed a Copernican to teach at Wittenberg. So kind of Lutherans were sort of cool with it. They didn't see this as a threat. Wait, Copernicus taught at Wittenberg? A Copernican, Georg Redekes, he was a mathematician who actually, they gave him a sabbatical for two years to study with Copernicus while he was at Wittenberg. I thought this was some new revelation that you had or something. No, no, no, old news. But that Luther thing, I don't think Luther knew or really cared, he was just kind of a conservative person. The new ideas weren't right just 'cause they were new, right? I think Melancthon had a good idea though in terms of saying, this is my personal view at this point in time, but follow up and let's see where this goes. I think we need that kind of attitude in the modern church today. Yeah, well and let's not neglect our boy Kepler, right? You know, he's Team Luther, at least he was for a while, But he was Team Lutheran, and he kind of clinched the deal on this whole business that the Earth moves around the sun in an elliptical, not a spherical, but an elliptical orbit. So, you know, what a great thing. But this caused a rereading of the scriptures, didn't it? I mean, we had to kind of rethink the whole thing. The sun did not race across the firmament like a racehorse. And that was the issue, I think. It's back to this hermeneutical idea that at that point in time the Earth is fixed in the center of things, and to look at that in a new way. And I think that's part two of that is now with evolutionary theories and ideas.

***You know, one of the issues that I really struggled with in my early days of studying this was the question of, is all truth God's truth? And then, you know, going to the idea of, so what is truth for science as opposed to what is truth for us Christians? The way I look at it is truth for science is based on evidence, and truth for people of faith is based on authority, the authority of the scriptures, the authority of prophetic individuals and so on. And those two truths overlap somewhat, but they are quite different. And when people on the faith side demand of science the kind of truth that we handle, absolute truth, science says we're not in that business. can approach truth, it can always be overturned. What we have as theories and so on can be overturned tomorrow.***

Now you know that's really interesting because we use that term truth in a variety of ways, don't we? We hold these truths to be self-evident, we say in our founding documents of the United States, but that's different than I am the way, the truth, and the light. My words are spirit and they are truth says Jesus and that's different than what we might call an historic truth or a scientific truth or something based on evidence. That word has a lot of facets of meaning doesn't it?

***Absolutely***

Now the question is does it all coalesce as one truth does everything do all truths have to have to basically harmonize at some level or can there be apparent conflicts? Can there be tensions in this?

***You know, folks have said, you know, if it's all supernatural then all bets are off scientifically because anything can happen.***

Oh yeah, it's chaotic universe at this point. Mmhmm. And yet there's evidence, there's fossils and so on, and folks have struggled with that greatly. What do you do with the scientific evidence? Yeah, and one of the problems that I see is this faith versus reason thing. Because that's when you get into other kind of colorful Luther quotes, like Luther calling reason a whore in a sermon, right? I think you have that quote from one of his

sermons where he speaks of whose reason, but he's very careful. That's in spiritual matters. That's not in matters of observation.

**Exactly. Exactly, but you know, a lot of it boils down to ideology versus evidence, you know, the ideology on the faith side, as faith takes various forms, and the evidence on the scientific side. You know, it's interesting to follow debates and discussions on the internet with regard to this issue. And there's something I call presuppositionalism in my book, which is what Ken Ham's folks do. They basically say, you know, evolution is man's word versus God's word. We follow God's word. And their interpretation, they look at it and say that it can't be changed, it can't be revised, it can't be seen in any different way except the way we see it.**

So now you're introducing this whole sort of, this category of six-day young earth creationism where Ken Ham "Answers in Genesis." They're like the, that's the chief proponent these days. Of course, there's a lot of people on board that ark, ship, whatever. What's fundamentally wrong there? Where's the misstep as you see it? I mean, I have my ideas, but I'm curious, what's the misstep in the Ken Ham approach?

**The Ken Ham approach is that presuppositionalism, which says we presuppose that our view of the Scriptures is correct no matter what, and there's no way we can change that. We're locked into that. And therefore, it doesn't matter what evidence you present to me from science, I have to disregard it. I have to just push it away.**

So in other words, if the Bible says the moon's made of green cheese and we send people up to the moon and they bring back containers of dust and it's basically made of mineral dust, we're going to insist it's green cheese 'cause the Bible says, right? And that's basically what he's saying. Yes, in my interpretation of what the Bible says. Well, yeah, there's been a redefining of what green cheese is somewhere along the way, obviously. See, now that's, but you said a tricky thing, interpretation, so the question is, is that a wrong interpretation? Is that a wrong turning with the scriptures to insist that, say Genesis 1, that this is geological time, this is natural history, This is how it went down in the world's first week.

**Yes, in my book I argue that that's eisegesis, reading back into the scripture, something that the original authors never intended.**

See, I think that Ken Ham has succumbed to a sucker punch, and it's Richard Dawkins' sucker punch, because Dawkins says ultimately, God is a scientific question. And once you go down that road, and once you agree to that, then everything becomes a matter of proof. Everything becomes the skeptics, you're playing the skeptics game at that point. So if the scriptures are scientific, they must be scientifically correct in all aspects. Every single point. If you prove them wrong in one, then you can throw the whole thing out.

**That's right. Science, the way I understand it, is supposed to be agnostic towards spiritual things, the resurrection of Christ and so on, and basically say that's an area that we can't look at, we can't study, we can't falsify it, we have nothing to say about that. So science, the way I understand it, mainstream science would say, "We have no right to speak about the existence of God or anything like that because that's not our bailiwick." Folks like Dawkins and Dennett and others would, that's what I call scientism, which really is arguing that only science has the answers.**

Now that gets kicked around a lot in our church bodies, "scientism." What's your working definition of "scientism" as opposed to "science"? Science only has the truth. We live by science alone.

