

THE TRINITY REVIEW

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh, for the weapons of our warfare [are] not fleshly but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. And they will be ready to punish all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled. (2 Corinthians 10:3-6)

Number 354b Copyright 2019 The Trinity Foundation Post Office Box 68, Unicoi, Tennessee 37692 Nov – Dec 2019
Email: tjtrinityfound@aol.com Website: www.trinityfoundation.org Telephone: 423.743.0199 Fax: 423.743.2005

The Bible and the Idolatry of Science

By Ronald L. Cooper

Editor's note: This is the conclusion of the article began in the September, October Trinity Review.

Inventing Reality by Adding New Words

Physicist Bruce Gregory describes physics as nothing but an invented language to talk about the world, and there is no correspondence between theories and reality. Beginning with Newton, he says the first law of motion is simply an assumption. For convenience, the term energy was invented to describe a mechanical system; Newton's fictitious force no longer had to be mentioned. Coulomb added to the science vocabulary by inventing electrical force, which differed from gravitational force due to two polarities of electricity. However, "It is well to bear in mind that electricity is no more a 'something' than anger is a 'something'; electricity is a way of talking about how things behave."¹ Faraday invented the word *field* to enhance electrical theory and to add magnetic theory as useful concepts, and Maxwell expressed the electrical and magnetic fields mathematically as electromagnetic waves traveling at a fixed speed. But "it is important to keep in mind that in the wave description no physical object is going at this speed."² Wave and particle fictions were invented to talk about light. Likewise, electric and magnetic waves are a very useful way of talking about nature, but they are purely imaginary.³ The language of gravity has changed from a force on a given object by another object to a gravitational field which exerts a force on a particle in its immediate vicinity.⁴ The gravitational field makes the

same predictions as Newton's action at a distance, but it is no more real.

During the twentieth century physics has become much more abstract than in the nineteenth century, as has been the case for atoms. The physicists themselves acknowledge that Einstein's GR conflicts with Quantum mechanics. Regarding Einstein's GR in which space and time are no longer independent but linked together, "Einstein demonstrated the power of talking about space and time as though they were a unity, and in the process he showed that space and time are human inventions—ways of talking about the world."⁵ The advent of the photon theory of light was inconsistent with Maxwell's wave theory of light, but both theories are useful, so the normal physics language had to make allowance for these contradictions.⁶ This led to further development of the physics language to all objects by de Broglie's postulating a universal duality for all matter. Each particle also has a wavelength, and there is a whole number of wavelengths (or standing waves) that fit into each orbit of an atom. New experiments on the nature of the atom led to new problems, which required even more words to be added to the physics dictionary. Bohr invented the idea that electrons exist in discrete stable orbits about the nucleus, and photons are emitted only when an electron moves from one orbit to another.⁷

Heisenberg took a different approach from Bohr by ignoring the concept of orbits and developed a

¹ Bruce Gregory, *Inventing Reality*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1988, 38.

² Gregory, 42.

³ Gregory, 43.

⁴ Gregory, 46.

⁵ Gregory, 70.

⁶ Gregory, 73-77.

⁷ The idea of a discrete or quantized orbit for electrons was necessary to overcome the classical physics objection that electrons with their negative charges would collapse into the larger nucleus which has a positive charge.

technique, called matrix mechanics⁸ to calculate the frequencies of radiation emitted from atoms. In contrast, Schrödinger (discussed above) tried to preserve the concept of orbits and the classical wave interpretation of the atomic structure by developing the wave function.⁹ However, experiments showed problems with the predictability of the wave equation, and it seemed under certain conditions to spread out as a cloud. Max Born solved this problem by inventing a new language to describe the wave function. Solutions to the wave equation no longer represented electrons, but they are really probabilities of finding an electron at a particular point in space.¹⁰ This result seemed to be the final demise of any idea of determinism in physics. Indeterminism was further enhanced by the uncertainty principle of Heisenberg, who stated that we need to quit thinking about electrons as being tiny marbles and rely on QM for predicting behavior.¹¹ Quantum Mechanics is nothing more than mathematical expressions used to predict the outcomes of experiments, and there is nothing that corresponds to anything real. Problems in the theory of QM led to a further new language called quantum electrodynamics (QED) developed by Richard Feynman. In this new theory, the idea of a field was eliminated, and there were only probabilities associated with electrons and photons to get from one place to another.¹²

Conservation laws of energy and momentum were also redefined in twentieth century physics. For example, Einstein had to include the energy represented by the mass of the particle in $E = mc^2$. Further, new inventions of conservation laws for momentum had to be invented for the subatomic world to account for unexplained occurrences, such as the failure of the proton to decay. Gregory concludes, “physics is only indirectly about the world of nature. Directly, it is talk about experimental arrangements and observations.”¹³ Particles such as electrons, which used to be considered bits of matter are now not even a part of elementary matter. The success of physics tells us only that this subject is useful in making predictions. It provides man with no true propositions.

