

Science and the Bible E-Zine

The Science and the Bible E-Zine Volume 4, Number 3

Publisher: Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist
Motto: The Simple Truth
Date: March 31, 2011
Issue: Volume 4, Number 3
Home Pages: <http://www.AnOldScientist.com>
<http://www.ScienceAndTheBible.net>
<http://www.EyewitnessToTheOrigins.com>

Circulation: The subscriber list is growing. Circulation grows by readers passing it on. If you are not a subscriber, to get another issue, you must put your name and email on the list by sending an email to: signup@anoldscientist.com.

Be sure to put your name on the subject line.

"Truth: That which is in accord with fact and reality."

This is written so that you may believe the bible because of science rather than in spite of science.

What's in This Issue:

- 1) What's Happening at Science and the Bible?
 - 2) How Could An Honest Intellectual Be A Creationist?
 - 3) Reprint Rights.
 - 4) Sign up for this E-zine.
-

1) What's Happening at Science and the Bible?

By **Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist**

That same old question again rears it's ugly head.

Mention Science and Religion in the same sentence...
and the mind conjures up an adversarial relationship.

To many minds, the controversy boils down to, "Religion versus Reality."

To others it opens the debate of, "Creation versus Evolution."

Beyond that, the debate is a tool of those opposed to religion, to separate intelligent thinkers from what they consider to be an antiquated way of thinking.

In that regard, it has been one of their most effective tools.

One cannot deny the obvious that, like a bell that rings true, science has a ring of reality.

And, in the realm of reality, religion, with all its militaristic factions, does have a few glaring disconnects.

But the topic of science and religion has a greater significance than all of the above.

With this said, we come to the question of the age of the earth.

Not everyone agrees on the answer to that question. Not all religions agree. Even among followers of the Christian religion, there is major faction that declares adamantly that the age of the earth is quite young, only about six thousand years. The other faction declares that reality dictates the acceptance that the earth is much older.

Ask someone why they are a Young Earth Creationist and the usual answer is something like, "I believe the bible."

Ask an Old Earth Creationist why he or she is of that persuasion and the answer is generally something like, "The evidence is too overwhelming and therefore, that part of the bible must be interpreted as allegory."

To the rest of the world, those Creationists all believe something they know is not true. The Young Earth Creationists re-interpret science to agree with their religion and the Old Earth Creations re-interpret their religious book to agree with reality.

So, once again, I am forced to address the same old question.

2) How Could An Honest Intellectual Be A Creationist?

By **Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist**

" [be] ready always to [give] an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you..." I Peter 3:16 (KJV)

"When the bible is interpreted to agree with the rest of the bible, suddenly it comes into accord with reality. This is particularly true with things considered to be in the realm of science. Thus, the credibility of the bible is bolstered, having anticipated the discovery of the same reality by modern science." See Below

Listen very long to most any Creationist, be they of either ilk, Young-Earth or Old-Earth, and you will soon learn there are only two choices. Either you must:

- (1) **reinterpret science to agree with the bible**, or
- (2) **reinterpret the bible to agree with science**.

There is no other choice.

That is a real problem. Neither choice is acceptable.

But there is a third.

A few years ago, I was confronted with this problem

As an old scientist, in my retirement, I worked on the problem using all the tools I had learned or developed during the previous thirty years as a scientist in the field of information recognition.

Applying the art of information recognition to the bible, it soon became apparent that there is a third choice.

That third choice is to

(3) reinterpret the bible to agree with the bible.

After fifteen thousand hours, (that is equivalent to seven and a half years full time employment as a senior scientist, worth about two million dollars at the rate I was getting paid as a consultant after I retired,) the conclusion was stunning.

That massive effort resulted in a book detailing the evidence that whatever influence it was that caused the ancient scriptures of the bible to come into existence, it had to have an extensive, intimate knowledge of the origins. The long title of that book is, *“Eyewitness to the Origins, The Chronicle of Existence From Eternity Past to Eternity Future, Scientific Evidence of the Supernatural Authorship of the Bible.”*
<http://www.wordclay.com/BookStore/BookStoreBookDetails.aspx?bookid=34175>

It is a book about stuff that was published in the bible before modern science discovered it, stuff that was so foreign to what religion believed, that much of it was never recognized by theologians. Maybe that is what Jesus was thinking when he told the Pharisees that they did not understand, or why religion was so embarrassed by the Galileo episode over fifteen hundred years later, for which theologians finally formally apologized hundreds of years after that.