Ah, okay. So isn't that kind of the scientific version of fideism, where I believe the Bible's true because it says that it's true? It's kind of just turning it into science there?

**Yes, and because folks like Dawkins have done it, shout so loud, they throw people off and people of faith think that the majority of scientists are like that. They're not. The research that I've done and some in my book as well says that folks, that those new atheists as we call them, are really only about 5% of the total number of scientists out there.**

So isn't that basically a statement of faith on their part and therefore their science becomes their religion?

**I suppose you could say that, but I am very uncomfortable with the idea that science is a religion. I think that's a bit of a...**

Well, I mean, they start with an atheistic presupposition, and that's where they want to go with this. That's where they want their science to take them. Much like I had a kid in my confirmation class, we were talking about this, and I said, "You know, even if the world is billions of years old, it doesn't mean that God didn't create it." But there has to be something that this all started from. He says, "Well, where did God come from?" Of course, that's always where the science haters go, I guess you could say. And that's where we as Christians say, "Well, this is an article of faith at this point. God always was and we believe this based on faith, not because we have scientific evidence." And yet there are scientists who are very dedicated to their atheism who seem to have that same kind of faith statement, but instead of there being a God as an unseen mover, it's just that, well, there was a universe before this one, a universe before that one, infinitely into the past, and they, as Bill would say, they punt and they don't address the first cause.

**I think they overstep their authority too. They really are stepping into philosophy rather than science when they make statements about God and whatnot.**

I think they have no right to say that. See, that's why Dawkins hates Gould's Noma principle. That non-overlapping magisteria. He hates that. He has a whole chapter on how that's wrong. Because in his view, science has overturned religion. It's a better way of explaining things, he says. But he doesn't like Gould's Noma because it gives theology or philosophy or any of that. It gives it credence. It gives it a place. Sure, legitimacy, yeah. Yeah, it gives it a place in human knowing. I got a friend, Jim Bachman, a retired professor at Irvine, but he has this great saying. It's not his, but he says, "There are many things to be known, and there are many ways of knowing them." Science is one way of knowing some things. But once you expand it to, it's the only way of knowing all things, then you've gone into a philosophy. Then you're into what I would call kind of a metaphysical naturalism rather than a methodological one.

**You see how that skews it for people of faith though, because they listen to people like Dawkins and say, "Well, he must represent the majority of scientists." There's been research done over a century or so, finding out how many scientists are people of quite a strong faith. A hundred years ago it was about 40%, and the most recent studies show it to be around 40%. Yeah, probably. So as I've done my research, I've networked with scientists, Christian scientists around the world, unbelievable people of faith, often represented by this BioLogos organization, was founded by Francis Collins, but that's an aside just to say, there's a lot of Christian scientists out there that are not, they don't have a problem maintaining their faith and their science at the same time.**

Yeah, that's a guy named Fritz Schaefer has written. In fact, he's got a chapter on this in Angus Manouge's book, "Reading God's World." But he's a chemistry professor. He came

into Berkeley right after I was leaving, but he's a Christian, and he has this great lecture on great scientists who are also believers, and right to the present age. And it's kind of a common myth that Christianity and science are incompatible. In fact, a lot of famous scientists of the past and the present are confessing, believing Christians. The thing I'm concerned about is there are pockets of narrow dogmatism that might be chasing out some of the scientific minded by making it, putting this line in the sand. You either have to believe the Bible or you have to believe science, but you can't believe both. That's true, and that's not the way it is.

**No.**

That happens on both sides of the equation, doesn't it? Isn't that what you're saying?

**Yeah, it does.**

I mean, I have met them, people in the scientific world who basically say, you can't be a rational, functioning scientist and believe this Christianity stuff or this religion stuff, it's irrational. You know, you're believing things without hard, observable evidence, and that's kind of, for them, a form of insanity.

**The way I see it is there's ditches on both sides of that road.**

You know, I like to say that faith goes beyond reason, faith doesn't contradict it. And so, you know, because we're Lutherans, first article gift is reason and senses, that's science. And third article gift is faith. And so spiritual matters are discerned by faith and revelation, but boy, that doesn't rule out reason and senses. You know, think about medical science and biology and chemistry and physics and all the ways we've benefited and have served our neighbor that way, so these are not incompatible, just that faith goes beyond. Faith goes where reason can't go. Love the Lord with all your mind.

**Yeah, there's that. Yeah, and the other part of it too, for me, is that this is a stewardship issue because it's a stewardship of knowledge and information that's been gathered and we have to make decisions about that and manage that as wisely as we can. But there are times when I think that, I've said this in my book and I'll say it here too, that we're confessional Lutherans and so the confessions protect our doctrine and practice and that's a wonderful, good thing, but sometimes they are impervious to build a wall around our doctrines and practice and then don't let new information in that should be allowed in, that we should at least think about and work our way through.**

I want to get back to six day creationism because it's a hot button issue in our Synod, Missouri Synod in the States. I don't know how it is up in Canada. We have it kind of ensconced in our brief statement, which is kind of like the ensconcement of the Scopes Monkey Trial, seven years after the Scopes Monkey Trial, so it's like in the air and the water of America. But to me, and correct me if I'm wrong here, Terry, but isn't six day creationism kind of inadvertent Newtonian deism. In other words, creation is sort of a once and done phenomenon, whereas we confess in our catechism that God has made me and all creatures, that the creative work of God is an ongoing thing, not a once and done thing.

