

Science and the Bible E-Zine

The Science and the Bible E-Zine Volume 2, Number 5

Publisher: Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist
Motto: The Simple Truth
Date: May 31, 2009
Issue: Volume 2, Number 5
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) Welcome to The Science and the Bible E-Zine.
 - 2) Question of the Month.
 - 3) The Debate of the Ages: Where Did We come From?
 - 4) The Debate of the Ages: A Detour?
 - 5) Steal This E-zine.
 - 6) Reprint Rights.
 - 7) Sign up for the E-zine.
-

What's in Next or Coming Issues:

Big Bang, Product of God or Imagination of Science? Does the bible contradict scientific fact? Is it possible that is in accord with scientific fact? Is it possible that science just has a different interpretation of the same facts? Read articles as they become available. www.scienceandthebible.net/articles/index.htm.

1) Welcome to The Science and the Bible 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. (Go to the end of this issue for directions.)

2) Question of the Month.

The question of the month is still the same as the question from last month:

Does the bible mention the Big Bang in the context of the origin of the universe?
If so, does the bible indicate it is of God, or of the Devil?

I see billboards along the freeway that tend to give me the idea that some people believe that either you believe in the bible or you believe in the Big Bang, but not both.

What do you think, and what do you think other people believe or have been taught?
What is the general public being taught in your circle of friends or region of the country?

I am putting off publishing details on this subject until I get some response of where the readers of this Ezine are coming from.

Give me your ideas and suggestions at
<http://www.eyewitnesstheorigins.blogspot.com/>

3) The Debate of the Ages: Where Did We Come From?

The Debate of the Ages:

Where Did We Come From?

by

Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist

The debate of the ages is about what is considered to be fact by one worldview contradicting what is considered to be fact as believed by another worldview. Now, both views cannot be fact. At least one must be false. Contradicting facts cannot exist simultaneously.

Recently, a debate has been raging that has gone on for many years.

It has taken on many forms.

More recently that debate has been between characterized as between science and religion.

Most recently it has been between intelligent design and creation.

But in reality, it has existed for ages between two unchanging, opposing worldviews.

Both opposing worldviews are religiously held by their proponents.

From ancient times, one worldview has put its confidence in a creator.

All the while, the opposing worldview has put its confidence in the creation.

But the opposing worldview does not call it the "creation." They use some other word like "nature." The possibility of the existence of any such thing as a creator is

not even acknowledged.

That opposing worldview religiously holds to the proposition that everything either existed forever, or spontaneously generated itself.

But first maybe I should explain what I mean by recently. In the context of this debate, recently does not mean a few days ago, or even a few weeks ago. It does not even mean a few years ago. It means just a few hundreds of years in the past. As the title implies, this debate has been going on for thousands of years.

In the context of this debate, a few decades, fifteen to be precise, is quite recent. For only three-quarters of two hundred years, the theory of evolution has dominated one side of the debate. In the context of time, that is very recent. When I was born, Darwin's theory of evolution had been published less than eighty years earlier. Now, it has been around only a little over twice my lifetime. And my lifetime is just a flash in the pan of the span of history.

This year, 2009, is only the 150th anniversary of that publication in 1859. That was the same year that Oregon became a state. Recently means most of the states of the United States are older than Darwin's publication of that controversial theory.

Even now, that current theory of spontaneous generation is in the throws of being replaced by the very proponents of that side of the debate.

No, the debate is not about evolution. The current theory of evolution will be replaced by another explanation of how life originally began and how all nature spontaneously generated itself. That side of the debate will not abandon that core belief.

So, again recently, a debate has been raging that has gone on for a long time. That debate has always been between the same two worldviews.

The one worldview has recently been erroneously defined to be exclusively in the realm of religion.

The other has recently been erroneously defined to be exclusively in the realm of science.

In reality, the debate is actually concerning the realm of fact.

One worldview assumes it is fact that all life on earth arose spontaneously. It assumes it is fact that there is no such thing as an intelligent designer, a creator so to speak. The other worldview assumes it is a fact that all that exists, particularly all life on earth, is the result of the creative efforts of an intelligent, pre-existing creator.

Which is it? Did we spontaneously arise from nothingness? Or are we the product of an intelligent creator?

Our origin is in fact, a fact. It did not happen both ways.

But just what is that factual beginning?

Some have tried to redefine the debate to be about the origin of the nothingness, or pre-existing intelligence, from which we came. But, in the rage of the debate, that is just a last ditch effort of one side or the other when they feel they are losing the

debate.

The real interest in the debate is whether or not there exists a creator to which we are accountable. One worldview says no, we are not accountable to anything or anyone, other than ourselves. The other maintains that we are accountable to some higher power.

There are many facets to the debate.

Just one facet is the shortness of time in which the Darwinian theory of evolution has dominated the debate. That facet is quite striking, considering it has been around only about five percent of the time since the debate was first recorded in world history. And even more striking in the light of the fact that the same Darwinian theory is aging and about to be replaced by another more encompassing theory just as its predecessor was proven wrong and replaced in that same year that Darwin fortuitously had his replacement theory ready for publication. Is it just happenstance that the year Darwin first published the theory of evolution is the same year that a young scientist, Louis Pasteur won the prize from the French Academy of Science in the contest to prove the then prevailing theory of spontaneous generation to be false?

But, that is enough of recent history.

Further back in time, about two thousand years ago, the apostle Paul defined the two worldviews to be those who chose to worship the creator versus those who chose to worship the creation. In his famous “depraved mind” discourse, he said it is obvious from the creation that there is a creator, and those who ignorantly chose to ignore that obviousness, are given over by God to believe the unprovable theory that there is no God.

You can see how biased Paul was. You can see where he was coming from.