Whatever influence it was knew a lot about the origins before modern science discovered the same facts. Whatever or whoever it was, had to have been there to have known what is recorded in the bible at the time the bible was originally written.

You see, there are recorded in the bible, not just one major account of the origins, but nearly three dozen such major accounts. The problem for the young earth creationists is the fact that only one of them says anything about any six-day schedule. Therefore, in the mind of the young earth creationist, the other accounts are not even recognized to be origin accounts.

I accept the Young Earth Creationist’s argument that the “day” used in that single account is actually and truly “literal.” It is just as literal as the seed and the soil in the parable of the sower. But, no one argues that the seed and the soil were anything more than a parable invented to illustrate an unrelated point—more about that later.

Reinterpreting the bible to agree with the rest of the bible is the most fundamental of all rules of biblical interpretation. So I started there.

Applying the art of information recognition, within all the major origin accounts of the bible, I found about one hundred details concerning basic principles and chronology of beginning times.

Many of those details were repeated in multiple accounts. Some were found in only one. For example, the detail that it was “God” that was responsible for it, is found in each and every one of the accounts. The detail that there was a time when the ocean covered the totality of the surface of the planet earth, before the continents existed as dry ground, is mentioned in at least eight accounts. In at least one, that event is the major event from which the chronology starts and goes back in time, then restarts over again back at the same event, and goes forward . (Modern science did not even imagine such a condition nor event was even a part of the development of our planet until around a hundred years ago—nearly three hundred years after the King James version of the bible was translated, or after the Galileo incident.)

At the time when the writing of the book, “*Eyewitness to the Origins...*” was in the early stages of writing, other details were found in the bible concerning things modern science did not accept at that time, but which modern science is currently beginning to accept now. Such details include the detail that, after the earth had a solid crust, and before the continents emerged, a large quantity of the water to fill the oceans came from outer space, not entirely from internal to the planet earth. Another detail in the stage of emerging realization is that planets typically form in water rich regions of outer space.

Many previously unrecognized details emerged in the study, not the least of which is the fact that many previous interpretations that theologians have presented as agreement between science and the bible, are based on misinterpretation of the bible. One glaring example is the highly touted pre-publication in the bible that the earth is round rather than flat. That is a flat out contortion of the facts recorded in the bible and of the facts about what people knew about the planet—more on that in another article.

But the most amazing result of all this study is the fact that all the origin accounts of the bible can be flawlessly interleaved according to the chronology clues found within these biblical accounts. The resulting chronology stretches from the era of Eternity Past, to the era of Eternity Future. And that chronology comes from interpreting the bible according to the bible, not cheating by interpreting it according to any pre conceived point of view such as religious tradition or modern science.

And, that biblical chronology is also in one hundred percent agreement with two much later discovered God-given records of the past, The first such record is the light currently arriving from the past, from the Cosmos. The second is the chronology recorded in the rocks covering the surface of the earth commonly referred to by geologists as The Geologic Column. The details of chronology found in both these later discovered records are in the same chronological order as those found in the combined chronology gleaned from all the creation accounts found in the bible.

Again, that biblical chronology comes from reinterpreting the bible to agree with the bible, not reinterpreting the bible to agree with science.

That is how we got into trouble the first time. The bible was interpreted to agree with “science” when it was first translated into other than the original language by scientists at the legendary Library of Science at Alexandria, Egypt, about 250 BC.

But that too is another article.

That brings us to the problem of the fact that only one of the many biblical accounts of the origins says anything about any 144-hour, six-day, schedule. Like I said, the chronology found in all the biblical origin accounts combined is in total agreement with the chronology found in each and every other biblical account of the origins. That includes the account with the six-day schedule. Little known, however, and mostly ignored, is the fact that the one most popular account has two superimposed chronologies. A Six-day chronology is superimposed over a dissimilar underlying chronology. It is the underlying chronology that is in conformity with the rest of the bible. It is obvious that the six-day, non-conforming, chronology is more blatant in that account. Nonetheless, the underlying chronology is there, very detailed, and undeniably in conformity with all the other origin accounts of the bible.