**Correct, continuing creation.**

So by kind of defending this creation work week sort of thing as a piece of natural history, we're kind of almost playing into the hand of the watchmaker, thinking God made it all, wound it up, it runs on autopilot, it's all cool. Which isn't really our doctrine of creation, is it?

**No, it's not. And it's interesting when folks of faith, people of faith, look at the evolutionary theory, they tend to say that it runs totally on automatic pilot and**

***God's not involved and that's why they're against it. And yet there's various views of evolutionary creation that say God's very much involved in an oversight kind of role to this. So he's not absent by any means from that perspective.***

From a scientific viewpoint, you have to be honest and say, if you are talking about agency, so when you say it runs all by itself, there's no evidence for that. That's a presupposition that it's running all by itself. You know? Exactly. And that's where that line has been crossed. You kind of crossed into that realm of philosophy, theology, and it's like, how do you know the difference between all by itself and a deeply hidden hand? You know, God has this penchant for hiding, and so how do I know the difference between a hidden hand and all by itself? Truth, I can't. a matter of faith, not a matter of fact. So I'm going to play heaven's advocate here. No, devil's. No, you're on the side of the devil. We've always known. Well, if, you know, depending on which side of this coin you're on, a lot of people will insist that that Hebrew word "yom" has to be a 24-hour day. How do you respond to that one?

***That's one of the biggest arguments that you hear from the authors. People have looked at that in different ways. I think the basic principle that I try to work by is, what did the original author intend us to know? What was the original author doing? Another question I ask is, what genre is this? How did ancient people write history? Did they write it the same way we do? Do they have the same expectations that we have? I tend not to take the word "Yom Day" to be 24hour days. I don't do that, but you know, it's taken me two or three decades to get where I'm at, and my whole motivation was to say, "I want to grapple with the scientific evidence and see where it leads me." And it's a scary thought for a lot of folks, and it was a scary thought for me too, like where am I going with this? One of my colleagues said, "When you go down that rabbit hole, when you come back out, you're never the same as you were before." That is scary. And you're not. You're not. No? How has it changed you? It's changed my view of the Scriptures, especially the creation accounts. I tend to look at them as not to be taken literally in the sense that we mean literal in the modern day world today. I think that the creation account of Genesis is set up on the six day, seven day kind of Sabbath idea and there's more to it than meets the eye. Now I know that's going to make a lot of folks uncomfortable and that's okay, but when somebody says just read the words on the page, that's all you need to do. To me, we have to interpret, we have to understand, go back in time as best we can to what the original author, said, "I think if we could bring the original author beside us and sit that person on a chair beside us and say, 'So this is what I think you meant when you wrote,' and they may scratch their head and say, 'Excuse me.'"***

Yeah, when he stops laughing. Yeah, true. Yeah, we never thought that. Where'd you get that from?

***Well, you know, in my book I'm trying to say there's a hermeneutical challenge. It's all about hermeneutics. We have to go back and revisit that. I'm not saying to people, "Well, let science demand that we change things," and so on. I just am a little uncomfortable with, I think the 1932 brief statement was written by Francis Pieper, if I'm not mistaken. And others, yeah. But, you know, when I read Pieper, I was surprised to see him be so critical of science, you know, Wiseacres and so on, the way he said it. But basically, the way I read that was that he's saying, our theology is locked in, this is it. There's no changes to be made to our theology. And I think whenever any person makes any kind of***



***suggestion that we may need to tweak it a little bit, that makes folks very uncomfortable.***

And rightly so. The day issue is really, for me, a nonstarter, because God defines day in the very verse that we're talking about. The light he called day, and the darkness he called night. So that's the first use of day, it's the period of daylight. And I take that text to mean exactly what it says. Day means day, night means night, evening means evening, morning means morning. 20 hours, they didn't have hours, so that's irrelevant. So get that out of the picture entirely. But like you say, this is about time as sacred time. Evening and morning were the hours of sacrifice in Israel. Day was for work, night was for rest, and the rhythm is darkness to light. So, you know, I think this is more, if you ask me what kind of text it is, it's not prose, it's not history, it's only partially, there's a little poetic line in there, but I think it's liturgy, this is liturgical text. It's got that rhythm, there was evening, there was morning, a first day, the second day, the third day, And it sets it up, as you say, as a framework for Israel's sacred time. It's worship. That's true. It's temple, it's worship.

**An interesting book that got me really thinking was John Walton's *The Lost World of Genesis*.**

Yeah, okay, Walton's, where's he at, Wheaton? Yes, he is. Yeah, yeah, yeah. Walton's got his, I think he's got a beat on something here. That this isn't even really about creation. (laughing) 'Cause God didn't create anything in those days. He's just speaking things into order and naming stuff and putting them in their place.

***But people look at that and say, you know, it's interesting. Light doesn't show up till the fourth day. What's up with that?***

Irrelevant. I think evening means evening and morning means morning, even on the first day, because this is not chronological time. You don't play a day four versus day one game. In fact, I think you should just sort of meditate on light and darkness on day one. True. And you call it a day.

