

Science and the Bible E-Zine

The Science and the Bible E-Zine Volume 5, Number 5, May, 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) A Sampling of Ideas—A Rough Draft
 - 3) Reprint Rights.
 - 4) Sign up for this E-zine.
-

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

By Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist

A note about the articles appearing in the last two issues.

Some people apparently misunderstood the meaning of the title of the articles. It gave the impression to some people that "Depth of Information" had something to do with a "deeper" or "hidden" meaning. I did not intend to give the impression that I was talking about anything other than the inclusion of information that is the underlying basis in reality for the lesson that was being taught. Many times information concerning reality, the basic support for the lesson being taught is so obvious that most theologians totally ignore it.

A problem common to generic "religion" is that people seem to expect there to be some "hidden" meaning. This problem has its roots in the occult religions. The meaning of the word "occult" is, in fact, "hidden." That is not the way it is with Christianity, nor the ancient Hebrew scriptures. In the bible, the basis information is

obvious and not hidden at all, just ignored by many theologians (maybe because they are looking for hidden meanings.) Sometimes the obvious basis information that relates the lesson to reality may not be recognized because the reader is not grounded in reality. An objective of this science and the bible effort is to clarify the basis in reality that testifies to the credibility of the surface lessons being taught.

Your feedback is welcome. Let me know your impressions of what I say.

A New Effort:

I have recently been encouraged to write a new book. This time it is to be more on the level of something enjoyable to read. My previous book has been criticized as being so technical that it makes one think it is a reference manual for some complex piece of machinery.

This time it is to be on the theme of how I know something is really true. It is to be about whether or not one can know if the biblical promise of life after death has any credibility in reality.

This work is not intended to be an apologetic of any interpretation or doctrine.

Rather it is to test the validity of what is actually recorded in the ancient scriptures, to test biblical information that is within the realm considered to be modern science.

If the ancient scripture is found to be credible in that realm in which its credibility can be tested, then it bolsters the credibility in things that cannot be tested such as the claim that there actually is life beyond the grave.

The process is to investigate the credibility of the ancient scriptures as to accord with reality when it comes to pre-publication of many recent discoveries of modern science. The problem we run into is that some of the traditional interpretations of what the bible actually says contradict what it actually does say. Those contradictory interpretations also contradict reality as recently discovered by modern science. The premise is that some of the traditional interpretations of what the bible says are in error. Here we are talking only about things in the realm claimed by modern science, not about religious doctrine. In this area, grace is given to those ancient theologians because it was impossible for theologians to know what modern science had not yet discovered. In fact, it becomes obvious that theologians actually succumbed to the pressure to fudge the translation just a little bit so it would not contradict what was the politically correct "science" in their time. Currently, what is perceived to be the debate between science and the bible is actually between antique science and modern science with the bible coming down on the side of reality as discovered by modern science.

This has nothing to do with debating any religious doctrine.

"How Do I Know Its True?" is being considered for a possible name for the book.

This new book may turn out to be a stew of many topics. I have been warned against ruining it with too much technical referencing.

A book over salted with references is just as distasteful to many readers as a delicious stew can be ruined by over salting it.

But then, a lot of references are not needed when a lot of the stuff is either original with the author, or so obvious that to give one source all the credit would be overly arrogant. Some information may be claimed by the first one to publish it, but when it is so obvious that anyone can come to the same conclusion, there is no reason to try to prove one is more learned than someone else by over referencing. It gives the impression of lack of confidence in the author's own independent conclusions about reality. If it is true, if it is self evident, no one gets the credit. If it is false, the source must be tracked down and exposed by referencing whenever it is expedient.

So. A lot of my work is without reference to any particular source.

Of course, when the source is exceptional, like the milestone of Louis Pasteur disproving spontaneous generation—then the reference is included.

For many centuries scientists believed that living organisms arose spontaneously from such things as dust, mud, or other non-living substance. This belief goes back at least as far as the 4th century BC during the time of Aristotle. It persisted for thousands of years until 1859.

In 1859, about one hundred fifty years ago, the theory of spontaneous generation being the origin of life was being hotly debated. The French Academy of Science had a contest to settle the question. Louis Pasteur won the contest with a scientific experiment, which disproved spontaneous generation of microorganisms.