The So-Called Physical Constants of Nature

What is often not understood by people unfamiliar with physics is that the estimates of masses, charges, and other constants is based on nothing observed. The only things that can be observed from experiments are effects in the form of dots or lines on photographic plates or similar materials. The numbers themselves are derived from both experimental data and theory. For example, the so-called discovery of the electron by Thomson originated in an argument between British and German physicists regarding whether electricity was a wave or a particle. The German experiments by Hertz favored a wave theory, but Thomson made a correction to the experiment overlooked by Hertz, and the evidence favored a charged particle that he called a corpuscle. Further experiments combined with electric ($q\epsilon$) and magnetic (qvB)¹⁴ forces led to the measurement of the mass-charge ratio of the electron. Thomson’s work was followed by experiments of J. Townsend and M. Millikan that led to estimating the negative charge on the electron.¹⁵ No electrons were ever observed.

In a study of how physical constants are estimated, Taylor, Parker, and Langenberg, state that the physical constants are related to each other throughout the different branches of physics. This was demonstrated by a new estimate of the ratio of the charge on an electron to Planck’s constant (e/h), which was obtained from an experiment in solid state physics. Once a new estimate was obtained, this forced the other physical constants to be revised because they are interrelated.¹⁶ “Our analysis is based on a complete least-squares [see below] adjustment of the fundamental physical constants. These constants are important links in the chain of physical theory which binds all the diverse branches of physics together, and the careful study of their numerical values as obtained from various experiments in the different fields of physics can give significant information about the over-all consistency and correctness of the basic theories of physics themselves.”¹⁷ New calculations for physical constants can lead to new theoretical calculations as well, which in turn can lead to further revisions of the constants.¹⁸ There are *no discoveries* of physical constants.

⁸ Richard L. Liboff, *Introductory Quantum Mechanics*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1980, 418-426.

⁹ Tipler, *Modern Physics*, 203-205.

¹⁰ Max Born, *The Restless Universe*, Dover, 1951, 106-165.

¹¹ Born, 93.

¹² Michael A. Gottlieb and Rudolf Pfeifer, editors, Chapter 1, “Quantum Theory,” Chapter 2 “The Relative Particle and Wave Viewpoints,” *The Feynman Lectures*, California Institute of Technology, 2013, 112-119.

¹³ Gottlieb and Pfeifer, 181.

¹⁴ The charge on a particle is q , ϵ is the electric intensity, v is the velocity of the particle and B is the magnetic induction.

¹⁵ Rom Harre, *Great Scientific Experiments*, Oxford UP, 1983, 157-165. Tipler, 91-102.

¹⁶ B. N. Taylor, W. H. Parker, and D. N. Langenberg, *The Fundamental Constants and Quantum Electrodynamics*, Academic Press, 1969, 5.

¹⁷ Taylor, Parker, and Langenberg, *The Fundamental Constants and Quantum Electrodynamics*, 1.

¹⁸ Taylor, Parker, and Langenberg, 5.

As mentioned above, the authors discuss a revised estimate of ratio e/h , and from this revision they are able to get a better estimate of the fine-structure constant, α , which is associated with the electron property of spin (the fourth quantum number that describes the energy states of an atom).¹⁹ The apparent weakness of previous estimates of α was that it was obtained from both QED theory and experiment. However, while the new method of estimating α avoids the direct use of QED, a new problem arose because there were multiple estimates of α depending on the particular equation chosen. The method of least squares²⁰ was used for the "...calculation of a best compromise value of α that approximately satisfies all of the relevant equations."²¹ Once the revised constants are estimated, revisions to other related constants were to be made. In the revised calculations, inconsistent or bad data, based in part on improper experimental procedures, were deleted.²² The data are arbitrarily separated into auxiliary constants, those with errors so small they are assumed to be known with certainty, and stochastic input data, those with larger errors. Errors can be different due to different investigators using different methods to calculate them. Least squares adjustments and various types of averages are taken due to different methods of estimating the constants. Because of *ad hoc* adjustments and other difficulties, the authors state "the adjusted values of the constants should always be viewed with caution."²³ After extensively analyzing the experimental data,²⁴ combined with theoretical calculations, making other *ad hoc* decisions about what data to retain and what to throw out and using least squares to combine different estimates, the authors conclude, it is "rather difficult to decide objectively just which of the measurements should be retained and which should be discarded."²⁵

Despite the admission of both physicists and philosophers that science is not cognitive, the abandonment of Scriptural inerrancy by theologians, combined with the acceleration in technological advancement throughout the twentieth century, has

vaulted science to be the highest authority, not only among theologians, but in the general populace as well.