***The point I'm trying to get back to there is the ancient Near Eastern documents, you know, where the heavenly bodies are gods and we're slaves to the gods, and the Genesis writer is saying, these heavenly bodies are under God's control for his use.***

You know what I love about Walton is this idea of temple. So he sees Genesis 1 as Earth as temple, cosmic temple, which is pretty awesome. Bible does say that, that's where God puts his foot, right? And then Genesis 2, garden, that's another kind of temple, temple in the wilderness sort of thing. So that kind of gives you a whole different, and so you can carry that on, he doesn't, but I would, the ark, temple, you know, who's the priest, Noah. You know, and this goes on and on and on, this is the biblical motif of temple and priesthood.

***To the question of whether this study of science changes your view of scripture, in some ways it does. And again, I would say that's scary to some folks. But my view, and I argue this in my book, is that science is a friend of faith in the sense that it drives us back to the scriptures to be careful, very careful in terms of our hermeneutics. Can we ever make our hermeneutics, can we make that more accurate? I believe we can. Is our scriptural interpretation set in concrete and never to be changed? I'm not sure about that.***

We were talking, and I wanna get back to that 'cause I think this is really huge. This is your part three, your hermeneutics. That's correct. But in part two of the book, so you talk about six day young earth creationism, the favorite of people, let's be fair, people who want to preserve the integrity of the scriptures. I mean, what's at stake? Biblical

inerrancy and inspiration. That's really what they're afraid of losing. I don't think you do, but they're afraid of losing that, right?

**For sure.**

So you got, then you got another camp that's sort of old earth creationist, right? That's the Hugh Ross, Reasons to Believe, that's the big website, or Creation Research Institute and that. So what about those guys? What do they have right, what do they have wrong? Where are they going?

**One of the issues that I raise in my book is something called scientific concordism, which is the argument that the scriptures are totally accurate whenever they make statements about the natural realm, those are accurate statements. What you have to do with that though, I think is you have to read modern ideas back into the scriptures and then find a way to justify that.**

Yeah, this is a harmonizing approach, isn't it? So a day means a long age of indeterminate time. A day is like a thousand years, a thousand years like a day. But I think that does violence to Genesis 1. You lose a week. I've got to have a week because, look, frankly, you and me, I don't need a Bible to figure out day. I don't need a Bible to figure out month. just follow the moon, right? True. I would not. You know what you've got here. But a week, a week, you can't figure out a week on your own. There's nothing about a week. Week doesn't make sense.

**You look at folks, you know, when geology came out with the idea of the ancient earth, and that was quite a long way back, probably around 1820, they had already agreed on the fact that the earth was ancient. Then you had Christians looking back at Genesis saying, maybe we need to read it in a different way. Maybe we can read it in such a way is to make room for in ancient Earth. And then they come up with the gap theory and pre-Adamites and a lot of speculation, which sounds quite forced to me. But trying very hard to say, well, we've made the scriptures work with science. But that's an illegitimate way to do that, I think.**

See, I kind of, for the simple, I put it this way. So young Earth creationism tries to make scripture, it tries to make science talk Scripture. It's trying to force science into a scriptural framework. Old Earth creationism tries to make Scripture speak science, and that's equally, I think that's equally a failed endeavor. I think you're going to destroy both. You're going to ruin both science and Scripture when you do that. Scripture's not antiscientific, it's prescientific. Yes, explain that.

**Well, the way I look at that, the argument I make in my book is that the science in Scripture is an ancient science from an ancient day. It's phenomenological, and what I mean by that it's common sense, what the eye can see. You know, there's a solid dome above us, the firmament, there's windows in that, the rain comes down from there, that kind of thing. That's what we would have thought if we lived at that time. But that's not what science has found. In other words, if we just let the scriptures be this document made up of various writings and so on, from an ancient day, and just try to step back into their day and see it the way they saw it, rather than us trying so hard to read our modern ideas back into that.**

Like for instance, the people in the ancient day didn't think of the earth as a sphere floating in space. Even if it says the circle of the earth, what that means is you're standing there, like on the prairies where I am, and you can, you know, when your dog runs away you can see it for three days, because there's a huge circle around you. That's called North Dakota by us, we understand that. We're part of that. But no, it's observational,

experiential, phenomenological, it's a view of the world as you experience it, and quite frankly it's still valid, isn't it?

***It still works for me.***

Yes, but you see what that does to our view of inerrancy? It takes us to that and say, well, you know, if it's not absolutely correct and true in terms of what it says about the mustard seed being the smallest seed or whatever, what are we doing with the scriptures? Are we giving up something super valuable to let science come in and take over? You know, my problem with inerrancy is define error. I mean, what is an error? It's not a lie. It's not falsehood. is intent to deceive. But you see why folks have the slippery slope argument, which is the moment you let science say anything about our theology, we're doomed. It's all going to crumble. And I don't think science should comment on our theology, but maybe we shouldn't be commenting so much on science either. (laughing) Kind of let the theories rise and fall with the evidence. That would be kind of novel, wouldn't it? That's why I'm nervous about any synodical meeting that's going to vote on the theory of evolution. It's like, what's next, quantum mechanics or special relativity? Which is the next item on the list, you know? Well, let's go back to Scripture and this evolutionary idea, because one of the other big things that we come across besides the yom, 24-hour day kind of thing, is death and bloodshed before the fall. For there to be evolution, there has to be death and bloodshed. Yeah, I think the death issue and the Adam issue are kind of like big hot button. These are ones where we... The historical Adam all comes into play with that question. You know, is Adam the first human? Is he the father of us all? Is there a historical Adam and Eve? Yes, right. And also the place of what, if there is death before the fall, is there a place for death before the fall? There's a theologian, not a theologian, a scientist, let me step back and say, a scientist by the name of Joshua Swamidass from St. Louis. Interesting guy. I've met him personally. He's putting together some information on Adam and Eve and says these are historical individuals. I'm sorry, I spoke over you there, Terry. Go ahead. I was saying, would you say that again because I was speaking over you, I'm sorry. We'll be quiet now, Terry.

