

Science and the Bible E-Zine

The Science and the Bible E-Zine Volume 5, Number 8, August, 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. 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) Faith, Evidence, and the Very Nature of God
 - 3) Reprint Rights.
 - 4) Sign up for this E-zine.
-

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

By Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist

Can an intellectually honest person believe what the bible says?

This month the emphasis is on Reality versus Religion.

There are many creation seminar speakers out there speaking on the bible versus science. Many are obviously trying to convince people that reality is wrong and their religion is right, because the bible says so.

Little do they know that when all creation accounts of the bible are combined, it becomes obvious that the ancient scriptures of the bible are more aligned in accord with reality as discovered by modern science than with religion.

It seems that their source, the bible, has turned against them and has gone over to the side of the opponent. In the debate between Reality and Religion, the ancient scriptures of the bible sides with reality and against religion.

We certainly know that many of the claims of creation seminar speakers are from the unbridled imagination of religious thinking, not from what the ancient scripture actually says. The teaching that all the stratification of all the geologic column is the result of a recent world wide flood is consistent with neither reality nor the creation accounts of the bible. The chronology and details of beginning times found in the bible are consistent with reality. It is the addition of religious imagination that causes typical creation seminar teachings to be inconsistent with the bible and disconnected with reality. When you look at what the ancient scripture actually records versus what the imaginative interpretive translations present, you see evidence that it was originally much more in accord with reality. As Clyde pointed out in last month's E-zine, many of the details of the Noachian flood as assumed by theologians are not in accord with reality. If one dares to check, neither are they in strict accord with the actual dictates of the record in the ancient scriptures. Those assumptions may be in accord with the imaginative religious interpretations, but certainly are not dictated by what is within allowable translation of the original record. For example, a 10,000 year flood, (extrapolated from the concept of a 100 year flood,) possibly caused by some tectonic upheaval, would not leave any more evidence of its occurrence than is actually common in the environment or than is described in the biblical account. The bible does not attribute the geologic column evidence to the Noachian flood, certainly not the catastrophic evidence claimed by many creation seminar speakers. Yet, as we have recently observed, it would be more than sufficient to float an unguided, free-floating dock from Japan to Oregon in a similar span of time. Could the ark of Noah have come from a similarly distant place, in a similar span of time, say from North America, about the time of the North America Large Animal Extinction event that is described by modern science? Could the Garden of Eden been in North America in the ancient past? You realize, the passage translated "in the east" in describing the existence of the Garden of Eden is from an expression that actually says "Beyond the Rising Sun." That expression describes a far direction in either space or time. In space the direction is east. For time the direction is backward. "Beyond the Rising Sun" may be translated with equal validity, "in the ancient past" as well as, "in the east." It appears the only reason it was translated in the space sense rather than time sense is because the translators "knew" there was no such thing as an "ancient past."

But then, I am getting ahead of myself.

The deeper I dig into what the ancient scriptures actually say, the more I find that those ancient scriptures of the bible, and many discoveries by modern science, stand together on the side of reality, where religion stands alone by itself.

When the bible touches on what is considered to be in the realm of science, it can be tested against reality.

Obviously, upon reading the parts of the bible that wonder into that realm we find something is not quite right. So, if the bible is to be believed, how do we resolve these disconnects with reality?

In the examples above, the problem is not with what the ancient scriptures actually say. The problem is with the religious spin that is reflected in the translations of today. It seems impossible for a translation of the ancient scriptures to not be slanted

toward some religious point of view. The problem is, science has been outside the area of expertise of theologians. They didn't understand what it said, so their spin gravitated toward something religious.

It has been said that the Devil's most effective tool is Religion.

After reading this you might see some credibility in that saying.

How else could religion get it so wrong when the ancient scripture they are looking at gets it so right?

Or you might ask, Is it possible that there is something we are overlooking?

The question remains.

Can an intellectually honest person believe what the bible says?

More specifically, can an intellectually honest person say that the ancient scriptures of the bible, when they touch on subjects that are considered to be in the realm of science, the realm of testable reality, can it be honestly said that the accord with reality actually bolsters the credibility of the bible?

Or does the lack of accord with reality destroy credibility?

