

# Science and the Bible E-Zine

The Science and the Bible E-Zine Volume 4, Number 5

---

Publisher: Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist  
Motto: The Simple Truth  
Date: May 31, 2011  
Issue: Volume 4, 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](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) Religion versus Reality & the Bible
  - 3) Reprint Rights.
  - 4) Sign up for this E-zine.
- 

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

By Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist

In the last two issues of this e-magazine we have seen where the heart of what the ancient scriptures say about things related to science has been distorted by religious tradition to the point that much of it is interpreted to be out of accord with reality.

It has been said, "Religion is the most effective tool of the Devil."

Religion, if you mean by *religion*, doggedly sticking to a pre-conceived idea instead of looking at what the bible really says, when you mean by *religion*, believing something you know is not true... you are seeing the basis of the rampant division among factions of the Christian Religion.

Then there is a great disconnect between the ancient scriptures of the bible and religion. The bible..., when have to decide between religion and reality, the bible always comes down on the side of reality. When you find out what the bible really says about anything that can be checked against reality, the bible exposes the contrary religious interpretations to be irrational imaginations of the religious human mind.

There are many examples where incorrect assumptions are made as to what is reality.

We have seen that no view of the age of the earth is synonymous with evolution. The incorrect assumption that an old earth view is equivalent to believing in evolution is one of those tools of the Devil. The bible clearly states it was all created by God, and by studying in detail, all the biblical origin accounts, it is found that a chronology is presented that is contrary to the popular religious interpretation of the one and only one of the many biblical origin accounts that says anything about six days.

With that said, there are areas of biblical teaching that cannot be tested against reality, such as the teaching concerning eternal life after this earthly life. Thus, concerning such things, the honest intellectual must decide to believe or disbelieve based on the credibility of what the bible says concerning that which can be tested.

This month we are getting a glimpse of examples where the interpretation has changed over the years from what was considered reality at an earlier time, to realization that the ancient scriptures really is in accord with reality as discovered by modern science. The problem is not that one can interpret the bible any way he wants, rather, earlier interpretations based on erroneous beliefs required the interpretation to be fudged to agree with what theologians thought was true to avoid making their God look bad, then ending up with egg on their faces.

---

## 2) Religion versus Reality & the Bible.

# Religion versus Reality & the Bible

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)*

*“I know, what I know, what I know.”*

Charlotte Wheeler, Arnold, California, ca. 1979

The greatest stumbling block to believing the bible is true is the obvious disconnect with reality of what theologians attribute to the bible.

Sometimes the bible could shed a lot of light on the religious bible commentaries.

Truth, and knowledge of the truth, should trump religious tradition in the establishment of doctrine.

In reality, it has been the other way around. Religious tradition has consistently trumped truth in establishing religious doctrine.

That brings us to the difference between religious doctrine, and true doctrine. In defining doctrine to be a summary statement of complex concepts of reality, religious doctrine—as opposed to true doctrine—is sometimes based more on religious tradition than on the truth about reality. By religion I mean zealous, tenacious clinging to belief, independent of whether or not it is supported by fact.

It has been said that religion is one of the devil's most effective tools. And in this case, a lot of truth is found in that statement.

For Example, before Galileo insisted otherwise, theologians taught that the bible absolutely states that the planet earth is the center of the universe—that the bible says all the universe rotates around the earth.

Theologians went to great lengths to impose upon Galileo their most dreaded condemnation for daring to teach against the doctrines of what religion said the bible said.

But is their view what the bible actually teaches? Does the bible really teach what the theologians said it did—that the planet earth is the center of the universe?

The ancient scripture has not changed. The words are still the same.

The same church that condemned Galileo to the fires of Hell, eventually had to apologize to Galileo—and they did so formally. On October 31, 1992 the Catholic Church issued an apology and formal vindication of Galileo—over three hundred-fifty years after he was convicted of heresy on June 22, 1633.

The ancient scripture hasn't changed. So why do the religious leaders now believe it never said what they so strongly declared that it did in the past?

As is so popularly argued, can the bible be interpreted any way you want to make it match what you already believe?

It turns out, the bible said it correctly all along. They just did not understand what it actually said. Modern science had not yet discovered what the bible knew all along. At that time, it was beyond their comprehension to see that the bible said something they knew was not true, or at least what they thought they knew was not true.

Ancient Greek science, if you want to call it science, was based on the geocentric teachings of Aristotle. Back then, great minds thought that reality was the earth was the center of rotation of the universe. Since that is what was, supposedly, true, that is what the bible had to say.

So, the religious leaders read into it what they thought it should say so it would not be out of accord with what they thought they knew to be reality—but what they thought was reality was not—and it was not what the bible said either.