***Okay, sorry. Joshua Swamidass from St. Louis is a prominent scientist and has put together some thoughts about Adam and Eve and has done some scientifically respectable work to say that they were historical individuals and so on. He's got a discussion group on a website called [peacefulscience.org](http://peacefulscience.org), which I would recommend everybody check it out. And he's done a lot of work speaking at various groups around the world, around the US especially I should say. But he's a person we need to listen to.***

Yeah, I've seen his slides on this and I've heard him talk kind of quickly. It was really an afterthought at another talk he was giving. But the problem is that according to the geneticists, it's impossible for the entire human race to come from one set of parents. It's genetically not possible. Five maybe, but not one. But what he says is that it's possible for everybody to be genealogically related without being genetically related. And he actually, he's a mathematical geneticist, so he just runs kind of computer models, but he actually shows how this is possible. And it's really actually kind of cool. Yes, now that kind of argument and work that he's doing is above my pay grade. So I can't say that I understand it. The funny thing is I can say that he's a scientist who's trying to do justice to the scriptures as well. The funny thing is he's gotten in somewhat of hot water with people who are dogmatically insistent that Adam was not a historic figure because they have a vested interest in maintaining the genetic integrity of humanity. See, so it's kind of funny. Everybody's kind of has their hobby horse that they defend and then they dogmatize around it. So the poor guy gets like picked on by his friends who otherwise agree with him, but he happens to like argue the plausibility of a historic Adam. And you

know, go back to what I said before about respectful conversation. We ought to be able to differ with each other strongly, but still respectfully speak to one another.

***One thing I wanted to add was that I think in our church circles, there's a fear of being criticized, there's a fear of being labeled. The moment we start studying this issue, one writer said it's the E word.***

Oh yeah, the E word. It's the word that shouldn't be spoken amongst our groups of people and churches. We have forbidden words, yes. I call them forbidden thoughts, thoughts which you may not think.

***Another said it's a third-rail issue, that's an electrified rail, you better not step on it.***

Have you gotten any blowback, if you will, whether personal, professional, other things? Do you experience any sort of negative impact for your book? 'Cause your book is gonna be challenging.

***Absolutely, but the interesting thing is the book was published on August 3rd and I haven't heard a word so far. Maybe nobody's reading it, so that could be possible. People are, yeah, people are. Read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest. They're just ignoring it, you know? But you know, the interesting thing is the process of writing the book took me several years and I was involved with our Lutheran Church Canada synodical officials from the beginning. I sent manuscripts off and talked to folks. And so I was very much sharing with them where I'm going with that. So there's very few surprises, hopefully on our end.***

You know, Craig mentioned this death thing. I think you can go back to the Hebrew and think a little bit because in Genesis 2, the threat is on the day you eat of it, English translation usually runs, you will surely die. But if you look in the Hebrew, there's a compounded, it's a participle piled onto a verb. In dying, you will die. And so it's an intensifying phrase, which I'm open to the possibility that it's death beyond biological death. In other words, that first death, biological death, not a problem, okay? Second death, big problem. You know, it's the death of, it's what we might call a spiritual death, the death of relationship. like you say, "I'm dead to you," or "You're dead to me." On the day you eat of it, you're dead to me. And in dying, you will die like you wouldn't believe you would die, 'cause I think we're distracted by a biological death when we should be concerned with what Jesus calls the second death. And I think the way we should handle this too is to say these are discussions in process. We're not there yet. We don't have the final answer, but let's keep thinking. Let's keep looking. And go back to the scriptures not be afraid to say, "Could it say this?" without doing any violence to these words. You know, our hermeneutics supposed to be historical grammatical, right? So the words and the meanings and the historical context in which they're written, these are all in play. And let's do no violence to the text, but let's see if it couldn't say something we're not seeing, right? I mean, I think that's a fair question.

***That's true. That's exactly what I'm arguing.***

Quite frankly, for me, it's made Scripture more fun again. I'm not arguing. I'm not arguing with anybody. I'm just like, oh man, that is so cool. And I start making connections that weren't there before 'cause Darwin was getting in the way. (laughing) Hey, tell us about ***I would like to be called upon to be the kind of person who would be a resource person for a particular point of view. I certainly don't want to tell people this is what you have to do, have to believe or whatever, but simply to say, for me, over two, three decades, this is where I'm at and this is the kind of material I've covered and this is the conclusion I've taken with it. What do you think? And I would prefer to do that. And I would prefer to do that with our young***

**people in the church too, you know, in terms of youth groups and whatnot, college groups too. To say, let's cover the waterfront and that's what I've tried to do. These are the various ways that Christians have grappled with these ideas through the generations. What do you think about that? Rather than saying, I'll give you a pre-digested answer and you have to believe it.**

Yeah, that top down kind of thing. It really kind of, in a sense, the enlightenment did us all a favor by kind of kicking the knees out of these authority structures. But then you gotta be careful, you know. Now what do you have, you know?

**A hundred years ago, if a pastor told somebody something, they'd say, "You bet, that sounds good to me, Pastor." Nowadays, when a pastor tells a young person's group some things, they go, "I'll check Google when I get home."**

That's right, that's what you say. Hey, tell us about evolutionary creationism, because that's kind of the new kid on the block, right? It is.