The underlying chronology consists of two passes through the time line. The first pass, found under days one through three, is concerning the photosynthesis/botany side of the food chain. The second pass through the underlying chronology starts over in time at day four in the overlying chronology, and is concerning the zoology side of the food chain. Then, on day six, God dedicates the food chain to the benefit of humans. After the end of both these parallel underlying chronologies, in the overlain chronology is a seventh day, the day of rest. Thus, that account has been converted by the overlying chronology, into an ideal illustration for the fourth of the Ten Commandments, the one concerning six days of labor and a seventh day of rest.

And that brings us back to the question of why that non-conforming schedule of six days would be present in that account of the origins found early in the book of Genesis. Could it be that a previously existing account, with the same chronology as found in the rest of the bible, was used by Moses like Jesus used the parables? Could it be that the book of Genesis was written shortly after Moses had been given the Ten Commandments, and the one commandment that was so important that it had the death penalty attached, needed something like a parable to illustrate the principle? In the first account of the giving of the ten commandments, Moses did refer to that one account of the origins using the non-conforming chronology to illustrate the principle of six days of labor followed by a seventh day of rest. The six-day chronology, however, is not part of what was written in stone, contrary to what some young earth seminar speakers would lead you to believe. We know this because in a later account of the same event, Moses used the crossing of the Red Sea instead of the six days of creation to illustrate that same commandment.

After all this discussion, the greater cause of the differences between the Young Earth and Old Earth interpretations of the biblical origin accounts is not the facts found in reality, but the motivations behind the different factions taking their stands.

The first, and primary motivation, comes in the form of the many religious doctrines based on tradition, built upon traditions assumed above and beyond the traditional interpretation—I'll not go into that here.

The second, motivation, nearly as strong as the first is the erroneous basic assumption

that if the earth is old, creationists lose the battle at the starting line because billions and billions of years and makes the spontaneous generation theory of evolution a viable alternative. Their obvious solution then becomes, if the earth is young, evolution cannot be true. It is an erroneous assumption that only a young earth will make evolution a non-viable explanation.

The assumption that the old age of the earth gives sufficient time for evolution to produce life is a false assumption. Even those greatest thinkers dedicated to spontaneous generation rather than creation know that the oldest age of the earth cannot make enough time for evolution to be a viable explanation for the origin of life. According to the physical evidence, when life first appeared in abundance upon this planet, it was during an era relatively early in the development of life on this planet. Scientists call it the Cambrian Explosion. At that early stage, life was, according to them, almost as complex and diverse as it is today. Scientists recognize in the physical evidence that the increase in complexity and diversity over the vast eons of time since the first very complex life forms first appeared, compared to the complexity now indicates at most, a very slow increase in complexity over vast eons of time. The relatively little time from the first appearance of life to that vast complexity and diversity in the Cambrian Explosion is incompatible with the slow rate of increase in complexity and diversity since that Cambrian Explosion. Thus, scientists have concluded that, even with all the vast quantities of time given by the longest old earth age, there is still not enough time for the current theory of evolution to be a viable explanation for the origin of life.

Accordingly, those great thinkers, such as Stephen Hawking, are already, currently searching for a replacement for the theory of evolution. They are searching for another, different theory of spontaneous generation so they can explain the origin of life without the need for a creator.

Thus, the motivations for the Young Earth Creationists to reinterpret science in such a way that it agrees with the traditional religious concept of a young earth is a futile motivation. No matter which age is assigned to the earth, it does not change the fact that there is not enough time for the current theory of spontaneous generation to be a viable explanation for the origin of life.

One more note. Reinterpreting the bible to agree with the bible eliminates the need for all the pseudo-science theories put forth to explain the problems of this non-conforming, six -day chronology being accepted as the official chronology. Those unnecessary theories include such things as, The Gap Theory, the Day Age Theory or the Expanding Time Theory. The list of pseudo-science theories proposed is too long to include in this article.

