

THE LANGUAGE OF GOD UNDERSTOOD

Recently at a presentation someone asked me what I thought about the book, “The Language of God” by Francis S Collins. At the time I was in the middle of the book and hadn’t finished so I thought I would finish and share with everyone. Francis Collins claims faith in Jesus, which I won’t question. However, I will strongly question his understanding of God and His Word. Mr. Collins makes no apologies about his belief in the Big Bang, billions of years and evolution. His claim to proving God’s existence lies in the fact that human beings have a moral law or an “awareness of right and wrong” (pg 23).

Later, he asks the question, “Why would a loving God allow suffering in the world?” His answer is simply that man has been given a free will (pg 43). This falls completely short of the real answer. This is a foundational truth in God’s young earth. If free will is the answer to suffering, why do many die of cancer that choose to live a healthy lifestyle? Why do people get any disease that is not a matter of choice? Wouldn’t God be the one to blame for this? He certainly would. The Biblical truth of the matter is that this entire world has been subjected to decay because of Adam’s sin. Collins isn’t sure Adam is even a real person, but if there is no real Adam, there is no literal fall into sin, which means no literal explanation for death, disease and suffering. The Bible is clear, “Therefore, just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all men, because all sinned-” (Rom 5:12-13). Also, “For the creation was subjected to frustration, not by its own choice, but by the will of the one who subjected it, in hope 21 that the creation itself will be liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the glorious freedom of the children of God’ (Rom 8:20-21). Clearly, death and disease has come about because of Adam’s sin and the entire creation was affected by it. Free will isn’t the problem, rather Adam’s sinful flesh passed on to us is. Sin is the cause for evil even being a choice for man to choose and death for reigning in this fallen world (Gen 3;19). When the Lord returns, there will be no “knowledge of evil” to even choose from.

In the chapter on the Origins of the Universe, Collins claims support from Pope Pius XII who was a supporter of the Big Bang theory. Collins explains that only God could have orchestrated the Big Bang billions of years ago and that this must have been the way God started the evolution process and, at this point, put the information in DNA. He rightly admits that science has thus far not explained the origin of life (pg 92) so God must be the one who initiated this among the lifeless chemicals and elements. First, we must ask, how did these elements evolve? How did the chemicals evolve? How did the atomic particle that blew up in the Big Bang evolve? Again, no answers from the scientific community, we must just trust them apparently. Collins, of course, will say God must have created them. Well, if God can create that, why not just do it all right away like the Bible says He did? Perhaps the biggest problem with this whole idea of millions of years is the concept of death and disease once again. Evolution says it was death that led us up to human beings. The Bible says it was man that caused death. According to evolution there is no meaning and purpose behind death. Death is just natural. If this is the case, what was the purpose of Jesus’ death on the cross. He could have stayed in heaven and said, “I forgive you,” saving Himself a lot of trouble. He couldn’t because as Hebrews 9:22 says, “Without the shedding of blood there can be no remission of sins.” Death had and has meaning and purpose. It is the curse of man’s sin in the Garden of Eden and the cure for man’s sin on the cross as Jesus overcame death. The Big Bang gets rid of the meaning and purpose of death, and thus, the meaning of Christ. Collins is obviously confused here. So why does he feel the need to believe in billions of years? On page 93 he says that many of the previous “gaps” in the fossil record have been filled in by discovering extinct species of animals. He says, “Furthermore, their age can often be accurately estimated, based on the same process of radioactive decay that helped determine the age of the earth.” Collins is putting his trust in this faulty science. First of all, he doesn’t mention which fossils have filled in the gaps. I haven’t seen or heard of any yet. The evolutionists keep trying to make up things like Lucy and others but in every case, these things aren’t missing links but frauds, misinterpretations, grabbing at straws, combined fossils etc. Not a one has been conclusively proven to be a missing link scientifically. Secondly, the dating methods have many assumptions and problems that go with them. The institute for Creation Research RATE project has

shown the rate of decay in these rocks is not a constant plus many other issues that falsify these methods of dating. But again, Collins would rather trust these fallible men who constantly are changing their minds rather than the infallible, unchanged Word of God.