Modern Theologians and Science

As mentioned previously, following wide acceptance of heliocentrism, theologians felt it necessary to reinterpret Scripture, often using phenomenon (what appears to our senses)²⁶ to describe the apparent movement of the Sun. Even nineteenth century conservative Reformed pastors, such as Louis Gaussen, accepted the rotation and revolution of the Earth around the Sun.²⁷ Despite approximately seventy verses of Scripture that speak of the Sun moving or the Earth fixed, he denied any error in Scripture, e.g., attributing Joshua's long day (*Joshua* 10:12) to a miracle of God. Regarding the apparent movement of the Sun and stars, he also attributed them to observed phenomena. In contrast, liberal scholars and Bible critics considered the replacement of geocentricity by heliocentricity as a major victory for science, and a major defeat for the authority of the Bible.

In response to the alleged proof by science of an old Earth, the gap theory was presented by Thomas Chalmers and popularized by G. Pember. The idea was postulated that a major rebellion occurred led by Satan between *Genesis* 1:1 and 1:2, with pre-Adamic beings perishing before Adam and Eve were created. Pember stated nothing in creation proves the Lord created everything in six days,²⁸ and "without form and void" in verse 2 really means chaos due to a pre-Adamic rebellion, not a logical sequence in the creation process.²⁹ Another attempt to reconcile Scripture with the view of an old Earth is the progressive creation theory in which the days of creation were long ages, with man-like creatures before Adam.³⁰ In addition,

²⁶ Two theologians in the nineteenth century who promoted the language of the Bible is phenomenal were J. H. Pratt (*Scripture and Science Not at Variance*, 1872), and Taylor Lewis (*The Six Days of Creation*, 1879). Ramm also supports this view that the language of the Bible is not scientific. Bernard Ramm, *Christian View of Science and Scripture*, 1954, 65-73.

²⁷ Louis Gaussen, *God-Breathed: The Divine Inspiration of the Bible*, The Trinity Foundation, 2001, 219, 228.

²⁸ George H. Pember, *Earth's Earliest Ages*, Hodder and Stoughton, 1884, 22. Hodge was sympathetic to Gray's views of theistic evolution because the latter ruled out atheism. Charles Hodge, *What Is Darwinism?* Scribner, Armstrong and Company, 1874, 174-177. Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, II, 31, 35.

²⁹ Charles V. Taylor, "Syntax and Semantics in Genesis 1," *Journal of Creation* 11(2) (August 1997), 181-188.

³⁰ Ken Ham, "What's Wrong with Progressive Creation," *Creation Ministries International* (August 1999). In this view, gradual steps of creation took place over long periods of time,

¹⁹ Tipler, 150-151, 262-257.

²⁰ Least squares is a statistical method used to estimate of set of parameters used to predict a dependent y, from one or more independent variables x. To predict the best value for y, some sort of average is taken of the independent variables. This is all based on human judgment. There is nothing in the data that requires least squares or any other adjustments.

²¹ Taylor, Parker, and Langenberg, 4.

²² Taylor, Parker, and Langenberg, 6.

²³ Taylor, Parker, and Langenberg, 8.

²⁴ Taylor, Parker, and Langenberg, 11-272. This analysis is much too technical to consider in this paper.

²⁵ Taylor, Parker, and Langenberg, 275.

numerous reinterpretations of Scripture were made, such as the flood of Noah being only local rather than global. With the advent of Darwinism, some theologians were convinced they needed to incorporate evolution into the creation process. Harvard biology professor, Asa Gray, was instrumental in inventing the concept of theistic evolution. He said *Genesis* does not specify the origin of kinds, and evolution does not rule out God in the process. In responding to the charge by Princeton theologian, Charles Hodge, that evolution is atheistic, Gray said, "...the difference between the theologian and the naturalist is not fundamental, and evolution may be as profoundly and as particularly theistic as it is increasingly probable."³¹ Agreeing with this view were theologians George Wright, James Orr, and Benjamin Warfield.³² According to Warfield, "'evolution' cannot act as a substitute for creation, but at best it can supply only a theory of the method of the Divine providence."³³ He also stated that how long man has been on Earth is irrelevant to theology, and he rejected Bishop Ussher's date for a young Earth.³⁴ Warfield apparently held to two sources of truth: science and Scripture.³⁵

each one by divine intervention. Macroevolution is rejected, but microevolution is generally accepted by most of its adherents. The long ages are based on the acceptance of secular geology and cosmology. A similar argument is the Day-Age theory, which holds the creation days to be long periods of time. The Earth and the universe are estimated to be 4.5 and 14 billion years respectively. Theistic evolution is accepted. Richard Niessen, "Theistic Evolution and the Day-Age Theory," *Impact*, No. 81 (March 1980), Institute for Creation Research.