**I've gotten to know a fellow, Dennis, or Denis in French, Lamoureux, at St. Joseph's College in Edmonton, Alberta. And he's one of the, sort of the founders of this idea of evolutionary creation. I've got his book in my hand here as I speak, but I've gotten to know him from early on. When he was writing one of his books, he sent me a chapter, he trusted me enough. You know, I'd made contact and we were back and forth with some discussions, So I've known him for quite a long time. He basically says, and this is connected to the BioLogos organization founded by Francis Collins. That's become kind of a clearinghouse for ideas along these lines, especially in terms of the evangelical community around the world. They have a rich website. Their website is fully loaded. One of the things that has been a great blessing to me is I've done some networking with some folks from BioLogos and they've been a great help to me. I would simply say to people, check out their website, see what they say and start on the process of learning about this. You know, there's lots of folks who say, "Listen, I'm not interested in science." Great, then leave it. But there's other folks who have a deep interest and have never really had good resources to follow up on. And BioLogos is helpful in that way.**

You know, Francis Collins himself is an impressive person. He's the director of the National Institutes of Health, which is the major point organization for the funding of a lot of medical and biological research. And formerly he was the head of the Human Genome Project, which is the group, it's actually several laboratories that sequence the entire human genome. It was like a 10 or 12 year multinational project, international project. And he was the head of that. The guy is serious, serious science, and yet he is one of the most outspoken, lovely, professing believers in Christ you could ask for. So much so that at his confirmation hearing for the NIH, they asked him very point blank hard questions. Would his Christian faith interfere with his science and his scientific research? And they kind of asked him to kind of parse out this relationship of faith and science. and he did so very, very well. He has written a book called "The Language of God" and in that book he talks about the fact that in his early years, professional years, he was an atheist. Yeah, he was raised by hippies.

**Absolutely, he would be a medical doctor in South Carolina or someplace like that and talk to some folks who are, you know, at the terminal end of their life, terminal diseases and one little lady said to him, so what do you believe, doctor? And he got to thinking about faith issues and so on. Apparently he went and talked to a pastor the pastor recommended C.S. Lewis and that led him to faith.**

So he's a very interesting individual, atheistic background, Christian now, and a strong advocate for folks who would say, now here's a Christian who's an evolutionary creationist, how does that fit together? And a good guy to know, good guy to read. Now as I read the lay of the land, there's kind of a divide between what they call evolutionary creationists and theistic evolutionists. The former don't like to be called the latter. And the distinction that I see, tell me if I'm wrong here, is that a theistic evolutionist is basically saying evolution is the mechanism and God guides it. It's not undirected, but it's guided by God himself. Whereas an evolutionary creationist says that the process pretty much runs on its own, but it has this kind of like almost, shall we say, innate intelligence that God basically designed it to work this way. And so from the outset, it works because God designed it to work that way.

***Lamoureux talks about that, you know, and I had written in my original manuscripts of my book, I kept theistic evolution and evolutionary creation separate. And several of the reviewers said, "How do you do that?" because they're really synonymous. I think that evolutionary creation is a term that people who are evangelicals prefer to use because both of those points of view talk about God's direction of the process more of an overview type of thing. Well, one's more direct, one's indirect, I think. That's right, but the differences are very, very small. True, but I think one of the things is a philosophical difference.***

I would, looking at those camps, I would label it more properly evolutionary creationism. Here's why. Theistic evolution is too, seems to be too certain as to precisely how God intervenes, whereas the other one is a little bit more uncertain. It also leaves evolution to be evolution. It's a scientific theory. It rises and falls with the data. And yet as Christians we confess, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven, the heavens and the earth, regardless of what mechanism science comes up with, you know what I'm saying? So there's a doctrine of creation and there are mechanisms of creation, and the two may not always coincide really well. Yes, and our investigation is a work in progress.

***You know, when you go back to Biologos, one of the interesting individuals I met was Daryl Falk, who's a fellow Canadian from Vancouver, but long story short, I got to know him and he reviewed my manuscript several times and directed me to be, he said, "It's not a matter of intelligence with people differing on this, it's a matter of ideology." I think that's right. He really said that, "What does science demand of faith? Very little, except to go back and have a look again at those creation accounts." He graciously agreed to write the foreword to my book and all the way along he was saying, Be gracious with other Christians. Be careful with them. That's where the idea of respectful conversation came. He's really an advocate for that. He said to me at one point, you're way too hard on the young earth creationists and you're way too hard on the intelligent design folks. Be gracious with, we need to be gracious with one another. And that's what he pounded into my head. Yeah, I think that's kind of, the graciousness is lacking.***

I think we have to get away from the cage match mentality. You know, the Bill Nye versus Ken Ham, no referee, cage match, fight to the finish sort of thing. It sells tickets and it appeals to their respective bases, but it solves nothing. In fact, they're actually arguing off the same presupposition. So for those outside the conversation, it's kind of like almost comical to watch, because Bill Nye and Ken Ham actually believe the same thing. They're just opposite sides.

***I don't know if you gentlemen know this, but the Pew Research folks did some research with Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod laypeople.***

Oh gosh, that always scares the daylights out of the hypocrite.

