

# Science and the Bible E-Zine

The Science and the Bible E-Zine Volume 5, Number 7, July, 2012

Publisher: Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist

Motto: The Simple Truth

Mission: To reach the intellectually honest skeptic and critical thinker with an intellectually honest approach to the credibility of ancient scriptures, their credibility being attested to by their publication of information before its discovery, obscured for centuries, then independently discovered by modern science, verifying its reality and credibility.

Web Pages: <http://www.AnOldScientist.com>  
<http://www.ScienceAndTheBible.net>  
<http://www.EyewitnessToTheOrigins.com>

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](mailto: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) The "God Particle"
- 3) Truth vs. Knowledge of the Truth
- 4) Reprint Rights.
- 5) Sign up for this E-zine.

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

By Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist

To all of you who have sent feedback to me, Thank You.

### Correction:

I have been told by someone who should know that in last month's issue, I mischaracterize what Islam says about Christianity. The statement I made was concerning the attitude of Islam toward Christianity. My statement was to the effect that Islam teaches that Christians are not to be included in the eternal bliss of an afterlife. While Muslims reject many tenants of Christianity, that is not one of them. Therefore, in my archive version of last month's Ezine, I have made the following correction where I explained the incompatibility of the three competing religions.

*"Christianity makes the claim to be the only way to eternal life. If Christianity were valid, all the other religions claiming to provide a way would be invalid."*

*If Islam is supernaturally valid, as it is claimed, then Christians are not the only ones to be included in the eternal bliss of an afterlife.  
Atheism makes the fundamental assumption that there is no life after death. There cannot be both an after-life, and no life after death.  
All three are mutually incompatible. They cannot all be equally valid.”*

---

## 2) The “God Particle”

**By Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist**

*If a man die, shall he live [again]? all the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come. (KJV) If a man die, shall he live another day? Until my coming forth will I wait, till the coming of my changing. (MOST)  
Job, ca. <1500 BC, Job 14:14*

*...the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.  
Paul, ca. 35 to 57 AD, I Corinthians 15:52*

The Latest Chapter in the Debate of the Ages...

If a man die, shall he live again?

Is there really a God who can cause us to live again?

That is the question.

Is there really a God who can cause us to live again?

This month, on the fourth day of July, the scientific community announced the discovery of the Higgs Boson particle, referred to by the media as “The God Particle.”

Does the discovery of what the media calls the “God Particle” bring us closer to an answer?

I have been asked the question, “Do you believe that the accumulating evidence of the Higgs Boson has lessons for religious belief?”

From my point of view, the answer is yes, It does have a lesson for the religious community.

**But** will the religious community even recognize the lesson, let alone learn the lesson.

This is an on going debate between the forces that believe there is a capable God, and the forces that believe such a God does not exist. This debate has been going on for thousands of years, and will continue on into the future without resolution.

The current detail under scrutiny is the question as to whether the cause of all existence is an inanimate particle, or an intelligent living force.

Is it Creation? Or is it Spontaneous Generation?

From my point of view there are three major points related to this subject.

(1.) There are two camps that have taken opposing sides on the question of the beginnings of both the universe, and of life. One side believes all was created by some supreme intelligent being. That side is generally referred to as religion. The other side has taken the position that everything, the current universe, and life in it, arose spontaneously with no outside intelligent influence. This side is generally assumed to be the scientific community. That alignment correlation is not as solid as hype would have us believe. Some on both sides, religion or science, hold the view of the opposing camp.

**Both camps have claimed victory with the announcement of the discovery of the Higgs Boson, or The God Particle, whichever you wish to call it.**

(2.) Religious creation seminar speakers generally, although not universally, have adopted the misrepresentation that science is undependable because it is constantly changing its position while religion has been constant in what it teaches concerning the beginnings of all things. As I said, that is a misrepresentation, both parts of it. Beginning with the first translation from the original language of the ancient scriptures, religion has modified its interpretation to correspond to what was believed at the time to be true, to correspond to what was at the time, the religious politically correct view. In other words, even the first translation of the bible was influenced by the science of the time, as antique as that science was. In my writings I have documented where many of the misconceptions of what the bible says have their roots in human interpretation, not in what the ancient scriptures actually say. On the other hand, science, although it appears to outsiders to be constantly changing its mind, is following the scientific process of constantly testing its hypotheses and correcting them to correspond to observations of reality.