Collins's claim to fame is that he was put in charge of mapping the human genome. No doubt this was an incredible task and one that will be extremely useful in science. Though his science and observations were good, his interpretation of the data is flawed. This is the problem in science today. The scientific observations are good, but the interpretation is bad. I use a number of examples of this in my presentations. Some of you may recall the scientists who wanted to see how far a frog could jump as legs were removed. With four legs it jumped 80 inches, 70 inches with three legs, 60 inches with two legs, and 50 inches with one leg. With this observation the expected outcome with no legs was 40 inches. Obviously, the frog didn't jump no matter how loudly they yelled at it. The scientific observation was that a frog jumps less as legs are removed. The interpretation of the observation was, a frog with no legs GOES DEAF. A humorous example to show what is going on here and throughout the scientific community. Scientists zapped fruit flies with radiation to speed up the process of evolution. They got fruit flies with curly wings, stubby wings, no wings and even extra wings, yet none of them could fly (so they must have been fruit crawls) and all of them were sterile. The observation was that all mutated fruit flies were "inferior to the original fly." Good scientific observation here. What was the interpretation? "Fruit flies must have evolved as far as they can go." How silly is this? Did you ever stop to think that maybe scientists were screwing up what God made right to begin with? Good science . . . bad interpretation. Likewise, Collins has been involved in some very good science, he just screwed up the interpretation.

Collins discovered in this genetic map that very little of it was used to code the protein with only about 20,000-25,000 or 1.5% of the total. Scientists had expected a minimum of 100,000 genes, especially since worms and flies have around 20,000 genes for coding proteins. Though some have taken this as an insult to the complexity of man, Collins says gene count must not be the whole story (pg 125). I agree with him there, however, his other interpretations of the facts I believe are in error. He went on to say, "By any estimation, the biological complexity of human beings considerably exceeds that of a roundworm, with its total of 959 cells, even though the gene count is similar to both. . . . Our complexity must arise not from the number of separate instruction packets, but from the way they are utilized. Perhaps our component parts *have learned how to multitask*." (pg 125, emphasis mine). Perhaps Mr. Collins, they didn't "learn" anything, but were created that way to begin with.

Another amazing discovery was that in examining a number of members of our *own species*, at the DNA level we are all 99.9% identical. Thus, we humans are "truly part of one family" Collins said (pg 126). This distinguishes us from most other species. Isn't that amazing? Biblically, no surprise is it? Humans should be genetically similar to one another having been created by the same Designer out of the same dirt.

Furthermore, it is pointed out that in comparing our DNA sequence to that of other organisms, a computer can pick out a stretch of DNA of a human and find a similar stretch in another species. Collins said, "If one picks the coding region of a human genes (that is the part that contains the instructions for a protein), and uses that for the search, there will nearly always be a highly significant match to the genomes of other mammals. Many genes will also show discernible but imperfect matches to fish. . . . If on the other hand, one chooses a bit of human DNA that lies between genes, then the likelihood of being able to find a similar sequence in the genomes of other distantly related organisms decreases. It does not disappear entirely; with careful computer searching, about half of all such fragments can be aligned with other mammalian genomes, and almost all of them align nicely with the DNA of other nonhuman primates. . . . What does this mean? At two different levels, it provides powerful support for Darwin's theory of evolution. . . a computer can construct a tree of life based solely upon the similarities of the DNA sequences of multiple organisms" (pg 126-129). Big deal! A human has similar DNA to other species. That is a nice scientific observation, however, the interpretation does not mean Darwin was right. I believe it means the Bible was right and God created all of these things and it shows a common Designer, not a common ancestor. A lug-nut on a Chevy fits on a Pontiac. It doesn't mean they evolved from a Nissan, but rather GM makes both vehicles. Even Dr. Barney Maddox, another leading genetic