And none of these alternate theories are necessary when the bible is re-interpreted to agree with the rest of the bible instead of re-interpreting the bible to agree with science, or re-interpreting science to agree with religion.

In conclusion:

When the bible is interpreted to agree with the rest of the bible rather than to agree

with religious tradition, suddenly it comes into accord with reality. This is particularly true with things considered to be in the realm of science. Thus, the credibility of the bible is bolstered, having anticipated the discovery of the same reality by modern science.

For too long, the bible has been interpreted to agree with what theologians think it should say, to agree with religious tradition. Those interpretations have worked their way into all English language translations. Therefore, sometimes it is required that the scholar go all the way back to the original language to realize that what the bible says actually does agree with the rest of the bible.

In the end, the bible, (particularly as close as you can get to what it says in the original language of the ancient scriptures,) is a reliable source of information.

Thus, we are confronted with an important question:

If we can trust what the bible says in the realm of things that can be checked against reality, what do we do with what it says about things that cannot be checked against reality, such as eternal life?

So, How Could Anyone Be an Old Earth Creationist?

That is a two part question.

Concerning the first part, the question of the age of the earth, the earth is old. Science agrees with the bible on that. So I believe the earth is old because of the consensus.

Then, concerning the second part, the question of creation versus spontaneous generation being a valid explanation of the origin of life, in a realm where neither religion nor science can offer up definitive proof, or even physical evidence in the realm of reality, I must depend upon the credibility of the proponents.

The credibility of the bible is enhanced by the fact that the bible published many facts concerning the first part of the question clearly before modern science discovered those same facts, indicating some sort of supernatural knowledge. And the fact that the early publication in the bible survived through an era in which both religion and the forerunner of modern science agreed in a belief that was contrary to that reality. It survived through an era when religion even fudged the translation of the bible to make it appear to agree with religion rather than reality, that survival in the face of hostile belief bolsters the credibility of the ancient scriptures of the bible.

On the other hand, there is the degradation of the credibility of the proponents of spontaneous generation by the fact that, after the failure of a long line of spontaneous generation theories, by their own admission, they are currently searching for a new, replacement theory that will hopefully, adequately, explain their point of view that creation is impossible and therefore must not be considered...that there has to be an alternate explanation

Due to that superiority of the credibility of the bible, and when I am forced to choose a side in the creation versus spontaneous generation debate, I select the source with the greater credibility when it adamantly states that the universe, and life within that

universe, came into existence at the intentional guidance of a pre-existing intelligent being, that it did not spontaneously generate itself.

If a choice must be made, the choice must be made based on faith in the credibility of the opposing proponents.

Thus, the double faceted title, Old Earth Creationist.

3) Reprint Rights.

Permission is granted to use any of the articles in this e-zine in your own e-zine or web site, as long as you include the following blurb: “Retired Scientist, Theologian and Author, Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist, publishes the FREE Science and the Bible E-zine, nearly every month. Visit <http://www.ScienceAndTheBible.net> for more articles like this.”

4) Sign up for this E-zine.

The Science and the Bible E-Zine is emailed to subscribers. If you have not subscribed, someone might have thought you would be interested. Please feel free to forward it to others. But please be careful to send it only to those who may be interested. Also, if you have not personally done so, please sign up for future issues. Right now there is not an automated way to sign up. So for now, to sign up, and get future issues, you must put your name and email on the list by sending an email to signup@anoldscientist.com. Be sure to put your name on the subject line.

This E-zine is free, you may take it and pass it on to others. However, this E-zine is copyright Max B. Frederick, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011. Therefore, with my permission I encourage you to email this E-zine to any friends of yours who might be interested in Science and the Bible. I only ask that you email the whole thing, not bits and pieces. Otherwise, you'll be getting desperate calls at midnight from your friends asking where they can get their own free subscription.

If you miss an issue, I plan to archive all back issues on my web site at:

<http://www.ScienceAndTheBible.net/ezine>

Max B. Frederick, Publisher, www.scienceandthebible.net © 2011