(3.) In my studies, both sides, both camps, are arguing their point from a lack of understanding of what the ancient scriptures of the bible actually says. The view of the religious camp is a traditional religious interpretation, generally based on a pre-conceived idea of what one single account found up front in the bible is trying to say. The other camp, generally viewed as the scientific community, has assumed that what religion says the bible says is in fact what it really says. If that assumption is true, the bible is out of accord with reality. Both sides are debating a false concept of what the bible really says. Neither side is generally aware of what should be obvious to the intellectually honest bible believer. There are in fact, three dozen major God given creation accounts, accounts of the beginning times and events. Thirty-four of these major accounts are found in the bible, and two are found in the creation itself. The two extra-biblical accounts are the cosmos, and the geologic column. All thirty-six agree in every detail as to the facts of chronology and detail. It is only the traditional interpretation of one of the biblical account that is contrary to all the accounts, including the one that has the troublesome interpretation. Both sides are debating a false interpretation of what the ancient scriptures of the bible actually say.

As an example of the problem, one major point of that debate is the concept of the

beginning of the universe from nothingness, be it either creation, or spontaneous generation, was it really from nothingness. That is not what the bible says, that is only the agreed upon misinterpretation of what the bible actually says. What the bible actually says is, it originated from darkness. Theologians have agreed upon the interpretation that darkness means nothingness. One view of modern science would interpret that as meaning a black hole. Both the bible and science agree that from that beginning it expanded into the universe as we see it today. The ancient scriptures of the bible refer to some event where the darkness could not hold back the light which could be interpreted to imply that there is a situation where darkness could do such a thing as not allow light to escape—that concept is also included in the scientific description of a black hole. What are we to think of the credibility of theologians who condemn the very thing the bible says as being a false invention of science?

The only real disagreement among intellectually honest scholars, those in the camp associated with religion, versus those in the camp associated with science, is the ultimate cause.

Religion generally goes with the claim of the ancient scriptures that an outside intelligent influence had something to do with it.

Science generally goes with the belief that there is no need for an intelligent outside influence.

Both sides claim victory at each turn of events.

Take for example, the year 1859. That is when Louis Pasteur disproved the spontaneous generation theory that was current at that time. That is the very same year when Darwin published the replacement theory of spontaneous generation.

That replacement theory is what is popularly known as evolution.

Currently, scientists are searching for a replacement theory for evolution. Renowned scientists declare that the current theory is inadequate to explain everything it is purported to explain. Steven Hawkins, possibly the world's most lauded scientist even stated a few years ago something to that effect. Currently His most acclaimed work, "The Grand Design" is purported to be his own theory to replace evolution as the latest theory of spontaneous generation.

**So, the lesson to be learned is:**

Those in the scientific community will not be persuaded to give up the search just because their latest pet theory is proven flawed.

Those in the religious community will find a way to interpret it as a victory.

The bottom line is, both sides are claiming victory and it is mostly just hype over disagreement in interpretation not disagreement in facts of reality.

The debate will go on unresolved into the future, giving people a quandary to resolve for themselves.

### 3) **Truth vs. Knowledge of the Truth** or **Search for the Simple Truth**

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)

“For [as] the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.”

*Yēhovah* , ca. 700-680 BC, Isaiah 55:9 (KJV)

What is Truth?

What is Knowledge of the truth?

There has been a lot of discussion about what is truth. We must not confuse the concept of “truth” with the concept of “knowledge of truth.”

The existence of truth does not depend upon our knowledge of the truth.

Many times it is difficult to actually know the truth. Sometimes it is impossible.

This has caused some questioning as to whether or not absolute truth really exists.

Truth exists. It is reality, without spin, whether or not it is observable, measurable, or even knowable.

For each detail, there is only one truth. That is why it is called *the* truth.

But telling the truth is another matter. An accounting that purports to be the truth depends upon not only the existence of truth, but also the existence of the ability to actually know the absolute, simple, truth.