genome researcher in the genome project, said concerning these genetic similarities, “Now the genetic difference between human and his nearest relative, the chimpanzee, is at least 1.6%. That doesn’t sound like much, but calculated out, that is a gap of at least 48,000,000 nucleotides, and a change of only 3 nucleotides is fatal to an animal; there is no possibility of change.” (*Human Genome Project, Quantitative A Disproof of Evolution*, CEM facts sheet. Cited in *Doubts about Evolution?*. As Henry Morris said, “The function of only 1% (some say 3%) of human DNA has been determined. If 98.6% of this small amount is similar to chimps it still proves nothing.” (Modern Creation Trilogy vol. 2 chapter 9). And by the way, because of better understanding of our DNA map, it is now believed that we are only 94.3% genetically identical to a chimp which genetically speaking, isn’t even close.

One other comment on genetic similarity. A rain cloud is 100% water and a watermelon is 97%. Do you think they are related? And wait! A snow cone is 98% water. Perhaps that is the missing link? A jelly fish is 98% water too. Take a bite out of a snow cone and a jelly fish and see if you can tell the 2% difference. Clearly small differences mean big changes. Also, these men always like to point out the similarities but ignore the differences. A human is actually closer to a sunflower than a chimp when our cytochrome C is compared. We are closer to a pig if the heart is compared, yet nobody is running around claiming our great, great, great, great, great, great grandfather was a pig.

On page 132 Collins says that the difference between micro-evolution and macro-evolution is artificial. He couldn’t be more wrong. He believes micro simply is a small change and macro is a large change. However, according to the definition of these words it means much more than that. Creationists believe in micro-evolution. This is simply variations among a species. For example, dogs have puppies, fish have guppies and people have yuppies. From two dogs you can get a big dog, little dog, hairy dog or even a bald dog. However, you will never get a half dog, half cat (dat) which would be macro-evolution. (Large changes outside of genetic possibilities). Collins uses the freshwater sticklebacks as his evidence that macro-evolution is happening. These fish in salt water typically have a continuous row of three dozen armor plates from head to tail. However freshwater sticklebacks have fewer predators and have lost most of these plates. First of all, it is an assumption to say they lost them because the predators were fewer. Secondly, the same genetic information has just been lost. There is no addition to the genes and this is what macro-evolution requires. You can’t put wings on a horse if the DNA of a horse doesn’t have the genetic information for wings in there to begin with. Therefore, gaining armor or losing armor isn’t macro-evolution but simply micro-evolution in big ways and Collins is wrong about the difference between micro and macro being artificial.

Also, on page 132 Collins says that bacteria becoming resistant to antibiotics is evidence of evolution. He says, “Truly it can be said that not only biology but medicine would be impossible to understand without the theory of evolution.” Again, Collins is confusing micro and macro-evolution. Take for example, H-pylori, a bacteria that causes stomach ulcers. When one takes penicillin it is absorbed through the cell wall of the bacteria. The bacteria then produces an enzyme that turns the penicillin into a poison, which kills the bacteria. What has happened is that this bacteria has *lost* the ability to make this enzyme. Therefore, without the enzyme, the penicillin can’t be turned into a poison and the bacteria lives. Note, this is a loss of information, not a gaining of new information, which is what evolution requires. Once again, Collins is mistaken and medicine doesn’t need to understand evolution to advance, rather we just need to understand genetics.