On the other hand, when the reality is obvious, like the existence of about three dozen accounts of creation to be found in the bible, not just the one up front, No one needs to be given credit for compiling a list of them. Besides, I could not find a complete list published anywhere, so I had to make my own list.

Another example, I have not found any particular publication announcing the discovery that, at one time in the early development, the earth was once completely covered with water of the oceans and that continents did not exist above sea level—just statements of that fact sprinkled throughout college course material. I give no one in particular credit for that discovery even though it was not known other than within the writings of the ancient scriptures for thousands of years prior to modern science.

Of particular interest, among the encouragement sources for my writing a new book, is an email from a high school Junior named Billy in a far away place. Billy found my work on the internet and has requested a book.

The article this month is a rough draft of some of the thoughts going into the new book.

The aim is to differentiate religious interpretation from what the ancient scripture of the bible actually says. The thesis is that religious interpretation has confused religion with reality when there is a vast difference. In the study of science and the bible, the discussion generally boils down to science and the bible being together on the side of reality and religion on the side of myth, fantasy and occult (hidden) explanations. A goal is to root out the truth in the cases where religion has contaminated what the bible really says with what religion thinks it should have said.

2) A Sampling of Ideas—A Rough Draft

Preview of Introduction to: **How Do I Know Its True?**

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)

““In our society we are free to believe anything we want to believe as long as we don't actually think it's true.” Ravi Zacharias, in his book [*Jesus Among other Gods*](#), said that. He was talking about our skewed understanding of religious belief.”

<http://scriptspot.blogspot.com/2012/04/actually-thinking-its-true.html>

“...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)

Why Would Anyone Want to Believe the Bible is Actually True?

Isn't that the book that puts a quash on all the worldly pleasures of life?

Isn't that the book that makes people afraid that if they mess up their lives they will be tortured eternally after they die.

What ever happened to the wish that you find on many gravestones, “Rest in Peace?”

At least, if the bible is not true, and there is no torture after this life, we can get all there is in this life and not have to suffer for it later.

Many people see science as an ally in this endeavor for peace.

Is that what Paul was talking about when he said that if there is no such thing a life after death then Christians are, of all men, most miserable? Did he mean that after giving up every hope of the good life here just to get a non-existent eternal reward, we are also robbed of our hope for the good life in eternity?

But what if there really is life after death, and this God thing, whatever that is, is actually a rewarder of those who diligently seek Him.

Rewarder? But isn't that contrary to the politically correct perception that God is a punisher?

Maybe we should try to find out if the bible really is true in this respect.

Maybe even more important, we should try to find out if that is what the bible really says.

There is no denying the fact that many evils have been, and currently are being enacted in the name of religion.

But there is a big difference between what the bible really says, and what religion says it says.

In fact, many of the perceived pleasures of life, evils that religion condemns,

including much of the Christian religion, are not condemned by the bible—some appear to be even overlooked in bible heroes. That does not add up to the popular perception of God being the punisher of those who get out of line with what the religious leaders use to control the masses. There is something amiss.

Apologetics—Proof? or Warm Fuzzy Feeling?

There is a field of study called apologetics.

It has nothing to do with apologizing.

Or does it.

Apologetics is formally defined as something like, reasoned arguments or writings to give rational justification of some concept, typically a theory or religious doctrine.

Apologetics is not the science of proving the bible to be true, just the art of rationalizing something that is firmly believed, independent of whether or not it is actually in accord with reality.

Apologetics has become a branch of Christian theology that aims to present a rational basis for traditional interpretations of the bible, not a branch of theology that aims to discover what the bible really says.

In the arena of science and the bible, apologetics has gone wrong, in rationalizing erroneous traditional interpretations rather than discovering what the bible really says.

Typical is the rationalization that God is defined to be able to do anything he wants to. Therefore, He could have done it that way even if reality indicates otherwise.

In reality apologetics is one apology after another for getting it wrong.

As my neighbor across the street complained to me, The bible has been translated so many ways how can we know what it really says?"

Apologetics owe him an apology—or should I say, a myriad of apologies.

When I first got serious about studying science and the bible, I got a discussion group together.