Asking someone to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, may be based on an invalid assumption that *truth* and *knowledge of truth* are the same thing.

A basic principle of eye witness reports is that there may be as many conflicting versions of what the teller considers to be the truth as there are tellers.

Establishing truth is a difficult thing.

In response to my proposing to write another book, this time trying to get closer to the simple truth, as I refer to it, Clyde Spencer has been reminding me of some of the basic principles of truth—or possibly rather, basic principles of the knowledge of the truth—the difficulty of establishing a credible report of the truth.

So, if there is difficulty in establishing the truth, how can I say, “What the bible really says, concerning matters in the realm of science, is closer to the truth than what theologians interpret it to say?”

Listen to what Clyde has to say about truth, and knowledge of, or establishment of the truth: (Published with permission.)

**From:** Clyde Spencer  
**Sent:** Monday, July 02, 2012 1:31 PM  
**To:** Max Frederick

Max,

Something to think about before you get too far along on your new book:

Truth?

Truth, like beauty, is often in the eye of the beholder. Therefore, I would suggest that the test of truth, being that which conforms to reality, is only valid when there is general agreement among several observers. There is the human problem of what I call the *Rashomon* Syndrome; different people can have the same facts and observations, yet interpret them differently and come to different conclusions. Thus, even when there is abundant evidence, it may be very difficult to determine The Truth.

There is a general class problem for which it is particularly difficult to determine the 'Truth' as being that which conforms to reality. That is, neither the hypothesis nor its derived null-hypothesis can be validated or invalidated readily. This general class problem is the hypothesis for which any evidence, for or against, is scarce.

The classic example is the claim (hypothesis) that Big Foot or the Abominable Snowman exists. Theoretically, it should be possible to validate the hypothesis if it is true. The proof is to produce one of the animals, or at least incontrovertible evidence such as verified, detailed photographs or anatomical parts. Unfortunately, it seems that even if the claim is true, the creatures apparently are so rare and elusive that after decades no one has been able to come up with such conclusive proof. Most of the evidence supporting the claim is anecdotal and often third-person hearsay, such that it would not be admissible as evidence in a trial even.

The null-hypothesis is that these supposedly elusive creatures don't exist. Unfortunately, a universal negative is impossible to prove. If one claims that unicorns don't exist, there is no conclusive way to prove the statement is true. That is, a lack of evidence for something is not evidence against it. Thus, the lack of evidence proving that these creatures exist is not evidence that they don't exist. Now, if someone produced a unicorn or other similar suspect creature, then the null-hypotheses would be disproved, but it can't be proved.

So, what we are left with is two conflicting lines of thought: 1) something exists, but there is unacceptable evidence to prove the existence; 2) something doesn't exist, but the claim cannot be proven. We are unable to proceed to resolve the logical conflict. What makes this frustrating is that anyone is free to make all sorts of bizarre or ridiculous claims, and the claims reside in limbo, not being disprovable. And, if the claim involves events or objects that are rare, it may be impractical to prove the claim in any finite amount of time. And, to make matters worse, Chamberlain advocated creating multiple working hypotheses to attack a problem of explaining phenomena, thus compounding the number of null-hypotheses as well.

One approach, advocated by Carl Sagan, was to demand that extraordinary claims be accompanied by extraordinary evidence to support the claims. However, people tend to be subjective on what an extraordinary claim is, and what the nature of the supporting evidence should be like.

It seems that the way that we have come to manage at least some of these logical problems practically, is by using probability or the weight of evidence. Thus, a claim, that some presumably mythical creature — be it dragons, unicorns, the Lochness Monster, the Abominable Snowman, Big Foot, or extraterrestrial aliens — exists, is improbable if after an honest, concerted effort to establish proof, proof is lacking. Since it is impossible to prove the claim that the creature(s) do not exist, an intellectually honest person has to maintain some

reservations, albeit the probability is vanishingly small the longer the search goes on.