On pg 137 Collins claims, “A further example of this close relationship stems from examination of the anatomy of human and chimpanzee chromosomes.” He goes on to explain that a human has 23 pairs of chromosomes and a chimp has 24 pairs. His explanation is that these chromosomes appear, “to be a consequence of two ancestral chromosomes having fused together.” Again, nice observation, terrible conclusion. Penicillin has 2 chromosomes and a fruit fly has 8, therefore, penicillin must have evolved first huh? A house fly and a tomato both have 12 chromosomes. An opossum, a kidney bean and a redwood tree all have 22 chromosomes. They must all be related (ha ha). A human being has 46 chromosomes and a chimp has 48. Maybe someday we can evolve as high as a carp that has 100 chromosomes. If we aim really high, perhaps someday we can become a fern which has 480 chromosomes. Again, the number of chromosomes has nothing to do with evolution.

Of course, Collins brings up Galileo and how the church opposed him and held back science for hundreds of years. He tries to say that this is what young earth creationists (like me) are doing. On page 175 he tries to show how ridiculous it is to take the Bible literally by quoting Isaiah 41:10 where the right arm of God can not be literally lifting up the nation of Israel. This and a few other crazy examples where context and common sense clear up any confusion are used to say that Genesis is just poetry.

Collins also shows his ignorance as to what young earth creationists believe in distant star light and Biblical interpretation and pleads for us to use reason. He claims the intelligent design movement makes a clumsy Creator who has to “intervene at regular intervals to fix the inadequacies of His own initial plan for generating the complexity of life” (pg 193). Isn’t this what his theory of evolution does? I won’t get into all of the comments on intelligent design for the sake of not making this newsletter a book. However, suffice it to say, he is obviously attacking I.D. simply to support his theory without ever really giving evidence as to why I.D. isn’t scientific. He simply uses examples of so-called poor design and micro-evolution to say evolution is a better explanation than a poor designer. Again, Collins is forgetting about a literal Adam and Eve that caused death, disease and suffering and what looks like poor design is actually sin. (In some cases, it is a good design that they are misinterpreting due to lack of understanding). In any case, I myself agree that Intelligent Design falls short of the answer because it doesn’t claim who the Designer is, but it certainly isn’t what he makes it out to be.

On page 207 Collins show his ignorance of Scripture and creation science by questioning where Cain got his wife and where all the people on earth came from when Cain has to flee. First of all, the Bible says that Adam had “other sons and daughters” (Gen 5:4). Population statistics show there could have been several hundred people on earth by this time. Secondly, Collins mocks the idea that Cain married his sister because God said incest was wrong. However, God doesn’t say this until after Noah’s Flood in the book of Leviticus when the gene pool had become corrupt. As I speak about in my DVD on the Pre-flood world, Adam and Eve had a pure gene pool and this probably wasn’t corrupted until after the flood when the environment changed. Therefore, incest, before the Flood wasn’t physically dangerous or immoral.

The evolution of language is suggested to be found in the DNA because of the FOXP2 gene. A family in England had three generations of people who struggled with speaking and understanding grammatical rules. The affected family members were said to have a single letter of the DNA code misspelled on chromosome 7. Astonishingly, in the world of mammals this gene has been remarkably stable he said. However, in humans, there are “two significant *changes* in the coding region of the gene, *apparently* as recently as a hundred thousand years ago” (pg 140 emphasis mine). Again, perhaps these aren’t changes at all, rather creation differences. Secondly, there are many factors that could affect language, yet this one tiny study of one family is proof of evolution? I don’t think so. Third, how do these changes take place and how do you know the timing? The answer is they don’t. They assume so because that is what the belief about human evolution suggests. He is certainly adding presuppositions into his interpretations here.

On page 136 Collins talks about “jumping genes” that can insert themselves in various location in the genome. “45% of the human genome is made up of such genetic flotsam. . .Some of these may have been lost in one species or the other, but many of them remain in a position that is most consistent with their having arrived in the genome of a common mammalian ancestor.” First of all, one must realize that the same information is being turned off or moved around. It doesn’t add new information into the species as earlier discussed, and thus, has nothing to do with evolution. Secondly, Collins admits some might say this is just God’s creation made this way, however, he argues that when these genes move they are often truncated and become useless and God wouldn’t create “junk” DNA. However, scientists at Answers in Genesis have shown that there is no such thing as “junk” DNA. Rather, in some cases these genes may have a purpose in earlier stages of development etc. Of the 3 billion nucleotides in the human genome, most of them do not code for proteins. It is simply these non-coding genes that are said to be junk and support of evolution for three reasons: 1) Why would God put extra DNA in the genes. 2) Extra DNA is assumed to collect over long periods of time. 3) Similar non-functioning DNA in animals suggest a common ancestor. There are many explanations outside of evolution for this “junk” DNA. First of all,

