

Science and the Bible E-Zine

The Science and the Bible E-Zine Volume 5, Number 1

Publisher: Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist
Motto: The Simple Truth
Date: January 31, 2012
Issue: Volume 5, Number 1
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) The God of Religion vs. The God of 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

This month the article is another continuation of the exercise of thinking outside the box started in the November, 2011 issue. The December, 2011 issue contains many concepts that were not only difficult to wrap your mind around, but also evoked critical commentary. And that is one of the purposes of thinking outside the box.

When a scientist reads the bible with an open mind, there arises a multitude of ideas known as thinking outside the box. Again the following warning is appropriate.

Warning: The material in this issue of this electronic magazine may be offensive to some theologians. The content is the product of thinking outside the bounds of traditional theological thinking. It is presented in the spirit of academic freedom to stimulate thinking in others. It is not intended to be the answer, nor is it intended to be authoritative. Please be so kind as to bring any thoughts you may have to my attention. Unlike the time of Galileo, today it is not illegal to practice theology without a license.

Critical commentary centers around several points. It may be worth your review.

<http://www.scienceandthebible.net/ezine/2011/SATB-Ezine-2011-12-31.pdf>

First, Is there really any such thing as a supernatural God? Does the God of the Bible really exist? That question hits on a sore subject. A *negative* answer assumes that that there is no such thing as a supernatural God, particularly the God of the bible. The current anti-Christian movement in the United States is based on the *negative* answer, But, a *positive* answer demands that not all religions are equally, and totally, simply based on false beliefs of religious kooks. But it also demands that some are.

Second, the question of how you define the concept of a “god,” of what you define “God” to be is a very offensive question to many religious people—particularly when they have no idea of how to answer that question. From belief in a lucky rabbit’s foot, to a great Sugar Daddy in the Sky, religion is a great impediment to discovery of truth.

Finally, from the intellectual honesty of a true scientist, comes a specific criticism that I made an over simplification when I pointed out the eternal nature of energy according to modern science. He is right. That was an over simplification. What modern science is currently speculating is that the sum of energy and matter—the sum of all existence, not just energy alone, is what is eternal. The sum is, always was, and always will be, constant—in another word, eternal. Theologians long ago invented the wrong idea that the bible promotes the doctrine of Creation Ex-Nihilo, creation from nothing—that is not what the bible explicitly says. Carl Sagan’s “all there ever was, is, or ever will be” is much greater than Carl Sagan himself even imagined. His “all there ever was,” according to the current speculation of modern science, actually includes that which caused the current observable universe to come into existence. In this there is complete agreement between the current thinking of modern science and the ancient scriptures of the bible—much to the embarrassment of modern theologians and anti-religion scientists alike.

Reality Versus Religion

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

In the discussion of Reality versus Religion, the ancient scriptures of the bible come down on the side of reality.

Through the centuries, theologians have interpreted the bible to be in accord with the traditions of prevailing religion. Thus, in the realm of science, religion that is supposedly based on the bible has drifted from reality. It is like circular reasoning. The ancient scriptures started out in accord with reality. Theologians interpreted it in accord with prevailing mind set of religion, thus establishing religious tradition. Then

religion adopted that religious tradition (rather than what the scripture actually says) as their basis of future religious interpretation of the ongoing translations of the bible. That is why much of science agrees with the ancient scriptures but not with some of the religious tradition that has hound its way into modern versions of the bible.

In general the older the translation of the bible, the more accord with reality in the realm of science. There are exceptions however, reality as recently discovered by modern science has allowed some passages to be corrected. Still, there is no substitute for the original language version. The meanings of many of the words in the original language have been defined by theologians from their context assuming the religious interpretation of what was being communicated. However, if you realize the ancient Hebrew language had fallen into non-use and many meanings were lost before the first translation into any other language, you would realize many of the definitions need to be re-thought in the light of reality. When you do so, you see the accord with reality in obscure passages becomes clear based on the meanings derived from the context of other passages where the same word is used.

The First Point of critical commentary:

Is there really any such thing as a supernatural God? Does the God of the Bible really exist? This question is at the heart of much of the raging debate in the political arena today. If there really is a supernatural God, then the current politically correct philosophy that all religions should be treated as equal is based on the false assumption that all religions are equally false. To be logically consistent, they cannot all be right. Logically, they could all be wrong, but they cannot logically all be right. There are a particular few religious doctrines that if any of those are right, then all the other religions are wrong. If all are wrong and there is no such thing as a supernatural God, then religious people are a great danger to the existence of the human race. Some particular religious doctrines, even if they are right, are inclined to end the human race on earth in the near future. Some people are of the opinion that if the human race is to be prolonged on this earth, all such religions should be abolished. Thus, the current political correctness bias against evangelical Christianity.