There is the oft heard objection that the bible can be interpreted any way you want. Aren't you just re-interpreting it to be in accord with our current perception of reality? How can we know what the bible really says? The answer is simple to say, yet difficult to do. Study the ancient scripture instead of the opinions of theologians. My favorite example is Psalms 104:8 where the ancient scripture says the mountains rose and the valleys fell. Most translations of the ancient scripture by theologians fudged the translation to imply it was the water that went up by the mountains and down by the valleys, (except for Jerome who thought the ancient scripture meant what it said and translated it correctly into Latin centuries earlier.) Then, after modern science discovered the bible was right, without fanfare, theologians began translating it in accord with what it really said.

Back to the Galileo episode, What is it that the religious leaders so erroneously misunderstood?

Well, lets see, let me try to simplify the explanation.

The verse they thought said the planet earth was the center of the universe actually said the world (the whole of the dry land [earth], what we call continents, not the planet earth) was fixed in position so it would not go away. (Psalm 93:1, see also, 1 Chronicles 16:30) What the bible knew, that the religious leaders did not know, is the fact that the word “world” used there did not refer to the planet, rather, it referred to the whole of the dry land, the continents, as defined in Genesis 1:10. Apparently, some time in the past, people feared that the sea might again return and cause the continents to again be under sea level.

What? You never thought of Genesis 1:10 as being the definition of a word? Why else then, after describing the covering of the planet earth with water in an earlier stage of development, resulting in a condition where there were no continents, then, after the next step of development—the rising of the continents to be above sea level—why else would the writer then emphasize the word “earth” meaning the continents rather than the planet? Why else would he say, “And God called the dry [land] Earth; and the gathering together of the waters called he Seas.”?

For more details, see, *The Story Behind the Legend of the Firmament*, <http://www.scienceandthebible.net/reports/art1216firmamentlegend.pdf>

In another example, the division over religious doctrine concerning the age of the earth is the stated reason for many thinking people to reject religion, including Christianity. To many people, what has derisively become known as the *Judeo/Christian creation myth*, is simply belief in that which we know is not true.

But this is another case of theologians interpreting the bible according to religious tradition instead of considering what it really says.

In the bible, many details of events of the history of existence, from the Eon of Eternity Past to the Eon of Eternity Future, but focusing on the beginning times, are present in nearly three dozen major biblical accounts. Within those accounts, about half contain information concerning the chronology of events, a time line, so to speak, without a specific time scale other than the fact that a great portion of that history is before humans appeared on this planet, and the time of humans on this planet is at least two thousand generations of humans. (The bible mentions “thousands” of human generations. The bible mentions 40 years as being a generation. The plural of thousand times 40 is 80,000 years.)

The problem is, religious tradition has defined a doctrine that creation occurred in 144 hours, in six days, about six thousand years ago. That doctrine is based on a misinterpretation of just one of those nearly three dozen biblical accounts. Specifically, the problem is, one, and only one, of those biblical accounts says anything about any six days. None of the others even mention anything about six days. In fact, when all biblical accounts are compared in detail, a common chronology becomes obvious that is much longer than the six days found in that one

account. And the order of events is different. Looking deeper, that chronology common to all accounts is also found in the account that has the six-day schedule. As it turns out, both the six-day and the common chronologies are present in that one account. The six-day schedule is superimposed over an original chronology that is in accord with the rest of the bible, and contrary to the six-day schedule.

Like I said, Sometimes the bible sheds a lot of light on the religious bible commentaries.

Perhaps, a little more should be said on the subject. Many readers could be quite confused by the above revelation.

Religious tradition is divided over when creation occurred. Whether it was in reality confined to six days about six thousand years ago, or spread out over millions, even billions of years generally hinges on one's interpretation of the word "day" in that six-day presentation. Those who believe creation occurred during a six day period say it is intended to be literal. Those who are willing to accept a longer schedule have come up with a rationalization that the word day does not have to be interpreted literally, and the bible still be true. (None have considered that it could be literal, yet still fiction to illustrate an unrelated principle as the stories of Jesus called parables.) This popular rationalization has become known as the day-age theory. In addition to the problem of the time scale, there are greater problems with the day-age theory. The order of events in the day-age theory does not match reality, nor does it match the common chronology found universally in all the biblical accounts. To make the day-age theory come into accord with reality, theologians have to fudge the meanings of what the ancient scripture actually says.

A more obvious, and more in accord with reality interpretation is:

- 1.) The chronology that is universal in all the biblical accounts of the ancient scripture, is the true chronology—published in the bible before modern science discovered it, and
- 2.) The six-day schedule is a literal, yet fictional chronology, similar to the literal, yet fictional parables of Jesus. Just like the parables, the purpose is to illustrate an unrelated principle.
- 3.) The unrelated principle to be illustrated by the six-day creation schedule is, in fact, the principle of six days of labor followed by one day of rest as laid out in the fourth of the Ten Commandments.