³¹ Asa Gray, *Darwinia: Essays and Reviews Pertaining to Darwinism*, Harvard UP, 1876, 270-271.

³² David N. Livingstone, "B. B. Warfield, the Theory of Evolution and Early Fundamentalism," *The Evangelical Quarterly*, Issue 1, Volume 69, 1985.

³³ Benjamin B. Warfield, "On the Antiquity and Unity of the Human Race," *The Princeton Theological Review*, Vol. IX, No. 1 (January 1911), 1.

³⁴ James Ussher, *The Annals of the World*, Master Books, Inc., 2003. According to Ussher the creation of the Earth and the Heaven occurred in 4004 BC (17).

³⁵ It was also Warfield who (unknowingly) betrayed the *Westminster Confession of Faith* by adopting modern textual criticism, the method by which rationalist methods are used to reconstruct the original text of Scripture that somehow was not preserved by God. He was confident that the principles of modern textual criticism would restore the New Testament text to its original form. Benjamin B. Warfield, *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, Thomas Whittaker, 1887. Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible*, The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1948. See also, Theodore P. Letis, *The Ecclesiastical Text*, The Institute for Renaissance and Reformation Biblical Studies, 1997, 1-29.

Writing in the 1950s, Theologian Bernard Ramm argued it is imperative that Christianity be harmonized with science. He says the battle for respect of the Bible was already lost in the nineteenth century due to the continuing revolt of man from religion, as well as the idea that science can progress only when it is freed from religion. Simultaneous with the rapid advancement of science was a growing liberalism in the church, an increasing number of scientists who were atheists and a lack of development by Christians in the philosophy of science.³⁶ Christians who are scientists must be convinced that they can maintain their faith in Christianity without compromising their views about science. To bring about harmony we must "pay due respect for both science and Scripture.... We must be as ready to hear the voice of science as we are on Scripture on common matters."³⁷ It is also the case that science needs theology as much as theology needs science, and without theology science is meaningless because there is no purpose to human existence. However, it is true science rather than actual science that theology cannot contradict because the former is never final.³⁸ Because we never know true science, we never know we have a contradiction between them. Despite this problem, Ramm concludes: 1) it is not necessary for evangelicals to believe in either a recent creation or a recent appearance of man on Earth; 2) It is not necessary for evangelicals to believe the Earth is the center of the solar system; 3) evangelicals can believe theistic evolution is consistent with faith; 4) the principle of objectivity prevails in science but not in Christianity because what is true for believers is not true for unbelievers.

Even supposedly twentieth century conservative Reformed theologians, such as James Boice, accepted theistic evolution. "Not that the Genesis record will be opposed to any established true scientific data; truth in one area, if it is really truth, will never contradict truth in another area."³⁹ Thus, while he wanted to save Christianity by denying that true science can conflict with Scripture, he in fact denied it by accepting two sources of truth. Further he states, "Actually, there is no firm [B]iblical reason for rejecting some forms of evolutionary theory, so long as it is carefully qualified at key points.... There is no reason to deny that...one form of land animal may have evolved from a sea creature."⁴⁰ William Craig, Professor of Philosophy at Biola University, believes in the Big Bang Theory of

³⁶ Ramm, 17-26.

³⁷ Ramm, 32.

³⁸ Ramm, 42.

³⁹ James M. Boice, *Foundations of the Christian Faith*, InterVarsity Press, 1986, 162.

⁴⁰ Boice, 163.

cosmology, and he attributes the cause of the universe to be a something that transcends space and time, is eternal, uncaused and extremely powerful. But this something must be personal because temporal effects can only be caused by a personal being, which theists understand to be God.⁴¹ Craig is also a theistic evolutionist, who believes God used mutations to end up with Adam.⁴² Presbyterian Pastor, Tim Keller, also believes in an old Earth and theistic evolution. In an article written for BioLogos, he begins his discussion by posing an *aut* disjunction⁴³ that exists between some young Earth creationists, such as Ken Ham, and Darwinian evolutionists, like Richard Dawkins.⁴⁴ Either you can believe in God, or you can believe in Darwinian