The claim that the bible was written by God, or at least divinely inspired, is a similar problem to the above. Here we have an extensive body of writing, some of which is at least loosely supported by ancient historians and modern archaeologists. However, the hypothesis that it is a collection of writings by mere mortals, which reflects legends and embellished historical events, is a tenable hypothesis. It is also what Occam's Razor would suggest is the most probable explanation. The approach of trying to prove the divine origin of the bible is fraught with difficulties, not the least of which are translation inaccuracies and selective use of evidence. The claim that the bible contains knowledge that was unknown to the ancients is weak. What is in the bible that passes for scientific knowledge is of the observational type and not of the experimental type. All of what can be presented is easily explained by assuming that people who lived closer to Nature than today's people were keen observers and they stated the obvious. However, the ancient Greeks realized that Earth was round and even calculated its diameter accurately. Is there anything of similar quantitative nature in the Bible? Much of that knowledge was lost during the Dark Ages, and rediscovered after the Enlightenment and invention of the Scientific Method. (Evidence for very ancient batteries and electroplating cells has been found.) What is missing from the bible is knowledge that can only be obtained through technology and mathematics, both relatively modern inventions. That is, microscopes and telescopes were unavailable to the ancients who were responsible for the earliest writings. Thus, there are no references to things that can only be learned from microscopy or instrumental astronomy. Further, there are no hints about mathematical relationships that portend profound fundamental relationships at the atomic level. In actuality, there is little if anything in the bible about physics, chemistry, and biology. Thus, the subtleties and nuances of modern science have to be ignored in order to make the claim that the bible has scientific knowledge that only God could have known. What is in the bible seems to be limited to observations of things like marine fossils on mountain tops, yielding the claim that "The mountains go up, and the valleys go down."

To explore the selective use of evidence, commonly known as "cherry picking," one only needs to examine the things in the bible that are clearly at odds with what science believes to be true. That is to say, one cannot ignore the 'science' in the bible that is wrong; the errors have to be accounted for. One can easily dismiss Aristotle's claim about spontaneous generation of life as being the mistake of a mere mortal. It is difficult to reconcile errors in a document inspired by a Perfect Being, incapable of making mistakes.

One significant problem is the Noachian Flood; there is absolutely no evidence that there was a worldwide flood during the Anthropocene Era. The claim that two of everything on Earth could be contained in a vessel of the given dimensions is absurd. The Noachian story doesn't explain how Noah could have obtained life forms from the New World. And still, there is no evidence of a massive extinction of any life forms in recent times (Those that didn't make it to The Ark.). Resorting to divine intervention to provide the exotic life forms (and redistributing them after the flood) weakens the case for the bible and science being compatible. Of course, some interpretations of the bible suggest that evolution doesn't exist, which is one of the greatest incompatibilities between the bible and science. Related to that problem is the appearance the bible gives that humans are a relatively recent phenomena; whereas, science believes that modern humans have been around for about 50,000 years, and have closely related ancestors that go back a few million years. The Noachian explanation for the rainbow is the antithesis of science. It violates James Hutton's principal that "The present is the key to the past." It suggests that some of the basic laws of physics changed dramatically in the last few thousand years. In short, there are many things about science that the bible got wrong! Surely a perfect God wouldn't allow that. If the bible is "The word of God," then the inaccuracies and contradictions create philosophical and theological problems. It is well known that "To err is human;" however, to always be right is to be divine.

Scientists don't claim to know everything about everything; indeed, it is acknowledged that there is much to learn and discover. If the bible contains science only God could have known thousands of years ago, then it reasonably should contain science

even modern people don't yet know, even if cloaked by misunderstanding. To properly evaluate the veracity of the 'science' in the bible, one has to take the viewpoint of how to accept or reject contradictory claims without the benefit of modern knowledge. The reason for this is, if there is scientific knowledge in the bible about things science has not yet discovered, we would not know whether it was true or not. There have to be some guidelines about how to know if something is true, and the test of comparing to reality fails for things not yet discovered. Clearly, various stories about creation in the bible are at odds with the story in Genesis, which itself is at odds with modern science. How can one have trust in the validity of any of the conflicting claims? Would one trust the pronouncements of an acquaintance who was known to lie frequently?

So, in conclusion, some of the most important philosophical and religious questions confronting Man seem to be outside the realm of logical proof. The claims cannot be proven because the test of comparison to reality fails simply because one cannot produce a snippet of reality to compare against. The claims cannot be disproven because universal negatives cannot be proven. Lastly, the so-called 'evidence' about science in the bible is, if not contradictory, at least unreliable. And, the Scientific Method abhors "cherry picking."

