SCIENCE - TRUTH OR FICTION ?

The Bible claims that God's Word is Truth in John 17:17. Isaiah 8:20 makes this bold statement, "...if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." A strong statement that! Yet many in the name of science deny vast portions of the Bible if not the entirety of it. How can this be?

First - just what is science? According to Webster's Dictionary the word science comes from a French word that means "to know". Several alternate definitions are given, each of which include knowledge, facts and truth. Two specific definitions given are: (1) "a branch of study concerned with observation and classification of facts, especially, with the establishment of verifiable laws." and (2) "accumulated knowledge systematized and formulated with reference to the discovery of general truths or the operation of general laws." Note particularly these three points: (1) verifiable laws, (2) general laws and (3) general truths. It is very plain then, if the Bible is true (and you can prove that it is) and scientists restricted themselves strictly to scientific conclusions within the confines of these definitions of science, THERE COULD BE NO CONFLICT! Truth is truth no matter where it is found - in the Bible, or in the heavens, or in the scientific laboratories, or wherever!

"Scientists" Veer from Definition

Advances in technology have certainly proved the value of scientific research and development. Space achievements have also proved that many of the predictions of science, even though they have had a "Buck Rogerish" aspect, were absolutely correct. The television and electronic industries, based on an ever-widening area of scientific research and development, have had a tremendous impact on the American economy and way of life - whether for good or bad is a debatable point. Nowhere is it possible to avoid coming into direct contact with many of the chemical products that have resulted from chemical research and development. Certainly those branches of science have proved that they are based on a solid footing of truth. Mechanical, optical and sound technologies have also made tremendous contributions to the American way of life - the automobile and the jet plane have revolutionized the American mode of travel. Can it be denied that any of these are based on a good truthful scientific footing? No it cannot!

But, since "scientists" do not generally agree with the Bible, something is wrong. The Bible is absolutely true, which you can prove and certainly ought to prove or prove again if you have already proved it once. Science is based on: (1) verifiable laws, (2) general laws and (3) general truths - so it is true by its very definition. Thus we are confronted with an apparent paradox - truth contradicting truth. Why?

The problem is much the same in science as it is in religion - many come in the name of Christ who don't really

believe Him or obey Him; so also many come in the name of science or claim to be scientists who are not scientists at all in the strict sense of the term. The respect and sometimes almost worship that science receives from the public is due to the technological advances of true science and the inability of most people to differentiate between the results of true science and the wild claims of the pseudo-sciences. "Confidence toward science is steadily growing, founded upon the progressive generality that marks the march of science as well as upon the successful application of technology, both indicating that the complex symbolic structures developed by scientists do reflect in some fashion, even though ambiguously and with distortions, the complex order and structure of nature." (The Elements and Structure of the Physical Sciences by J. A. Ripley, page 550). Notice that he attributes the growing confidence in science to its application in making things - things that are physical and can be seen and felt. THERE IS NO DOUBTING WHAT THEY CAN SEE AND FEEL - so they think that science is true as it takes credit for their production. But is it really?

The "scientists", themselves, often doubt the veracity of their claims! Note this amazing analysis of Karl Popper's philosophy of science given by Herman Bondi in his book The Universe at Large, page 18, "His analysis is so profound and rings so true that it may be useful to describe it here in brief. The essential point that Popper makes with such force is that the real basis of science is the possibility of empirical

DISPROOF. It is NOT PROOF that is of importance in science; on the contrary, he claims, PROOF CAN NEVER BE GIVEN!" (caps are mine). Karl Popper is the author of Logic of Scientific Discovery, Basic Books, 1959. This doesn't sound like a science made up of verifiable laws, general laws and general truth - somewhere somehow they have gotten off the track of true science. They still go under the name of science, though. Isn't this what the apostle Paul had reference to in I Tim. 6:20, "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called:"? To understand what has happened in the "scientific field" it is necessary to get a basic understanding of what constitutes a "science".