Political Correctness and the Concept of a Deity/God

A least understood, yet most universally accepted concept is that of Deity/God.

The other day as I was walking by the TV, I was struck by a quiz show question and answer that defined the word, *deify*. The word *deify* was defined as, "to elevate to the rank of a god." So, It struck me, the politically correct concept of "god" is a rank to which humans elevate something. A god is something that is not, in its basic nature, actually a god. It is something that is not really supernatural, but is elevated, in the human mind, to be considered to be supernatural.

So, again, the question of the concept of a God arises. A Deity and a God, are different words for the same concept, different words that come from different etymologies. It is an ambiguous concept. Various modern views of the ancient Deity/God/LORD concept include a long list. But no English word for that concept is anywhere as old as the ancient scriptures of the bible, and none convey the exact meaning of any of the original words found in those ancient scriptures. The currently

prevalent concepts are quite varied as seen in the following list. Yet none are an exact match for the original concept. Many are meaningless circular reasoning.

Prime mover

Primary Cause

Higher Power

Any object or concept deemed worthy of worship/praise/glorification.

Something set aside for reverence

Imaginary benevolent benefactor

A god or goddess

The state of being divine; godhead

The rank, status, or position of a god

The nature or character of God

The one Supreme Being, the creator and ruler of the universe. (“Supreme Being” is a politically correct, yet ambiguous, phrase that avoids any additional detail concerning physical properties. It simply means the highest ranking official among all species. Synonyms for “Supreme” are, highest, best, ultimate, superlative, utmost, absolute, extreme, top. Synonyms for “Being” are life form, organism, creature, living being, human being, person, individual, mortal.)

The Supreme Being considered with reference to a particular attribute: the God of Islam.

One of several deities, especially a male deity, presiding over some portion of worldly affairs.

A supreme being according to some particular conception: the god of mercy.

The Supreme Being, understood as Life, Truth, Love, Mind, Soul, Spirit, Principle.

An image of a deity; an idol.

Any deified person or object

A word used to express disappointment, disbelief, weariness, frustration, annoyance, or the like: God, do we have to listen to this nonsense?

Again, none of these prevailing descriptions or definitions correspond to the information contained within the bible that describes the God of the bible.

Concerning the concept of the “God” of the bible, through the processes of logic and religious bias, theologians have added much to the actual information in the bible. Conversely, much has also been stripped away. That added information must be stripped away, and the lost information restored, before modern science even attempts to conceive of any such existence they would assume to prove, disprove, investigate, or even argue for its existence or non-existence.

Before any argument for or against the existence of something, a definition of what is being argued for or against would be in order.

Eternal Nature of Energy and Intellectual Honesty:

Last month, I wrote:

“Since the only thing currently identified by modern science as eternal—as something that can be neither created nor destroyed—is energy, it seems that scientists already accept a major concept associated with the God of the bible.

A favorite comeback by science minded doubters of the bible is the question, “If God existed before He created the universe, then who created God?”

The answer then becomes, “If energy, such as in a “black hole,” existed before the beginning of the universe, then who created energy?”

You see, energy and the God of the bible are in the same class of that which has neither beginning nor end. And the name for God in the bible is the word used for the ancient concept of Energy/Force/Power. Coincidence???

From the intellectual honesty of Clyde, a true scientist, comes a specific criticism that I made an over simplification when I pointed out the eternal nature of energy according to modern science. He is right. The bible even agrees with Clyde.

Clyde details the current speculative thought (hypothesis) of modern science thusly:

“It is not true to say that energy is eternal and that it cannot be neither created nor destroyed. First of all, the concept of entropy allows that energy can be degraded. In the beginning, right after the Big Bang, there was no matter, there was only energy. Over a period of time, much of the primal energy was converted to matter. That converted energy no longer exists, thus it had been destroyed when the matter was created. Under special circumstances, certain kinds of matter can be split or fused, releasing energy that could not be perceived nor measured prior to the event. Thus, energy has been created. You can play semantic games and claim that the energy was always there. However, none of the properties that are ascribed to energy in a definition of it can be discerned. That is to say, the ability to do work, the ability to alter the entropy of a system, or the ability to stimulate the sensory organs of a creature is not present when matter is used as an activator. More formally, there is equivalence between matter and energy that allows transformations. However, energy is NOT matter, and matter is NOT energy. They are different things with different properties, thus the two names. Clearly, at the very least, the amount and character of energy in the universe has changed over time. I would not consider that to be eternal. Also, if the universe eventually stops expanding, and then collapses in on itself, that would be the end of ‘eternity.’ If we exist in a multiverse instead of a universe, then perhaps Black Holes or Worm Holes transfer energy between the multiple universes. From the viewpoint of a closed system, then energy is being gained or lost in our universe, i.e. created or destroyed.

