

After His Kind

Michael Hawley

The following is an excerpt from *Searching for Truth with a Broken Flashlight*, which provides clear Scriptural/natural evidence that the Genesis phrase "after his kind" agrees perfectly with biological evolution, macroevolution, and common ancestry:

It is very clear reading anti-evolution creationist literature that even though they accept evolution within kinds they overwhelmingly deny evolution between kinds, which they call macroevolution. Why? As stated earlier, they interpret, "according to their kind", in the Book of Genesis as to mean God created all of life and placed them into preset divine categories, such as a whale category. The actual Hebrew word for kind is baramin. Any claim stating that modern species evolved from different "kinds" of animals, such as today's whales being descended from a land mammal with legs cannot be compatible with their literal interpretation of the Bible.

What is the accepted definition of macroevolution within the scientific community? They rarely use the term, macroevolution, but generally they consider it a historical look at evolutionary change at the species level or higher. It has been stated that microevolution is evolution within a species, while macroevolution is evolution between species.

As stated earlier, anti-evolution creationists have a different definition of macroevolution, because they are connecting it to the biblical term, *baramin*. *Baramin* does not equate to species. The horse kind category is not a species level category, but it is a family level category. What does family level mean? Scientists have organized all of life into progressively more specific categories based upon levels of relatedness. For example, the classification system organizes horses as follows: Kingdom – *Animalia* (all animals), Phylum – *Chordata* (all animals with spinal cords), Class – *Mammalia* (all mammals), Order – *Perissodactyla* (all odd-toed mammals such as horses, rhinos, and tapirs), Family – *Equidae* (horses, asses, and zebras), Genus – *Equus* (all horses), Species – *caballus* (a species of horse). Since horses, asses, and zebras are very horse-like, then this is probably what God meant by kind.

Most creationists claim that the Book of Genesis excludes the possibility of macroevolution, which comes from their belief that *baramin*, or kind, is a divine preset and permanent category of organism. The following are the specific verses in Genesis that use the phrase, “after his kind”:

-(Genesis 1:12): “And the earth brought forth grass, and herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind: and God saw that it was good.”

-(Genesis 1:21): “And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind: and God saw that it was good.”

-(Genesis 1:24): “And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so.”

-(Genesis 1:25): “And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that it was good.”

-(Genesis 7:14,15): “They, and every beast after his kind, and all the cattle after their kind, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind, and every fowl after his kind, every bird of every sort. And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is the breath of life.”

In their opinion, “after his kind” conflicts with the evolutionary concept of common ancestry, which states that all living organisms are descended from a common ancient ancestor. On the surface, it looks like common ancestry conforms to the creationists’ definition of macroevolution (evolution between kinds), thus conflicting with their interpretation of the phrase, “after their kind”. Little do most Christians realize, common ancestry is NOT evolution between kinds, which means it does not conform to the creationists’ definition of macroevolution. Common ancestry actually conforms to their definition of microevolution, which they accept. The idea that all organisms have a common ancestor is actually evolution WITHIN kinds, regardless of the definition of kinds.

If common ancestry states that the ancestor to all mammals was a non-mammal, i.e., an ancient reptile species, then how can this not be the creationists’ definition macroevolution? The answer is that evolution acts strictly upon populations from one generation to the next, which means that all modern

mammals descended from their own kind, their parents. It has nothing to do with what happened 10,000 or 100,000 generations ago, or what is going to happen in the far future.

The divine category of kind can be restated in terms of genetics as the overall genetic makeup, *i.e., the combined gene pools of all the species within that kind*. For example, most creation scientists agree that giraffes are a kind of animal. Today there are a number of giraffe species, but they all look like giraffes. Most artist reconstructions of Noah and the ark tend to have two giraffes either walking into the ark or they have their long necks sticking out of the roof. Genetic mutations (about 100 new mutations per individual) guarantee that the next generation of giraffe kind will have a slightly different set of alleles than the previous one. Notice how the definition of kind must be flexible enough to take into account additional new variations upon each successive generation. *This shows that the kind categories are not fixed categories*. Subtle changes in the total number and version of alleles from one generation to the next causes the category to change slightly.

Common ancestry claims that all mammals have a common ancestor, which means that modern day giraffes must have descended from mammals that had shorter necks. The fossil record confirms this with progressively older rocks containing giraffe-like mammals with progressively shorter necks. The oldest giraffe-like fossils are very deer-like in their morphology.

Besides having shorter necks, the most primitive giraffe-like fossils look deer-like. This also conforms to common ancestry, since giraffes are genetically similar to the deer family. Today, the giraffe and the deer are very distinct from each other, but it gets very difficult to separate them in the fossil record. The problem for many creationists is that deer are a different kind than giraffes. Common ancestry is conflicting with their definition of macroevolution. A certain population did not directly evolve from one set kind (deer) into another (giraffe), the kind evolved with it. The category of giraffe kind did not exist at the time of *Eumeryx*. More importantly, this does not conflict with the Book of Genesis, since each population of mammals is living and breeding after their kind at the time of their kind. This particular ancient population of deer-like mammals progressively changed their overall genetic makeup (kind) through time, yet they stayed true to after their kind and still do.

Organisms do not evolve from one kind to the next, as defined by anti-evolution creationists' macroevolution. **Their kind is inherently part of them, so organisms and their kind category evolve together. Since their kind category changes along with organisms, it guarantees that they always**

evolve WITHIN, or “after their kind”. This means that there is no conflict between common ancestry and Genesis. Interestingly, modern elephants, rhinos, camels, deer, sheep, pigs, horses, and hippos show a similar common ancestry pattern in the fossil record as in the case of the giraffe. Additionally, the ancestors to all of these very distinct kinds of mammals look more similar to each other than they do of their modern descendants.

Those opposed to this view may say that “after his kind” refers to preset categories, thus are not subject to change through time. God created kind categories then filled the categories with all of life. The problem with this interpretation is that it does not match God’s other infallible revelation, nature. As stated earlier, the overall variation within a kind category changes with the next generation, so the kind parameters just changed. Taking the Book of Genesis literally, it could just as likely mean that while God is creating separate and distinct organisms, they are conveniently fitting into different categories. **The purpose is “separate and distinct”, not “must fit into pre-made categories”**. Once complete, Adam now has the ability to name them since they are different from each other:

-“And out of the ground the LORD God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof.

-And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him.” (Genesis 2:19,20)