evolution. Keller does not accept this disjunction because it leaves no room for people who may be inquiring about Christianity or Christian laypeople that have great respect for science, which supports evolution. Fortunately, according to Keller, there are many who believe the irreconcilability between orthodox faith and evolutionary biology is greatly exaggerated.⁴⁵ There are four objections among orthodox Protestants that must be discussed: 1) if evolution occurred, then we must take *Genesis* as non-literal; 2) those, like Dawkins, that say evolutionary biology explains everything so there is nothing left for God; 3) evolution precludes a literal Adam and Eve; 4) evolution is inconsistent with the Fall that led to death and sin. He has heard the first three objections the most. Some parts of the Bible are clearly taken literally while other parts are not, and some are not clear one way or the other, *Genesis* being one example. For Keller we can't take *Genesis* 1 literally because it does not follow what he calls a natural order; for example, there is light before the physical sources of light. But there is a natural order in *Genesis* 2, and he appeals to the authority of theologian, Meredith Kline, who supports this position. Kline stated the first three days of creation in *Genesis* 1 must be figurative rather than literal because light appears before the natural sources of light, the Sun and the Moon were not created until the fourth day.⁴⁶ According to Kline, there must not have been ordinary processes operating during the first three days of creation, or we cannot make sense out of *Genesis* 2:5. Unfortunately, neither Kline nor Keller apparently understands *Genesis* 1 or 2.⁴⁷ *Genesis* 1 refers to God's creation work during the six days of creation, while *Genesis* 2 focuses on creation only on the sixth day. It is the domesticated animals and cultivated plants that were created on the sixth day, and it is only these animals that Adam named. Vegetation and wild beasts outside the Garden had already been created. The second issue Keller addresses is whether biological evolution completely rules out God.⁴⁸ He says no, because there is a difference between a grand theory of evolution (GTE)

⁴¹ William Lane Craig, "Creation and Big Bang Philosophy," *Philosophia Naturalis* 31 (1994), 217-224. This is the third of the five false cosmological arguments for the existence of God that originated from Thomas Aquinas. Thomas Aquinas, "The Five Ways," Paul Edwards and Arthur Pap, editors, *A Modern Introduction to Philosophy*, Revised Edition, The Free Press, 1972, 395-397. The first of Aquinas' five arguments is usually the one most quoted. See Clark, *Christian Philosophy*, 50-53.

⁴² William Lane Craig, "Evolutionary Theory and Theism," Q&A#253, February 20, 2012, www.reasonablefaith.org. Another stating this argument is Christian apologist, Norman Geisler, *Christian Apologetics*, which begins with a contingent being, who must have a cause that is non-contingent, *i.e.*, a necessary being, who then becomes an all-knowing being, and then is transformed into an infinitely all-knowing being, which finally becomes the Creator. He could have just as well carved a puppet god to worship. See, John W. Robbins, "A Lie in My Right Hand," *The Trinity Review* (February/March 1996).

⁴³ An *aut* disjunction means either one proposition is true or the other is true. Both cannot be true, and both cannot be false. Gordon Clark, *Logic*, 91.

⁴⁴ Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, W. W. Norton & Co., 1987. Dawkins says everything that exists has come into being by gradual and small steps due to cumulative natural selection, which is the only possible explanation of organized complexity (14, 317). He also says because life is so statistically improbable, it cannot be due to random chance. Then he says the antithesis of chance is non-random survival, and this is the true explanation for the existence of life. Single-step selection is random, but cumulative selection is non-random. Nowhere does Dawkins define cumulative selection, but he does say it is some kind of sorting or sieving process which converts a random process into a non-random one (45). It is then the sorting process, which he does not define, which becomes a being that has the power to do things. Regarding theologians, he says those that are sophisticated have long given up the idea of instantaneous creation, but many have smuggled God in the back door by some sort of guided evolution process (316). For Dawkins, science explains everything, and religion explains nothing. Richard Dawkins, "A Reply to Michael Poole," *Science and Christian Belief* (August 1995), 7(1), 46-47.

⁴⁵ Tim Keller, "Creation, Evolution and the Christian Lay People," *The BioLogos Foundation*, February 23, 2012.

⁴⁶ Meredith G. Kline, "Because It Had Not Rained," *Westminster Theological Journal* 20 (1957-58), 439-443. One major problem with Kline's interpretation is that the word *yom* comes with evening and morning, and it is modified by a number, which means it must be a twenty-four-hour day. Jonathan Sarfari, "Hebrew Scholar affirms that Genesis means what it says!" *Creation* 27(4):48-51, Creation Ministries International. This was an interview with Hebrew Scholar, Dr. Ting Wang.

⁴⁷ Keller, 3-6.