***And from a note that half of the laypeople in the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, I think the sample size was around 3,000, are fairly pro-science and pro-evolution. And there's a big, great gap fixed between the lay people and the clergy on that. I think that we really do need to have due diligence with this issue and keep on talking about it because our lay people are saying, you're way behind the times with this. And I think especially our young people, some people have argued that the young people leaving the church in droves, so to speak, I don't know if that's true or not, but they say that one of the reasons is that the church seems to be out of touch with science. There was a journal came out, the Concordia Journal, summer 2017, came to my desk. And it's interesting, the one who recommended I read it was my own district president. But when I looked at it, I thought, wow, look at that. Here's an issue that's basically saying let's reengage with science and so on. And I read that and a few of the articles kind of surprised me. One said that it would be okay for Missouri Synod folks to accept an ancient earth and I was surprised by that. Then I'd heard that that raised quite a firestorm.***

Still burning. And issues came out of that that were not very helpful. But the point of that is to say, that's exactly the problem in the church is that we can't speak freely about this because we're afraid of sanctions. And some of those sanctions are quite severe. So how do you speak freely when you're always looking over your shoulder? See, I think fear brings out the worst in us. You know, that's when we go fight or flight. And we become our most animal (laughs) when we're afraid and defensive. And I think this is a really bad place to be in because we're in a dangerous position of denying God's good gift of reason and senses. We're denying the first article.

***People come out of the woodwork to me, even now that my book is out, and will say, "Terry, I'm on the same page as you." I found clergy who have said, folks I would never have thought have said to me, "I agree with you, this is important to me. I've had some half-baked ideas about these things and you've helped me clarify. And that's fine to have that happen. I would simply say again that I don't want to convince people to do one thing or the other, but simply to say this is an exciting intellectual journey. Maybe I can help you along the way.***

I think it's confidence building. You know, this was kind of the fallout from my Cedar Falls retreat with the kids, is what I told them, I said, "Look, there's a lot of challenges to being a Christian in the modern world, and what you need is you need a Christ center of gravity. You need to be centered in Christ, and you need to be nimble. You need to be flexible so you don't get knocked down by every wind that blows your way." And I think these rigid dogmatic stances, like Six Day Young Earth creationism or any other kind of ideology, these are rigid, and they are prone to being knocked over very easily. We need something more nimble. Craig, didn't you say a couple of GWs ago, you were talking to like, you know, in your catechism class or something, and you engaged in kind of an even if. It's like, you know, some kids get, you know, going on this bender and you go, hey, even if the earth's four and a half million, billion years old, and, you know, we evolved from a common ancestor from, you know, our cousins, the chimpanzee, and all of this stuff, even if all that's true, Christ has died, Christ is risen, the sinner is justified before God, and baptized in Him we have eternal life. Nothing's changed, right? And no matter how you slice it, God created. You know, if He created in a way that leads through evolution, God

still created. There was an unseen mover. Things don't just happen out of nothing. You know, life doesn't come from a vacuum. So there has to be some origin. Well, I beg to differ on that. Victor Stengel, the mathematician, did calculate the probability of nothing becoming something. That guy owes me money. At 60%. 60%? 60% chance. He says nothing is metastable. It must become something. I don't know what he's talking about. How can that happen? Hey, I don't know. It makes no sense to me, but he seems satisfied with that. But here's my point. maybe we should be thinking about an even if way of looking at it. Not looking at ways to let's knock the legs out from under the evolutionists, but let's say even if it's true, what does this mean for our theology? What does this mean for us as biblical Christians, right?

**Yes.**

Is science, can science be a friend to faith in any way, shape or form or not? That I would say yes, it can. Oh, I think they're quite friendly. I, you know, you know, the way, You know, this takes me back to my lab days. OK, I was a research chemist for a bunch of years in academia and in industry. And in the lab, I was a chemist who happened to be a Christian. And I had people across the lab bench, how can you believe that stuff? You know, you're so smart. You know all this stuff and everything. And we had the best conversations across the lab bench about the hope of eternal life, about death and resurrection, about all of this stuff. And I'll tell you one thing, one of our co-workers developed a brain tumor at the age of 34 and died nine months after diagnosis. And it was the Christians in the lab who came to the forefront. They had some, they didn't blink. They had something to say, they ministered to this guy. And you know, everybody else, and suddenly those scientific atheists looked at us with respect because we were in on something and they wanted to know more about it. But those were great conversations, and they were never adversarial. They were never attacking.

***We don't need to be embarrassed about our faith. And I think that looking at mainstream scientific methodology again, I say that it's agnostic to faith. It's supposed to be agnostic to faith. There's an interesting science writer, his name is Gordy Slack, and he says that when you shift between the scientific world and the faith world, you need to hit the clutch so you don't grind the gears. (laughing) I think that's a learned skill.***

You know, as a chemist, I never prayed that this reaction would work, because that would be just kinda like maybe confirming my error, I don't know. Plus, miracles aren't scientifically valid, so that wouldn't be good. But I always prayed that whatever I did would bring glory to God and be of service to my neighbor. That's reasonable. And I think science is a great vocation in that sense. It really revels in the mysteries of creation and how wonderful a world we have. And it also is a service to neighbor in terms of the things that we can do to make our neighbor's life better and dealing with disease or whatever. You know, it's a wonderful thing. And knowledge, worshiping the Lord your God with all of your mind.

***That's what this is about, I think. There's lots of scientists in our congregations. I'm thinking of a fellow who's a geologist, my own son is a geologist.***

Oh, you have a son who's a geologist?

***I do, married to a geologist as well.***

Is he older or younger? I'm just wondering. (laughing) The rocks are really old. He wants to be respected in the church. He wants to be heard.