A careful analysis of the account containing the six-day schedule reveals the common biblical chronology is present, yet obscured by the overlain six-day schedule. It appears as though Moses took an already existing creation account, and overlaid a six-day outline

That common biblical account is presented in two passes through the chronology explaining the origin of the two sides of the food chain.

In the first pass, the botany side is presented. In the second pass, the zoology side is presented.

The first pass through the chronology presents the basic essentials for the botany side of the food chain: Light, Air, Water, Land, Photosynthesis, and Plants. First there is

light, the source of energy that sustains life. Then the atmosphere comes into existence to the point that it captures water from outer space to fill the oceans. At that point, what is missing is dry ground for plants to grow on. That is what appears next, in the emergence of the dry ground (continents) from below sea level. The next thing mentioned is photosynthesis (illustrated by green grass) that converts that solar energy into energy stored in hydrocarbon. Finally, the ecology of the diverse variety of plants completes the botany side of the food chain.

Then the second pass restarts the common biblical chronology at the point of the creation of the heavenly bodies with a future purpose of controlling the circadian rhythms in animal life. This second pass continues through the history of the zoology side of the food chain including the age of the sea swarming with living creatures, the age of the megafauna (dinosaurs) and finally the age of the dominance of mammals where humans were eventually introduced into the ecology.

But, this original common biblical chronology is obscured by the superimposition upon this original common chronology of a literal, yet fictitious, six-day chronology to illustrate the fourth of the ten commandments, which, incidentally was given to Moses just before he wrote the book of Genesis. It is no wonder that Moses opens with this account that is illustrative of the six days of labor/seventh day of rest principle.

For more details see, *A Commentary on the Seven-Day Creation Account*.

<http://www.scienceandthebible.net/reports/ACommentaryontheSeven-DayCreationAccount.pdf>

So, the bible knew what it was talking about long before any scientist had any idea of what it was talking about.

Modern science has vindicated Galileo in discovering the earth is not the center of the universe. Thorough study of the bible has shown the theologians were wrong in their interpretation.

Modern science has vindicated the universal chronology of the beginnings that is common to all the biblical accounts. Theologians are still wrestling with contortions to rationalize their six-day schedule interpretation of just one of the many biblical accounts to the ignoring of all the others.

And the religious theological interpretation is still contrary to reality as written in the bible and verified by modern science.

It was not the bible that had it wrong. It was the religious leaders.

You have heard it said, "Let God be true but every man a liar." Rom 3:4.

That is not just pertaining to religious stuff, but it pertains in the realm of science too.

The longer I study the differences between science and religion, the more obvious it becomes, the bible comes down on the side of reality even if theologians have for centuries gone beyond what the bible actually says and interpreted it to say something that it does not say. In every case I have studied, it is the interpretations of religious leaders, not what the bible really says, that contradicts reality.

Of course, the degreed interpreters of scientific fact have also had their blunders of

interpretation, they too are just as human as theologians.

The problem is, we all want to know the final answers before all the evidence is in.

And there is always someone willing to make up an explanation in the absence of real knowledge.

But in the end, the bible really is true after all.

Somehow the bible knew from antiquity, without having to make up some fictional explanation.

That does not say there is not fiction in the bible. There is plenty of that. Mainly, it is made up to illustrate an unrelated principle. No one would deny that the stories made up by Jesus to illustrate great truths were fiction—literal, but still fiction, but most of the time they are not called fiction, but are religiously called by their religious name, parables.

Could it be that the writer of Genesis anticipated the misinterpretation of the religious leaders of the sixteenth century and slipped that definition in just to prove God knew it all along? But there I go, putting the foot of religious interpretation into my mouth.

And so it goes. Theologians put their foot of religious interpretation into their mouth.

In every case I have studied, where the religious interpretation is out of accord with reality, I have found that the problem is with the religious interpretation of the bible, sometimes even embedded in the religious translations. But the problem is not with what the ancient scripture actually says. When science is in accord with reality, the ancient scripture comes down on the side of science, not on the side of the traditional religious interpretation.

Every fall—all across America—we send our best and brightest young Christians to college. It has been estimated that seventy five percent of them lose their faith during that first year. The major tool used to separate them from their faith is the obvious apparent conflict between the unreality of religion and the apparent reality of science.

But in the end, the ancient scripture really is true after all.

---

---

### **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](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. 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/ezone>

---

---

*Max B. Frederick*, Publisher, [www.scienceandthebible.net](http://www.scienceandthebible.net) © 2011