⁴⁸ He refers to Richard Dawkins who holds this view. See also footnote, 20.

and an evolutionary biological process (EBP) and believing it as a worldview. He does not see any problem with EBP, the *modus operandi* of The BioLogos Foundation.⁴⁹ However, he and the leaders of BioLogos apparently fail to recognize that science is not cognitive, which means it cannot generate any true propositions. Therefore, it cannot prove anything, including whether the creation days in *Genesis* 1 were 24-hour days or not. The third issue is belief in evolution rules out a literal Adam and Eve. One response by Keller is that C. S. Lewis did not believe in a literal Adam and Eve, but he does not question "...the soundness of his personal faith."⁵⁰ However, in this case Keller says Paul believed that Adam and Eve were real people, so there is no reason not to take this part of *Genesis* as literal even though the rest of it does not have to be taken literal. Also, man is in a covenantal relationship with Adam, and believers are in a covenantal relationship with Christ, which would not be possible if Adam was mythological.⁵¹ Keller concludes that it is possible to harmonize EBP with the idea that Adam and Eve were real people, who fell into sin. To think otherwise, is too narrow.⁵² However, what he fails to tell us is how

evolved knuckle-draggers magically transformed themselves into two people.

Some parachurch creation organizations defend a young Earth and a literal six twenty-four days of creation. Two such organizations are the Institute for Creation Research (ICR) and Creation Ministries International (CMI). Scientists from both organizations have demonstrated that geological and radiometric dating arguments for an old Earth have no credibility.⁵³ However, other scientists who claim to be Christians have attacked the work of these organizations for questioning the authority of science. Christian Astronomer, Hugh Ross, says "they [including Henry Morris at ICR] are misguided and are misleading many whose science education and [B]iblical training are inadequate to aid them in evaluation."⁵⁴ Ross, who agrees with the Big Bang theory, says estimates show the universe to be 12 to 14 billion years old,⁵⁵ and planets and stars evolved by natural processes.⁵⁶ Geologists, Howard Van Til and Davis Young of Calvin College, believe religion and science need to stay in separate compartments and not impose their views on the other. They also criticize creation scientists who

⁴⁹ The BioLogos Foundation (www.biologos.org) was formed in 2007 by Francis Collins. The presuppositions of this organization are both that God has revealed himself in two ways, through the Bible and through creation, or the Book of Nature. Science has demonstrated that evolution is true, so Scripture needs to be accommodated to the theory of biological evolution. Anti-evolution literature presents a false choice between science and faith, which causes a loss of credibility among young people in the church.

⁵⁰ Keller, 7. One has to wonder how sound Keller's assurance about Lewis' salvation was when he denied the inerrancy of Scripture, believed works in addition to faith are necessary for salvation and rejected the doctrine of Christ's atonement. See John W. Robbins, "Did C. S. Lewis Go to Heaven?" *The Trinity Review* (November, December 2003).

⁵¹ Modern Bible skeptics claim that *Genesis* originated from the Babylonian creation account (*Enuma Elish*). Linguist, Charles Taylor ("The Myth About Myths in Early Genesis," *Creation* (August 1984), of Creation Ministries International informs us it is history that has to happen before myth can arise.

⁵² Keller, 12-13. There is a raging debate now within the church concerning the search for the historical Adam, just as there was some years ago about the search for the historical Jesus. Matthew Barrett and Ardel Caneday, editors, *Four Views on The Historical Adam*, Zondervan, 2015. This book is reviewed by Shawn Doyle, "A Review of *Four Views on the Historical Adam*," *Journal of Creation* 28(2), 35-40. The fact that this issue is considered a legitimate topic for discussion shows how low the view of Scripture is in the current Protestant church.

⁵³ At ICR, see various articles on the fallacy of radiometric dating by physicist, Vernon R. Cupps. At CMI there are numerous articles on geology which expose the fraud of dating methods by different scientists, including, engineer, Tas Walker. Rock dates are accepted only if they agree with the presuppositions of the investigator. Tas Walker, "The Way It Really Is: Little known Facts about Radiometric Dating," *Creation* 24 (4) (September 2002), 20-23. Geologist, John Woodmorappe, analyzes the modern dating methods, including dogmatic claims of their success in proving the Earth is very old. He says these claims are laughable because of their fatal flaws. See John Woodmorappe, *The Mythology of Modern Dating Methods*, The Institute for Creation Research, 1999, vii, 95-96. Alexander Williams reports that isotope dating reflects the persistence of the investigator rather than anything else. Data and methods are changed until the long-age acceptable results are found. Alexander R. Williams, "Long-Age Isotope Dating Short on Credibility," *CEN Tech J.*, volume 6(1), 2-5.