***Yeah. I think there are scientific folks in our congregations who are pretty quiet and sort of live a quiet life because they don't want to speak up too much***



**and say too much. That's in the science classrooms of our universities too, I think, in our church universities. You have to be very careful how you say things. Haven't you seen over the years where there's sort of a science shock that's possible for folks, young people coming out of our churches and being taught that the earth is 10,000 years old and so on, and they go to university and they hear another side of the story and they go, now do I have to choose my faith or science? And I would say, please don't choose one or the other. You can have the best of both.**

That's always a really big fear. And I think that Bill, you've really enlightened me a lot on that one, that we need to prepare the kids to go off to college because they're gonna be faced with professors who will say you're an idiot if you're a Christian. And they need to be able to harmonize these things and be able to deal with both sides at the same time. Right, and not have a bag full of gotchas. Well, what about the duckbilled platypus? You know, that's not disproving anything. That's just being. The proper answer to that one is, they're hilarious. You know, here's the problem. The problem is from the other side, the rock comes back. Well, what about the rabbit who chews the cud? That's in the book of Leviticus. Okay, so I'll see your goofball answer and raise you another one. This is pointless. I would much rather our Christian kids go into the classroom with confidence that nothing that they hear in there is going to shake their faith in Christ. Nothing.

**You know, in the book of Job, God asks Job lots of questions at the end. Like, what do you know about this? And what do you know about that? And there's a physicist in England who's a strong Christian, Tom McLeish, who said, you know what, when you look at Job and you think those questions may be an incentive to get on with the study of it, that's a good way to see it. And I think that could be a foundational kind of document for science itself. Regardless of saying you don't know it, you know, at this point, but get on with it, come on. I've given you intelligence and curiosity, follow it up.**

You mentioned that, you know, sort of a pivotal book for you, or reading Stephen Jay Gould, and that kind of thing sort of coming free, or at least coming looser. You ever read a book called Finding Darwin's God, Kenneth Miller?

**I have, yes.**

1999, that book for me was very much of a paradigm shift sort of book. Because he made this interesting point. He says, "Look, you know your natural history. You know, first of all, you know how you were conceived because you know the facts of life. You may not want to think about mom and dad and all that, but that's how that happened. You know embryology. You know the fetal development from literally day one. In fact, now we have movies about it. So there's no mystery there. We know how this works. You also know how your grandparents met and your great-grandparents. Some of us know a big, long family tree. So we know a lot about how we came to be. But we are no less fearfully and wonderfully made. We can pray Psalm, what is it, 139, that the Lord knit me together in my mother's womb and he saw my unformed body in the depths and all of that stuff. We pray that sincerely and we mean it, because that has not demystified one bit of our life, even though we know our whole natural history. So why not the world or the cosmos? Same thing, huh?

**Exactly. Science has blessed our world in so many ways, and yet Christians are lacking trust in some other areas. And I just want to say to Christians, take a look at this. This is not a problem, this is an opportunity.**

So let's kind of piggyback on that since we're kind of over time a little bit. So they get your book, 25 bucks Amazon, right? 300 and some pages, great stuff. What's their take

home? What's your hope, your prayer, your vision for the openminded reader who's curious, wants to know more, wants to know why this Lutheran pastor pulled all this stuff together at potentially cost to his reputation? What's the take home? What do you want them to get out of it?

***I want people to read it and say, you know, I didn't know that. You've filled in some details for me in terms of the history, perhaps, of young earth creationism as an example. That I can look at science in a new way, I don't have to be afraid of it. I can, you know, enrich my faith with this. I just want people to realize that there's so much more to this than they may have thought. And there's folks that you can talk to about it. There's opportunities to open discussion, open up discussion in our churches with our young people and so on. I think this is a really hot topic. People are interested in this topic. Kenneth Miller, who you just mentioned, said whenever he speaks on a radio interview-type show, the switchboard lights up as soon as you talk about that. And people get quite nasty. They shouldn't, but they do. There's a lot at stake with this. There's no doubt about that. But I would say, you know, just bear with it, be patient. There's some interesting things to learn. And at the end of the day, my God is more awesome now than ever before. My view of scripture has been enriched, I believe. I've got some things I want to share with people. I realize they're controversial. Then, you know, there may be some rotten tomatoes coming my way. I'm looking out the window.***

You're retired, you know, I mean, what can they do to you, really?

***Plus I'm a Canadian, so we're—***

You're Canadian.

***We're very kind people.***

You are. Everyone's very polite. Any last thoughts, Brother Craig? No, you know, this is a conversation that will continue. And Craig and I will be unemployed as soon as this thing hits the internet, so... I was doing something new, and you know, my church, they seem to point and laugh at me, so I'm feeling pretty safe. I'm good. Hey Terry, thanks for joining us and thank you for taking a few years of your life out to put this stuff down on paper. I have admiration for anybody who can finish a book. I barely get articles done on deadlines, so anybody who can actually do a book, I'm hugely admiring of. But thank you for what you've done and for the courage of kind of going against the grain to get people to think faithfully because I think that's the goal.

***That's the goal.***

It's been a great pleasure all along.

***Tremendous.***

Thanks indeed, Terry. Hey, thanks for listening to today's episode and all the others. You can like us, please like us, Craig Needs to Be Liked on Facebook. You can follow us on, what can you follow us on? Oh, you can subscribe to us on iTunes, on Google Play, Stitcher, and all those podcasting. You can listen to the entire, the entire archive, the body of work of the God Whispers, back to episode one, the glory days, at godwhispers.org. And if you must, you can email us at godwhisperers@gmail.com. Until next time, keep thinking. We'll see ya. (upbeat music)