there is “spacer” DNA where regulatory regions are spaced appropriately and thus, they have a specific purpose to space out genes and other DNA elements. There are also repeating DNA called satellite and linker DNA. These satellite DNA serve as an anchor for protein attachment. Linker DNA are involved in the Histone proteins that bind DNA and allow it to condense. Part of this junk DNA is also called LINES and SINEs. Until recently, they were viewed as “selfish” DNA but now LINES are being recognized in DNA repair and perhaps x-chromosome inactivation. SINEs are being recognized as important protein binding sites. Again, these obviously are not junk, but have purposes that God created them for. Certain Pseudogenes we do not understand the function of yet, however, it is no surprise that we can’t understand the complexity of DNA with our simple minds. Some have suggested these are back-up copies or had functions earlier on but no longer do. Either way, they aren’t junk. In short, this junk DNA isn’t evidence of evolution and certainly not junk. They regulate gene expression, space and link genes, protect and repair and bind sites for proteins involved in cell division.

Finally, Collins does his push for cloning through somatic cells (body cells). He does recognize the problems with embryonic stem cells but says that somatic cell nuclear transfer is different and should be acceptable. His reasoning, however, is still biased. Cloning involves taking a regular egg cell and removing its nucleus. Then you take a cell out of a donor, remove its nucleus and put it into the original egg cell. From this a Blastocyst, which is a group of living cells develops. His argument is that in embryonic stem cell research the donor is an embryo and the embryo dies. However, in somatic cells the donor can be a piece of skin (not wrong to destroy) and the egg cell isn’t a human being either and thus it is not morally wrong to destroy it. Therefore, Collins says that neither one being human life, it shouldn’t be wrong to practice this type of research. However, where Collins logic fails is that even the nucleus of this skin cell put into the egg cell produces a Blastocyst, which does develop into a human being. Therefore, when you remove this Blastocyst to use its cells for research you are killing a human being in its early stages.

The moral implications to falsely interpreting what the scientific observations display are enormous. As he explains in his last chapter, there is much study trying to find a gene that causes one to be homosexual. Others are searching out the “God gene” that makes some people “religious.” Collins writes, “A few years ago, I saw an article in a religious periodical asking the question whether individual spirituality might even be genetic. I smiled, thinking that now I had heard the ultimate in genetic determinism. But perhaps I was too hasty; it is not impossible to imagine that certain personality types, themselves based upon *weakly inherited factors*, may be more prone to accept the possibility of God than others” (pg 262, emphasis mine). He goes on to explain a study done on twins which poorly demonstrated that personality parameters might have heritable characteristics. He admits that the study has been received with much skepticism, however, he still leaves the door open.

Clearly, God has allowed us to understand Him more clearly through the study of His creation, however, the interpretation of this science has been widely abused. I send caution to those who are using good science to make poor conclusions and ultimately, question the infallibility of God Himself in His Word. The sciences are not against the Bible and a young earth, despite what Mr. Collins believes. **“The wrath of God is being revealed from heaven against all the godlessness and wickedness of men who suppress the truth by their wickedness, since what may be known about God is plain to them, because God has made it plain to them. For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse. For although they knew God, they neither glorified him as God nor gave thanks to him, but their thinking became futile and their foolish hearts were darkened. Although they claimed to be wise, they became fools and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images made to look like mortal man and birds and animals and reptiles.” (Rom 1:18-23).**