⁵⁴ Hugh Ross, *The Fingerprint of God*, Promise Publishing Co., 1989, 155. This is an example of the logical fallacy of the abusive *ad hominem* argument. If one is a creationist, then he is incompetent in science.

⁵⁵ Ross, 123.

⁵⁶ James Stambaugh, "Hugh Ross, ICR, and Facts of Science," Institute for Creation Research, date unknown. Ross accepts the evolutionist doctrine of punctuated equilibrium, promoted by Harvard biologist, Elliott Gould. This theory says species came about abruptly at certain times in the past, which is supposed to explain the embarrassing lack of transitional forms in the fossil record. Don Batton, "Punctuated Equilibrium: A Coming of Age?" *Journal of Creation*, 8(2) (August 1994), 131-137.

impose the Biblical assumption of a young Earth on science rather than letting science determine the age based on its own criteria. They call “folk” science the view of either creationists or evolutionists who use science to support their preconceived philosophical or theological views.⁵⁷ In another work, Davis Young says, “We Christians need to stop expending our energies in defending a false creationism and refuting a false creationism... A vigorous Christian science will be of far more service in meaningful evangelism and apologetics than the fantasies of young-Earth creationism.”⁵⁸ Another supposedly Christian physicist, Karl Giberson, takes the view that evolution explains life from molecules to man, there was no literal Adam Eve, the *Gospels* contain contradictions, and man was poorly designed. There is so much evidence the Earth is 5 billion years old, the young Earth creation account is no more believable than a flat Earth.⁵⁹ He believes science is true, evolution is science, and therefore evolution is true.⁶⁰ In a review of Giberson’s book, Jerry Bergman asks why this man still believes in God, and the author’s apparently candid answer is: rejecting God would upset his Christian parents, his wife, and he might lose his job at the Christian college where he is employed.⁶¹ The reason neither Ross, Young, nor Giberson believe in a literal twenty-four hour six-day creation and other Biblical truths is because they have adopted more than one source of truth—science in addition to the Bible. In addition, they view science as a higher authority than the Bible, so the latter must always be harmonized with the former. But if Biblical revelation cannot be satisfactorily harmonized with science, then we have contradictory epistemologies, and the end result is skepticism.⁶²

⁵⁷ Howard J. Van Til and Davis A. Young, *Science Held Hostage*, InterVarsity Press, 1988, 169-178.

⁵⁸ Davis A. Young, *Christianity and the Age of the Earth*, The Zondervan Publishing House, 1982, 164.

⁵⁹ Karl W. Giberson, *Saving Darwin: How to be a Christian and Believe in Evolution*, HarperCollins, 2008, 146. The forward to this book was written by Francis Collins, founder of BioLogos.

⁶⁰ He refers to the work on falsification by Karl Popper, who at one time believed evolution was not science, but later changed his mind (187).

⁶¹ Jerry Bergman, “The Tragic Toll of Toxic Teaching,” *Journal of Creation* (25)3 2011, 155-156.

⁶² Clark considers two competing epistemologies—rationalism and revelation, and there are five possibilities. If science is substituted for rationalism, then these five are: 1) all the truths of revelation are the truths of science, and all the truths of science are the truths of revelation; 2) all truths of revelation are truths of science, but some truths of science are not truths of revelation; 3) some but not all truths of revelation are truths of science, and some but not all truths of science are truths of revelation; 4) All truths of science are truths of revelation, but

On the other hand, if we only have one source of truth, then this epistemological problem vanishes. The correct epistemology for Christians is the Bible alone,⁶³ and God intended Scripture beginning with *Genesis* and ending with *Revelation* to be understandable to his people. The creation week of six twenty-four-hour days and the Sabbath day is clear, being verified by *Exodus* 16:26 and 20:9-11. In *Genesis* 1 and the other two references in *Exodus*, the context is ordinary days.⁶⁴ In *Genesis* 1 God defines a day as the night plus the daytime. It is unfortunate that some Christians, particularly those that believe in theistic evolution, cannot stand being considered ignorant by the world (*Galatians* 1:10).⁶⁵ However, Gary Crampton correctly states “since the Bible has a monopoly on truth, whatever is true about creation must be learned from the Bible.”⁶⁶

Summary

In the Postscript of his *The Philosophy of Science and Belief in God*, Gordon Clark says, “in the present state of affairs, the world at large holds science in such high regard that some Christians have begun to question the value of preaching the Gospel. They have begun to share in the idolatry of science” (97). Theories are chosen by physicists for all sorts of reasons, but none of them has anything to do with the truth. Today the idea that science discovers truth is a falsehood that is assumed as true within the Protestant church as it is in the secular world, which is baffling given all the counter information presented by physicists themselves and science

some truths of revelation are not truths of science; 5) there is no overlap between revelation and science. Thus, even if we allowed some propositions of science to be true, there is no way to determine whether these two sources of knowledge conflict or not. See *Christian Philosophy*, 22-23.