That which is in accord with fact and reality,”

Clyde also references a web site that explains how to get a cosmos from nothing — without a “god” [but falls short of explaining how to do it without the one described in the bible.] In fact, it details a speculation that has some great similarity to much of the detail in the bible where it describes how it actually happened.

That web site suggests the speculation that the sum of mass and energy is the constant—not the energy alone.

Side Note:

Possibly in appeasement to the religious doctrine of creation ex-Nihilo, that web site also speculates the sum of that whole is zero. All that exists is simply in the

deviations around zero allowed by mathematical modeling. To understand such modeling, visualize a phone booth as something people go into and come out of where the phone booth starts out empty, one man enters the phone booth and two men come out. To the mathematician, it is simply a matter of when one more man later goes into the phone booth, it will once again become empty (the sum of those entering and leaving once again becomes equal to zero.) To the doubting physicist, there either has to be something wrong with our understanding of physics, or the math model does not represent reality. But, it crudely illustrates the speculative [hypothetical] positive and negative nature of matter for matter to exist from nothing when it is balanced out with anti-matter [negative matter.]

The bottom line in that web site's speculations is that spontaneous positive and negative perturbations in nothingness will cause the arise of somethingness.

Therefore, no "god" needed.

That web site Clyde referenced is,

<http://cosmiclog.msnbc.msn.com/news/2012/01/09/10076985-how-to-get-a-cosmos-from-nothing>

If we limit the speculation to the eternal constant being the sum of matter and energy, rather than energy alone, then the description of the beginning of the universe found in the first verse of the bible that energy created the mass [matter] of the universe, then all is in agreement with reality as described by Clyde.

"In the beginning, Elohiym [energy/force/strength/power] created the heavens and the earth [the heavens and the earth meaning all matter in the universe.]" Genesis 1:1

"In the beginning, right after the Big Bang, there was no matter, there was only energy. Over a period of time, much of the primal energy was converted to matter. That converted energy no longer exists, thus it had been destroyed when the matter was created." Clyde

But what is hard for me to swallow is, Who is the guy that claimed to be the "everlasting energies/forces/power/etc. that exists" who told Moses how it happened when modern science was not to discover those same details, of that which is in accord with fact and reality, until thousands of years later?

While still thinking outside the box, Might I suggest it was some extraterrestrial intelligent life form that is not matter-based as is the human life form, but possibly energy-based, and having the attributes of power, intelligence, and wisdom, similar to matter-based intelligent human life

Summary:

While we are still thinking outside the box:

Might I suggest that the bible contains a wealth of information describing the attributes of the God of the bible that is routinely ignored by theologians in favor of their religious concepts superimposed upon what the bible actually says.

More important to religion is devotion, fervor, zeal and related activities. These activities are the defining attributes that make something a religion. It is not the reality of the object of such activity. Devotion to an ultimate reality or to some supernatural imagination are equally qualified to define such activity a religion.

The first thing the bible says, says something about the physics of God. Looking at the original, non-religious meanings of the words used in the first verse of the bible, we see: “In the beginning, Powers (*Elohiym*) brought into existence...”

Elohiym is the plural form of the word used for the ancient all encompassing concept of power, energy, force, strength, etc.—theologians use the religious word “God” to express that concept to avoid the science related original actual meaning. The actual meanings of the English words “God” and “LORD” have more to do with rank or stature in society than they have to do with the physics related to the original language words of *Elohiym* and *Yēhovah* (“Powers/Forces/Energies/Strengths” and “That which exists [interpreted to be “everlastingly]”)

The English words we use to name the God of the bible have much broader meaning than the original language words from which they are translated. Even “deity” from the older Latin form used interchangeably with the English word God, contains much that is not contained in the original language. The definition of the word deify, to elevate to the rank of a God, is obviously related to cultural rank rather than the physics of *Elohiym*.

At least this thinking outside the box would make a good basis for a great science fiction series. The controversy might even give the series the boost of religious theologians forbidding their followers to read it or to go see it.

Your feedback and comments are solicited and appreciated.

To contact the author, go to: <http://www.anoldscientist.com/page3.html>

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, 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