Physical Science

One would guess by the name that a "physical science" should have something to do with physical things and that all "sciences" dealing with physical things should be called "physical science"; but they aren't - why not? Professor J. A. Ripley in his book The Elements And Structure of The Physical Sciences, page 3, states that: "...the subject matter of physical science is the systematic development of generalizations involving matter and energy in all their manifestations. ...But, it may be asked, if we include all manifestations of matter and energy, does not that imply the inclusion of biology and possibly psychology as well?... It is enough to say that unlike astronomy, most of geology, and chemistry ..., biology is still very far from permitting

...its systematic reduction to, and inclusion as, a branch of physical science."

Biology and part of geology are not considered by Professor Ripley to be included as part of the physical sciences for reasons that will become clearer as the study continues.

Biology is now called a "science" but it is obvious that it does not as yet come within the definition of "science" given in Webster's Dictionary. Because the "biolobical sciences" have by popular and long usage become known as "science" it has become necessary to differentiate between them and the "physical sciences". A little reflection on the names will show how arbitrary the names are - biological things certainly are just as physical as those of the physical sciences. They just cannot be included as physical science because they do not conform to the definition of "physical science" i.e., to be capable of a "systematic development" - which is in actuality the dictionary definition of just plain science!

Since the biological "sciences" do not reduce to general and verifiable laws, these "sciences" have become fertile ground for the doctrine of evolution. Indeed, so deeply entrenched is the evolutionary "lie" in the biological "sciences" that the professors and teachers in these fields of study claim that they cannot teach biology "truthfully" in states that have anti-evolution laws on the statute books. Most of the law-makers have been so steeped themselves in the lies of evolution taught in the name of "biological science"

that they sincerely think that these fields of study are, in actuality, part of science (that is "to know") and that they would appear to be bigoted and uneducated if they opposed the repeal of such "stupid" laws. So the ancient doctrine of evolution gained a secure foothold in the educational institutions of the western world by its acceptance within the fold of revered "science" - "biological science" (and through these into the "earth sciences").

During the seventeenth-century Scientific Revolution chemistry began to gain some status as a science. Dr. Derek Price's book, Science Since Babylon, makes this statement on page 70: "During that century, chemistry, as the next of the sciences, began to climb from the uncertain rationale of technology toward some scientific status."

At about this same time organic chemistry began to be organized into a systematic science along with inorganic chemistry, although the connection between the two was complicated by the fact that life processes were considered to be a part of organic chemistry. Now organic chemistry is simply that portion of the chemical sciences that is concerned with the carbon compounds. The need for the theory of evolution is rather closely associated with the expulsion of life processes from chemistry - the "life process" (biological) area of study was still not organized as a science. This is clearly brought out in the following quote found on pages 71 and 72 of Price's book, Science Since Babylon: "As organic chemistry was shakily rising, so also

were the biological sciences. To let drop the magic name of Darwin is sufficient to demonstrate the intensity of the revolution that he created and that resounded more than any previous scientific advance in its public repercussions. Although this was one of the greatest scientific advances ever made, it is important to realize that it was not a breakthrough but a BREAK-INTO. At the time when Darwin's theories were promulgated, the biological sciences comprised barely more than sort of catalogue raisonne'. The pieces of the jigsaw puzzle were all sorted, and it was Darwin and his contemporaries who laid out the frame and began the job of creating what was virtually a new science." (caps mine).

Dr. Price calls Darwin's contribution a "scientific advance", but he clearly points out that it was through evolution that the biological data could be systematized into what is now called "biological science". The "laws" around which biology had to be organized into a "science" are actually only those postulated by the theory of evolution. Stated another way biology, as a science, is based on no laws at all and cannot rightly be called a science in the true meaning of the word. William P. D. Wightman brings this point out very emphatically in his book, The Growth of Scientific Ideas on page 395: "The Big Idea of biology is evolution. It stands in relation to biology as the atomic theory to chemistry, and the theory of gravitation to physics."