Does the ancient scripture have enough credibility in what can be scientifically tested that an intellectually honest person might believe what it says when it goes beyond what can be tested?

More to the point, can an intellectually honest person believe the claim of the bible that there is life after death? Can an intellectually honest person believe the claim of the bible that there actually is an extra-terrestrial intelligent life form (Remember SETI?) and that that life form can be our future destiny? (I Corinthians 15:40)

Without that claim being true, the bible is for naught.

As Paul said,

"If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable."

1 Corinthians 15:19 (KJV)

There are many topics that need to be considered when the question is raised about the credibility of the bible in the realm of scientifically testable reality.

Two topics come to mind.

One topic is the very nature of the God of the bible versus the God of religion..

Another topic is the question of ambiguity or uncertainty.

Concerning the nature of God, there are many questions. Could a perfect God allow imperfect humans to tamper with His holy writing? Could a perfect God allow what we see as imperfections in His holy writing? Isn't that outside the nature of God as generally assumed by religion? If the nature of God is perfect in the way that religion supposes, shouldn't it be impossible for such a God to produce what appears to be a flawed bible?

Multiple possible explanations have been proposed. The least of which is that maybe

God is simply some imaginary super deity with a nature that is the product of human imagination. Such a nature could not produce such a bible as we observe it, thereby proving the bible is the fraud of religion.

But what if God does exist, but with a nature that is different than religion generally assumes, a nature different than what we typically think of as God? Could such a God really exist within the nature of God as actually recorded in the ancient writings of the bible, yet overlooked in favor of a nature imagined by religion?

In either case, the nature of God is at question.

Two possibilities are considered. The nature of God is either what the bible indicates that nature to be, different than we imagine, and capable of guiding the production of a bible containing ambiguity, or the nature of God is as religion supposes it to be and this perfection as we define it, makes God incapable of producing a bible that we judge to be imperfect, thus proving the bible is a fraud of religion.

Concerning the topic of ambiguity or uncertainty, more questions are raised.

Is uncertainty, or ambiguity an intentional component of the ancient scriptures of the bible—or at least of the translations of the bible that we have today?

If so, is that uncertainty the product of human imagination in the origination of the ancient scriptures?

Or, did it creep into translations by the later processes of religious interpretation?

The point is, Could it be that it is within the nature of God to have religion mess up in that area outside their area of expertise? Could it be for the purpose of proving to our generation of intellectually honest doubters that humans could not have produced a book that records what the bible actually does record?— Read on.

2) Faith, Evidence, and the Very Nature of God

By **Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist**

“But without faith [it is] impossible to please [him]: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and [that] he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.”

Hebrews 11:6 (KJV)

Caution: This article is not authoritative. It is simply an exercise in exploratory thinking. Do not assume anything in this article is anything more than for the purpose of getting you to thinking outside the box—an exercise in intellectual honesty.

Could it be that our religious concept of the very nature of God is somewhat flawed?

Do we really know what God really wants? What must we believe to please God?

The above verse lays it out quite clearly. This is what we must believe:

1. That God exists.

2. That God is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.

To be a member of some religion or some denomination, we might be required to believe their particular creed or religious interpretation about what one must believe to be saved. Maybe it is just other ways of saying the same thing, but I find most explanations of what you must believe are simply confusing religious words. You know, you gotta believe you are a sinner and need saving...whatever they mean by "believe," "sinner," or "saved." I've heard of a lot of other things that one must believe to be saved, or to be a member of their church; be they basic doctrines or frivolous doctrines, Pre-Trib or Post Trib, Young Earth or Old Earth... there is no end to humans adding frivolous stuff to what God actually requires. All are beyond the basic minimum requirement stated in the above reference.

All that aside, the basic required belief is this: God exists, and He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.

But, how are we to know enough to believe this?

Why doesn't God just make it plain so everyone will believe and have eternal life?

Wouldn't that please God? Wouldn't you think so if His nature is as some imagine it to be?

Wait, isn't there a third requirement mentioned in that verse? Doesn't it say that without our believing it by "faith" it is impossible to please God?

How then, are we to know enough to actually believe what we must believe?

If God really exists, why doesn't He simply prove it so no one can deny it?