⁶³ Russell Grigg, “How Long were the Days of Genesis 1?” *Creation* 19(1): 23-25 (December 1996). Grigg demonstrates there are different Hebrew words that would have been used for creation if long ages were intended.

⁶⁴ The numerical qualifier demands 24-hour days of creation. “The word ‘day’ appears over 200 times in the Old Testament with numbers (*i.e.*, first day, second day, *etc.*). In every single case, without exception, it refers to a 24-hour day.... Genesis 1:14 distinguish between days, years, and seasons.... Clearly the days here represents days, years represents years, seasons represents seasons.” Niessen, 4.

⁶⁵ This point was made in a sermon by William Mencarow, “6 Day Creation & The Presuppositions of Science: How Important Is Creation & Belief In Six 24 Hour Days of Creation,” June 22, 2008, www.sermonaudio.com. He also points out that “created” out of nothing (*baw raw*) in *Genesis* 1:1 is a heading, and verses 2 onward are subheadings under the main heading.

⁶⁶ W. Gary Crampton, “The Days of Creation,” *The Trinity Review* (February 1997).

philosophers. Not only is science not cognitive, it can't explain anything. Only revelation – the Scripture – gives truth. The Bible alone has a monopoly on truth. Clark gives the illustration that because the atomic particle world consists mainly of empty space, nobody can explain when one picks up one end of a pencil that the other end comes with it (91). There may be numerous reasons why physicists choose particular theories, but none of them has anything to do with truth (70).

Not only is science not a cognitive enterprise, but it is not clear when somebody mentions the word *science*, they know what they are talking about. Christian philosopher, J. P. Moreland says, "There is no clear-cut definition of science. Neither are there any generally accepted necessary and sufficient conditions for drawing a line of demarcation between science and non-science. It is foolish to say, based on popular opinion, that science, by definition, rules out theological or philosophical concepts."⁶⁷ Thus, not only is science not cognitive, neither is it intelligible. Christian astrophysicist, John Byl, believes that science should fall within the philosophy of instrumentalism,⁶⁸ which avoids the pitfall of the realist view of scientific theories. Science is at best useful opinion, but it is void of any epistemological content.⁶⁹ It is long overdue that seminary professors, pastors, and para-church creation organizations repent of worshipping the idol of science and return to *Sola Scriptura*. Finally, those creation groups that support the literal 24-hour six-day creation on the one hand but endorse heliocentrism without taking into consideration what the Scripture says about geocentrism on the other hand, also need to repent of putting *science* before Scripture. More exegesis of Scripture needs to be done to evaluate the two models. Christians should not support any Christian group or church that does not adhere to *Sola Scriptura* as the source of all knowledge.

New Sale Prices

In light of Reformation Day, October 31, 2019, the following products have new sale prices:

Tract – "Civilization and the Protestant Reformation" bundle of 100 now \$9 instead of \$12

DVDs – *A Lamp in the Dark*, *Tares Among the Wheat*, and *Bridge to Babylon* now 35% off retail, instead of 25% off

These sale prices are good from October 31, 2019 through January 6, 2020.

The other sale prices are still in effect through January 6, 2020.

The Trinity Foundation is a tax-exempt religious organization under 501 (c) 3 non-profit code, supported by the gifts given by those who appreciate this ministry and by the sales of books and other media. All gifts are tax deductible to the fullest extent of the law. If you wish to support the work of The Trinity Foundation, which publishes *The Trinity Review*, you may donate through the Foundation's web site, by phone at 423.743.0199, or by sending your donation by mail to The Trinity Foundation, P. O. Box 68, Unicoi, Tennessee 37692. Thank you also for your prayers, which are essential.

⁶⁷ J. P. Moreland, *Christianity and the Nature of Science*, Baker Book House, 1989, 56-57. Regarding the so-called scientific method, he concludes, "...there is no single thing called the scientific method" (101).

⁶⁸ This is the idea that laws, theories, and hypotheses are "...used to control, predict, explain, organize, and create possibilities for human experience. Whether ideas are true or false is not a serious question..." Peter Angeles, *The Harper Collins Dictionary of Philosophy*, HarperCollins Publishers, 1992, 147.

⁶⁹ John Byl, "Instrumentalism: A Third Option," *JASA* 37 (March 1985), 11-18.