Of course, he also predicted the raging of that debate would continue even to this day.

How could he have been so right? That debate is not about to go away.

Neither side will give in. Even as the current aging theory of spontaneous generation is aging and failing, just as its predecessor, another theory of spontaneous generation is being formulated to rise and take its place.

While still on the topic of the recentness versus the ancientness of the debate, about a thousand years before Paul, about three thousand years ago, the words of King David recorded the raging of the debate over the origins of humans:

^{3a} *Know ye that the LORD*
^{3b} *he [is] God:*
^{3c} *[it is] he [that] hath made us,*
^{3d} *and not we ourselves;*
^{3e} *[we are] his people,*
^{3f} *and the sheep of his pasture.*(KJV)

David, c. 1015 BC, Creation Account: *God Made His People,*
The Bible: Psalms 100:3

The debate is not about evolution versus creation. Nor is it about science vs religion.

You can see why it might be perceived to be science versus religion. The strongly held worldview on each side drives the holder of that worldview religiously into the camp in which he is most comfortable.

Currently there are two camps. They are loosely defined to be science and religion. The science camp is the current gathering ground for the anti-creator group. The camp of the creator group is currently perceived to be relegated to the realm of religion. It hasn't always been that way. Prior to the great separation of science and religion at the time of Galileo, less than four hundred years ago, science and religion were together in the same camp occupied by the creationists. The anti-creationists were gathered in the camp of philosophy.

But there are enemies in both camps. As a scientist, yet a holder of the worldview that there is an intelligent creator, I feel like I should consider myself a spy in the camp of the enemy. I am spying out a great wealth of concealed evidence that there is great validity to the theory that there really is an intelligent designer who, in fact was instrumental in the origin of all that exists.

The debate of the ages is about what is considered to be fact by one worldview contradicting what is considered to be fact as held by the other worldview. Now, both views cannot be fact. At least one must be false. Contradicting facts cannot exist simultaneously.

The debate of the Ages is the title of a new book I am writing. If you have any ideas you would like to see discussed in that book, please post them in the blog that you can find on my web site, www.ScienceAndTheBible.net. All ideas will be appreciated.

4) The Debate of the Ages: A Detour?

The Debate of the Ages:

A Detour?

by

Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist

Really, there are only two sides to the debate.

There is the side that believes the theory that everything arose spontaneously by natural processes.

The other side believes the theory that there was (or is) a creator.

However, for at least two thousand years it looks like the creator side of the debate has been on a side road. It has been on a detour, an adventure into non-reality. A third theory of how it all began has taken the drivers seat.

For about two thousand years, that third theory has had little effect on the eternal destination of anyone. But for the past few decades, that third theory has destroyed the faith of many thousands who would otherwise be creationists. They are the ones

who cannot overlook the unreality taught by the hijacker of the creator worldview.

Yes, what the bible really teaches has been hijacked for over two thousand years.

But that is coming to the end with the discovery of what the bible really teaches.

We know that third theory was prevalent at the time the New Testament was written because one whole chapter is dedicated to the refutation of that theory. That chapter comes after two other chapters refuting other heresies of that time. That refutation is the third chapter of II Peter.

That third theory, that detour, has become the traditional interpretation of creation based on only one of many accounts of creation found in the bible. That theory has become known among secular intellectual scholars as the Judeo-Christian Creation Myth. That theory has become the non-realistic view that is popular among many religious activists today.

So, both sides of the debate have something in common. The spontaneous generation side of the debate has been hi-jacked by the theory of evolution. The creation side of the debate has been hi-jacked by the Judeo-Christian Creation Myth. Neither hijacking will last. Both will be forced into a greater accord with reality.

When we read all the creation accounts of the bible, we realize that Peters refutation, along with the coordinated presentation of all the creation accounts of the bible, when combined, present a far more realistic account of creation than the traditional interpretation that has strayed from what the bible really teaches.

Why have all the other accounts of creation found in the bible been ignored through the ages, unrecognized by theologians as creation accounts?

It is simply because they do not mention anything about the six days that are the central part of the traditional interpretation.

Yet, within all the accounts, including that one with the six day framework overlain on the underlying chronology, there is presented a totally different schedule of creation. All of the biblical creation accounts combined present a chronology that actually predicts the schedule of the origins that modern science has recently (within the past three to four hundred years) discovered.

Yes, the bible pre-published the schedule of creation events before modern science discovered it. And it has lain obvious, but unrecognized for over two thousand years.

The creation side of the debate has taken a two-thousand year detour.

And now, it is just coming back to the original two sides: Those who claim no responsibility to a creator, and those who do. The facts of science are not in dispute, only the interpretation.

Currently, both sides are desperately hanging on to their side of the debate.

The two articles in this Issue of The Science and the Bible E-zine only scratch the surface of the debate. That debate is more entrenched into the society of today than most people ever imagine. More to come in future articles. Please add your

comments. Please post them in the blog that you can find on my web site, Give me your ideas and suggestions at <http://www.eyewitnesstotheorigins.blogspot.com/>. All ideas will be appreciated.

5) Steal This E-zine.

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. 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. Here is the place to subscribe:

<http://www.ScienceAndTheBible.net>

6) 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, every month. Visit <http://www.ScienceAndTheBible.net> for more articles like this. Also download your free Special Report on “Thirty-four Creation Accounts Found in the Bible.”

7) Sign up for the E-zine.

In the future you should be on this list only if you signed up for it. As soon as I get it automated, there will be a place to sign up for the e-zine on my web site at

<http://www.ScienceAndTheBible.net>

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.

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

© 2009, Max B. Frederick, an Old Scientist, Publisher, Science and the Bible E-Zine