For many months we looked at every anecdotal story we could find where people claimed science had proven something true as it was recorded in the bible. For example, we investigated the story that has been around for a long time about a scientist who was working on a computer model that predicted events such as the location of planets. He reportedly could not make it work until he read in the bible about the sun standing still for about a day—making that correction the program worked better, but was still a few minutes off. He then read in the bible about the shadow on the sundial going backward a few degrees. With that correction the program worked perfectly. Thus, the story was purported to be science proving the bible to be true.

The story turned out to be a fraud—made up by some well meaning Christian to make his God look good. All it did was make his God look bad in the eyes of thinking people who want an intellectually honest answer.

And so it went with so many things pointed to as examples of science proving the bible to be true.

So much for apologetics.

Somebody owes someone an apology.

From the much touted example of the symbolic depiction of some important molecule looking like the cross of crucifixion, to the story of coincidence of eight day circumcision and the timing of blood clotting development in a new born baby, the examples mushroom.

They all give you a warm fuzzy feeling, but they fall short of proving anything about the validity of the bible.

Such examples put forth by well meaning Christians are no more valid proof that the bible is true than the best similar example of Muslim scholars in their quest for science in the Koran.

Muslim scholars have an anecdote that points out where the Koran says that one who moves a property boundary marker shall sink down through seven earths. They then claim that modern science has discovered the earth has seven layers from the surface to the core. They claim that proves the author of the Koran had supernatural knowledge that the earth has seven layers. The problem is when you look in a different text book, the planet earth is divided into a different number of layers, typically anywhere from about five to nine.

Arrogance of theologians—of any religion—is responsible for a long trail of things to apologize for.

My neighbor had asked a valid question. How can I know what the bible really says?

It has been said that figures don't lie, but that liars can figure. So it is of anecdotal stories of science proving the bible—or the Koran Well meaning theologians of any ilk can make up false evidence to prove something true and in the end make a truth appear to be false by discrediting it. It is like the possibility of Mark Furman planting false evidence to make O. J. Simpson look guilty resulting in discrediting the prosecution and the acquittal of what many still think is a guilty man.

So, where do I look?

How do I know it is true?

Try looking at what the bible really says.

But it has been translated and interpreted so many ways.

How can I know what it really says?

And then there are Rules of Hermeneutics.

But they too Can be Abused.

Hermeneutics is a big word for figuring out what the bible really says.

The rules start with: Words have meaning. That rule is a big one. Especially when

many meanings have been lost during a period of time when the original language of the Old testament was not widely used.

There was a time when the Hebrew language was what some scholars call a dead language. Other scholars are terribly offended by this terminology being applied to their language. Perhaps I should call it a frozen language.

Even though there is a modern live Hebrew language, it is not the same as the one that became frozen in time. Ancient Hebrew language of the bible became and still is a frozen language. Becoming a frozen language has both its goods and its bads. The meanings of the words no longer change from generation to generation. But some meanings become lost—only to be deduced by inference from the context. You guess at the meaning and see if it is consistent with other and all cases where it is used. Sometimes your guess is inconsistent with reality, but you go with it anyway because you want it to say what the new meaning makes it say. If you want it to say something that is inconsistent with reality, you assign a dual alternate meaning—but more on that elsewhere.

Theologians owe us another apology here.

When we finally get to the sixth one, it is really a big one. But it is rarely stated—just applied without mentioning it.

“In a writing that claims to be true, such as the bible, when competing interpretations are equally consistent with the assumed context, the option most in accord with assumed reality is assumed to be the intended meaning.”

When working with science and the bible, there are many examples where this rule is applied wrongly due to some popular misperception of reality that just happens to be politically correct during the era of the translation.

My favorite example is Psalms 104:8 where the King James Translators could not bring themselves to contradict reality by translating it correctly to say that mountains go up and valleys go down. Instead, they implied that it was the water that was going up by the mountains and going down by the valleys. However, after modern science discovered the principle of isostasy around the year 1900, later translations seemed to have no trouble getting it right with no explanation. Could it be because now we know mountains do go up and valleys do go down?

There are many such examples. We have to face the reality that theologians are not above unnecessarily fudging the translation to make their God look good—and in the end make Him look bad.

There is no need for the fudging because what the bible really says is in accord with reality and their interpretation is not.

Was that by design?

Maybe.

Could it be that it was intentional to set up a double blind test where the answers are to be revealed in our time?

More on that later...

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/ezone>

Max B. Frederick, Publisher, www.ScienceAndTheBible.net © 2012