Clyde

Again, I say, "What the bible really says, concerning matters in the realm of science, is closer to the truth than what theologians interpret it to say?"

That statement is in the context of there being three perceived conflicting points of view, Reality as observed by science, Reality as theologians interpret the bible to say, and Reality as actually recorded in the bible. Interpretation is the outlier.

You can see in Clyde's input, the reiteration of several points where there is disagreement between what the bible really says and what theologians have interpreted it to say, sometimes to the point of theologians fudging the translation, bending it to the point of view of their interpretation. Clyde has a point, How can you trust someone who...?

So, the question comes to the credibility of the report of things concerning science, and how that credibility can be established, particularly when much is credited to the ancient scripture when it should be credited to the interpretation of theologians who, at the time of translation, did not know the reality of much of what is in the report.

Note that some of the things Clyde points out to be in conflict, are, in fact, inventions of theologians as to what the bible says, not what you find when you go back to the oldest known versions of the ancient scriptures in the original language.

Again I say, "When it comes to the debate between religion and science, the ancient scriptures of the bible generally come down on the side of reality as recently discovered by modern science." It reminds me of the book in my library, "Seven deadly Blows to Religious Beliefs," where seven religious beliefs are destroyed by reality and the author then draws the conclusion that therefore the bible is a fraud. In reality, it is not the ancient scriptures of the bible that is refuted, but the religious beliefs of theologians in their traditional interpretations.

The general assumption that God would make science in the bible more clearly obvious, that God wanted everyone to be convinced, is not necessarily a valid assumption.

I have been taught by theologians all my life that God intentionally makes it less than obvious so that the decision to believe He exists is to be a difficult decision.

But that seems like one is trying to make excuses for what is commonly accepted as the character of God. So, a more careful definition of the character of God is in order.

In this case, the simple truth is quite elusive. Where is the evidence? Is the evidence in the fact that the bible is actually written in such a way that it makes it difficult to make the decision, even from an intellectually honest approach?

In the question of the authorship fitting into either of two models, inspired by God, or fraud by humans, those two models may be ill defined. They should be very carefully defined before defense or rebuttal of either option is attempted.

The more I know, the more I know that I do not know.

But, on the other hand, there is much that I know now that I did not know before I started. It is just that the unknowns are growing faster than the discoveries of the known. So, one must be careful to differentiate between what is known, what is fact, what is reality, and all the other stuff like speculation, opinion, logical extension, etc.

It seems that the most prevalent problem in every seminar presentation I have ever attended is logical extension, both on what the presenter actually knows to be fact, and what the presenter thinks he knows about the opposite point of view.

But, most of the time they get by with it because they are preaching to the choir—trying to persuade someone who is already persuaded.

Most of the presentations I have attended are an attempt to win an argument rather than to discover knowledge of the truth.

### **Search for the Simple Truth**

History of how I got to where I am, trying to find out what the bible really says on the subject of the origins, is very long and involves much study. The scientific method is as applicable to discovery of what the bible really says as it to any other study. But that is another long story for another article.

None of the traditional interpretations of what the bible says concerning things that are in the realm of science consider all of what the bible really has to say on the subject.

Most of them start with what theologians have surmised over the centuries and try to prove that interpretation rather than going to the bible to see what it really says.

Many others employ various techniques of logically extending what they believe it says into something they can either prove or disprove, not realizing their original premise is not what the bible really says.

What it really says surprises many theologians and they are reluctant to believe they have been wrong for centuries.

Their wrong interpretation is not so simple, nor is it the truth. It isn't even what the bible says.

So how can we get down to the simple truth? Or rather, How can we get closer to knowledge of the simple truth?

Your comments are solicited and will not be published without your specific permission. Email to [SimpleTruth@AnOldScientist.com](mailto:SimpleTruth@AnOldScientist.com).

---

---

#### **4) 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."

---

---

#### **5) 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](mailto: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, 2012. 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.

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](http://www.ScienceAndTheBible.net) © 2012