But isn't faith believing something that isn't certain or obvious?

If God is the all powerful, perfect God according to our view of His nature, how could it be within His nature to not make it obvious to everyone?

Could it really be within His nature to actually make it uncertain, ambiguous, even unobvious?

Could it be that our religious concept of the very nature of God is somewhat flawed?

We are plagued with ever present logical attempts to define the very nature of God. Surely a perfect God wouldn't allow... (fill in the blank.) If the bible really is "The word of God," then... (fill in the blank.). If God is a "Perfect Being," then God is incapable of making mistakes (according to our definition of mistakes.) It is well known that "To err is human;" however, to always be right is to be divine.

So, if our definitions of the very nature of God are valid, what is this "faith" requirement? Why doesn't He simply remove all uncertainty?

Faith, no matter how you define it—and it has been the object of endless attempts to be defined—faith requires an element of uncertainty. For it to be faith, there must be plenty of evidence, but still the evidence must be insufficient to prove the case. Otherwise it is not faith, but certainty. For faith to be faith requires uncertainty.

And as the above verse says, without whatever this "faith" thing is, without whatever

it is that dictates uncertainty, it is impossible to please God.

Therefore, for the proof to be overwhelming would displease God.

To eliminate the alternate choice of not believing would displease God.

But, that goes against what many people believe is the very nature of God.

Many would argue that if God were real, If there were any such thing as an all powerful, omnipresent, etc., etc..., God, He would prove that He exists without question.

But that flies in the face of that requirement for faith. The bible is consistent.

What we must believe is that God exists and that He is a rewarder of them that...

And, the qualifier to please God is that it must be by faith, not by proof.

Without that belief, and that belief being the result of just almost enough evidence so that there remains room for uncertainty, one cannot please God.

It appears, from examples scattered throughout the bible, that to ask for greater proof, to test (tempt KJV) God, to ask for a "sign," is displeasing to God.

[Mat 16:4](#), [Mar 8:11](#), [Luk 11:16](#), [Luk 11:29](#), [Deu 6:16](#), [Mat 4:7](#), [Mat 22:18](#), etc...

When we diligently study the parts of the bible that have to do with verifiable reality, we find the bible is consistent with this aspect of the nature of God.

We can be sure, the bible, as we know it excels in making "faith" required to either believe it, or even to disbelieve it. It requires us to go beyond certainty to either believe, or to reject it.

To be consistent—a requirement of intellectual honesty—we must recognize that a sufficient amount of evidence, and no more, appears to be the amount laid out in the ancient scriptures where it touches on the science related topic of the beginnings of existence.

In the 34 major biblical accounts of creation, there is sufficient evidence to indicate their credibility concerning the details of fact and chronological order of events. This becomes obvious when all accounts are combined. This evidence of credibility includes the recording of facts and chronology that could not have been observed with certainty by humans and which were beyond human acceptance as reality. The actually recorded details were so beyond human acceptance that they had to be explained away by erroneous interpretations to be in accord with what was politically correct before the advent of modern science. Yet, within the past few years, modern science has verified what is actually recorded in those ancient accounts, and invalidated the erroneous politically correct interpretations.

Without being overwhelming in its proof, there appears to be sufficient evidence in the biblical creation accounts to indicate their credibility.

However, through the centuries (possibly to prevent the evidence from becoming overwhelming,) that evidence has been allowed to be obscured by the traditional interpretations by religion.

And that flies in the face of the popular religious concept of the nature of God.

As the argument goes, Why would God (as we perceive God) stoop to such a thing as letting humans obscure his glory? That is a good question.

Perhaps it is because what it takes to please God is for humans to have to make the decision to “*believe that he is, and [that] he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him*” with insufficient evidence for the decision to be dictated without the possibly to decide not to “believe...”

Is it a question of the true nature of God?

We might think we have defined God. But could that thinking just possibly be tainted with religious thinking rather than reality?

Do we really know what the bible really says about the true nature of God?

The point is this. Could it be that it is within the nature of God to have religion mess up in that area outside their area of expertise? Could it be for the purpose of proving to our generation of intellectually honest doubters that humans could not have produced a book that records what the bible actually does record?

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, and 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 © 2012