The previous quote from Ripley's book on the physical sciences also states that only part of geology could rightly

be called one of the physical sciences. Why? It, too, as the "biological sciences" has been systematized into a "science" by the use of "laws" that in truth are not laws at all. These "laws" are based on the "principle of uniformitarianism" first proposed by Hutton and later popularized by Lyell. Since neither the theory of evolution nor the "principle of uniformitarianism" have ever been proved, nor can they be proved, "laws" based on them cannot be valid. The "sciences" based on "laws" derived from these theories cannot be valid sciences either.

What, then remains? - is there no truth at all in science? True science is present in our society today which, as already mentioned, our technological advances have proved, but the truth has been smothered by the sensational and popularized versions of "science". People are just naturally interested in a mystery, vain babblings, "fables and endless geneologies" (I Tim. 1:4) - seeking for the beginning of things. People like this approach because it tends to knock down authority and they hate authority and laws - primarily because God is the Lawgiver!

Science has historically been considered to be in opposition to religion. It is frequently forced into this position because of misunderstanding or mistrust, but often it is because of the presence among the scientists of those who profess "science falsely so called".

Gerald Holton makes this observation in his article "The False Images of Science" which appeared in the January 9, 1960

issue of the Saturday Evening Post: "To some extent science was pushed into this position (of an iconoclast) by the ancient but dangerous tendency of some philosophers to prove the existence of God by pointing to problems which science could not solve at the time. Newton himself, who was deeply interested in theology, wrote, 'It is not to be conceived that mere mechanical causes could give birth to so many regular motions (in the solar system). ...This most beautiful system of the sun, planets and comets could only proceed from the counsel and dominion of an intelligent and powerful Being.'"

The key to how a useful and true science can be determined is found in Newton's methods. He looked for "how" something worked or was behaving under existing conditions- not "where" or "how" or "when" it came to be. The law of universal gravitation (and it is a law in spite of the fact that Mr. Wightman called it a theory on page 7) determined by Newton is still the basis for all mechanical and physical law even today. Astronomy, physics, mechanics and chemistry are all based on the action of exact laws that can be observed in space or in the laboratory. It is a positive approach to understanding and using our environment - not the negative, disproving, doubting approach so much in vogue today.

Recently as the result of the "genius" of Albert Einstein, Newtonian Mechanics have been imputed to be in error in some very few cases - none of which are of any consequence except where the investigations wander off into the nebulous areas of: when it came to be, where it came from, and how it came

to be. In all normal areas of physical and mechanical sciences, Newtonian Mechanics still give exact answers - even orbital calculations for satellites still employ non-relativistic mechanics. Again quoting from Ripley's book, The Elements And Structure of The Physical Sciences, page 538, "So, in 1917, when Einstein began publishing his work in general relativity, an upsurge in cosmology took place and a new look was given the universe whose form seemed so precisely outlined in the mechanics of Newtonian physics. Einstein's general theory raised the possibility of an alternate way of looking at the universe." Just what does he mean by an "alternate way" of looking at it? It turns out that it is a philosophical way instead of a strictly scientific way.

Mr. Ripley on page 454 gives the following quote from The Principle of Relativity: "Henceforth space by itself, and time by itself, are doomed to fade away into mere shadows, and only a kind of union of the two will preserve the independent reality." And again he quotes from Albert Einstein, Philosopher-Scientist on page 463: "Why were another seven years required for the construction of the general theory of relativity? The main reason lies in the fact that it is not easy to free oneself from the idea that coordinates must have an immediate metrical meaning." In other words, one must divorce himself from reality! This approach has a certain degree of similarity with the metaphysical approach to religion in the east except for the mathematical rigor employed. Professor G. C. McVittie makes this frank admission in the

introduction to his book, General Relativity and Cosmology, on page 3: "An individual scientist may perhaps believe that he pursues his work without considering philosophical questions of this kind, but his belief is illusory, and arises simply because the scientist has unconsciously acquired some particular metaphysical outlook." And the outlook they have acquired is that there is no God!

These are the reasons for evolution and relativity taking such prominent positions in the "sciences" today - they are sensational and God rejecting! BUT THESE ARE NOT SCIENCES!

