



## Who Made God? Searching for a Theory of Everything

Edgar Andrews

EP Books, Darlington, England, 2009

304 pp

Reviewed by Michael L Drake, Principal, [Carey College](http://www.careycollege.com)<sup>1</sup> May 2010

*Who Made God?* is a witty, stimulating and very readable explanation of the discoveries of modern science, exhibiting the marvels of God's creation and exposing the scientific inconsistency of attempts to explain the universe in terms of evolution.

Edgar Andrews does more than engagingly entertain while silencing on its own terms the challenge of atheistic scepticism to answer the question, "Who made God?" He does more than make important and obtuse concepts of modern science delightfully comprehensible in memorable imagery of daily life. He points readers to the truth and sufficiency of the Bible and faith in Christ as a framework – the only adequate framework – in which to think.

*Who Made God?* is possibly the most useful introduction to modern science a non-scientist could read. For that matter, because of the inter-disciplinary breadth of theory and experimental science canvassed, any well informed scientist will also likely profit from it.

Here is a readable and informative response by an internationally respected scientist to the flood of new-atheism's print and broadcast literature claiming that evolution explains everything. One by one he outlines with clarity and humour significant scientific constructs that describe how our universe functions. As he does that, he shows their usefulness and consistency with observable data, while exposing their inconsistencies and inadequacies in explaining the totality of everything. In particular the failure of evolutionary theory to explain the order and origins of the material and immaterial universe is rendered in stark clarity.

Against that he sets out what he calls the "hypothesis of God". One of new-atheism's fallacies of debating the existence of God is its failure to define its terms. Andrews shows that when the Bible's definition of God as creator and sustainer of the universe is used, the observable data fits, and does so with a consistency and comprehensiveness that evolutionary atheism can never sustain.

Andrews' last chapter highlights the inevitable and necessary conclusion to the data examined: God must exist, and does exist as the unmade maker and sustainer of everything. But more than this, the moral argument for God exposes our inescapable need of God and his redemption in Christ. So he closes with a personal affirmation of the grace he has found in the Saviour, and commendation of the *Gospel of John* as the next thing readers should turn to.

That last chapter aside, the first six chapters may be the most important contemporary writing anyone can be encouraged to read. Neither those nor the latter chapters are always easy reading. From the start Andrews warns that some of the science is challenging. He encourages readers to persevere: it may be necessary to read some sections two or three times, but that is worth the effort. Yet it is not so much how those first chapters induct readers into the theories of modern science, but how they introduce readers to a methodology of thinking about anything. These chapters, taken on their own, are an accessible and engaging introduction to biblical epistemology.

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.careycollege.com](http://www.careycollege.com)

The book is well printed, well presented and well bound: it can be given to others without apology and will keep its shape and appearance through many readings. Each chapter is introduced with a short summary and vocabulary that, much like a road-map, helps navigate through the detail that might otherwise distract or discourage. The summaries would also make great starters for family, class or group discussion.

My only criticism is that in making a passing comment to his reconciling the “big bang theory” with what he asserts is the Genesis 1 record of “genuine history” in an “epic poem”<sup>2</sup> with “clearly historical” intent (p106), Andrews unnecessarily introduces potential for doubt about Genesis. He explains briefly that he considers Genesis 1:1 as describing the creation of the heavens and the earth in an unspecified period of time, with the following verses providing the subsequent geo-centric creative work of God. This brief comment may cause more confusion than need be: it might have been better to have left it out or to have given it more explanation. In both *Who Made God?* and his earlier *From Nothing to Nature* he stresses commitment to the historicity and accuracy of Genesis 1. In *From Nothing to Nature* he commits to creation in six days each having a morning and an evening, while at the same time expressing belief in the very long periods of time the “big bang” presupposes.<sup>3</sup> Confused? Unfortunately, that is where this brief discussion can leave the reader; yet in the context of so much excellence this should not discourage the reading of *Who Made God?*

I had to be persuaded to read *Who Made God?* I found neither the title nor the prospect of reading another pedantic, ill-informed point-scoring and petty discussion of the creation-evolution debate at all enticing. I could not have been more mistaken. Before I had finished the first chapter I found myself enjoying a book that informed, stimulated and challenged, and in which neither the science nor the theology is superficial or dull. I have been passing out copies to friends and colleagues, commending to them what I believe will prove to be a lasting work in popular science, biblical theology, and devotional Christianity.

Feminist writer Fay Weldon describes it as “thoughtful, readable, witty, [and] wise.” David Kim of *Redeemer Presbyterian Church* in New York says Andrews writes a “nuanced and compelling argument that maintains the integrity of both science and theology.” Those comments are true but understated. This is a great book.

---

<sup>2</sup> But Genesis 1 is Hebrew narrative and bears none of the marks of Hebrew poetry (cf Robert Alter *The Art of Biblical Poetry* Basic Books 1985 p117).

<sup>3</sup> In *From Nothing to Nature* Andrews unequivocally asserts that “Genesis is a history book” and that “the Bible is true and can be trusted in all matters.” (p105f) He reads Genesis 1:1 as describing a “first” day of creation (which “lasted much longer than the other six days of creation, because, unlike them, *this* day was not measured as the time between morning and evening). In that first day God made the heavens and the earth before beginning the subsequent six days of creative work with regard to the already created earth. For example, having made the moon and sun in the first day one, “He could still have put them in the sky on day four.” (p109) As to those days having morning and evening, and therefore being clearly days, he argues that possible natural explanations could include such things as the earth rotating at a much slower speed than at present. Andrews acknowledges that this special pleading enables him to integrate the “big bang” with a literal (sort of) interpretation of Genesis. He is however quick to point out that it is valid to interpret the Genesis days as 24 hour periods, albeit such an interpretation cannot accommodate the “big bang”. In *Who Made God?* Andrews insists on a rigorous consistency in extrapolating scientific theory from observable data; a similar rigour in examining the literature of the biblical text would suggest that a) accommodation of the “big bang” to the Genesis text is neither necessary nor sufficient, and b) the inducement to such an accommodation arises not internally from the text but from external sources unrelated to the text. In any case, the literary form of Genesis makes the most natural interpretation of verse 1 an introduction that is developed and explained in the following verses, meaning that the entire creation process took place within the six days Andrews agrees are truly days. (cf Edward J Young *Studies in Genesis One* Baker, Grand Rapids 1973)