Reject All Science Then ?

Is there any value to any of the sciences then? Yes, even aside from the technological and economic blessings of applied science there are very deep educational benefits to be derived from the study of true science. Astronomy (with the pseudoscience, cosmology, stripped from it) is the backbone of all the true sciences and certainly proves the existence of a mighty God of which Newton made special note. Quoting again from Derek Price's book, Science Since Babylon, page 5: "...by far the most highly developed, most recognizably modern, yet most continuous province of scientific learning, was mathematical astronomy. ...In comparison, all other parts of modern science appear derivative or subsequent: either they drew their inspiration directly from the successful sufficiency of mathematical and logical explanations for astronomy or they developed later, probably as a result of such inspiration in adjacent subjects."

Gerald Holton brings out the vital need for some understanding of science in society today - even if only elementary in nature - in his article "The False Image of Science": "The brutal fact is that, by losing contact with even the elementary facts of modern science, our intellectuals for the first time in history, are losing their hold on understanding the world. Of all the evils arising from the separation of culture and scientific knowledge, this bewilderment and homelessness is the most terrifying."

God would have had a more difficult time in showing Job the tremendous feats of creation and sustaining the universe had Job had no understanding of science, astronomy, for instance. Job 38:31-33, "Canst thou bind the sweet influences of the Pleiades or loose the bands of Orion? Canst thou bring forth Mazzaroth in his seasons? or canst thou guide Arcturus with his sons? Knowest thou the ordinances of heaven? Canst thou set the dominion thereof in the earth?" This would have meant little to Job had he not known a little about astronomy, for example, the puzzler of star clusters—why they are grouped as they are has puzzled astronomers throughout all history. He knew of the orderly motion of the planets, moon and stars.

Daniel was well-versed in science too (see Dan. 1:4), which was part of the reason, at least, that he could be of use to the king of Babylon. It was also part of the reason he had such faith—he could understand better the awesome power and glory of God.

How did Job, Daniel, David and the others know about the complex order of the heavenly bodies? Could they have been acquainted with astronomy? Obviously they were-the preservation of the method for calculating the calendar by an infusion of principles of astronomy with the annual Sabbaths could only be acquired by a knowledge of astronomy and a knowledge of God! This fusion of knowledge of God and science is precisely what is lacking today in astronomy and all science! It is for this reason that astronomers, when considering the calendar, say that the joint motions of the sun, earth and moon are "incommensurable, no really satisfactory solution is possible, and the modern calendar of civilized nations entirely disregards the moon." (From Astronomy by Russell, Dugan, and Stewart).

The divergence apparently started back in Abraham's day according to Josephus. Then, as now, the simplified motions were used to serve specific purposes-then the Saros cycle was used to predict the eclipse seasons for pagan religious rites. Now again the tropical year is used to confuse the seasons of God's festivals. The Saros is a measure of the periodic regression of the nodes of the plane of rotation of the moon and is relatively easy to measure and tabulate with simple instrumentation-possibly Stonehenge was used for this very purpose. The Saros cycle has no connection with the nineteen year Metonic cycle although its period is confusingly close-a little over eighteen years.

The knowledge of the interrelation between the calendar calculations and God's seasons must have been what the Chaldeans did not want Abram to divulge to the people. (See Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, Book I, Chapter VII.) Another interesting point is cleared up in the same book by Josephus in chapter II, section 3 concerning Seth. He, too, was an astronomer and even left a record of the data still extant in Josephus' day.

Is it a coincidence that the base date for calendar calculation, 3761 B. C., should come in the early years of Seth's life? Could that be the reason that date is still used? He simply started it at that time and that date has carried on ever since. It certainly is too far off to have been confused with the date of creation.

God's people have anciently had a basic knowledge of science. At least an elementary knowledge of true science is essential to all educated people - and all Christians should be educated. Only the instruction Paul gave Timothy in I Tim. 1:4 needs to be followed, "Neither give heed to fables and endless genealogies," which means to seek after the sources or beginnings.