

## INTER-OFFICE

Date:

Department:

Subject:

From:

---

---

I think I have found the culprit. There has been some measure of difference in the geology and science taught in second year Bible and what was taught in Historical Geology. What I taught has always been known to Dr. Hoeh, Mr. Plache, Mr. Hegvold and to England because the concepts are written down and distributed to the class and other interested parties. On the other hand I have had no information from any other faculty member anyplace with the single exception of Mr. John Portune in England some years ago, and a semester astronomy test from Mr. Hegvold two years ago. And a continual exchange of letters with Mr. Gene Hughes over the years on the Carbon 14 dating problems.

The culprit is this Whitcomb & Morris text used in second year Bible. While on the one hand it is chucked full of valuable factual material, on the other hand the facts are often poorly understood, often used to support farfetched conclusions, and mixed with a measure of faulty information. To correct such a book is a monumental task in that the author does not recognize how to prove a thing true, but rather proceeds by making assertions that are beyond disproof. He might as well claim all the conclusions of the astronomers about the moon to be false because he knows reputable people who think it is made of green cheese. And how would we disprove him? The samples brought back. They are so only surface material, down under it is green cheese. It is a favorite gimmick of a debator, to make the other man do the footwork and furnish the proof.

Here is a real example of his absurd thinking:

On page 370 of The Genesis Flood, "the time required for light to reach us from the most distant stars is only 15 years." We do not propose to evaluate this theory . . . The very fact that such a theory can be developed and seriously considered demonstrates that astronomy has nothing really definite as yet to say about the age of the universe."

What can one say to an author who thinks like that? Or to students who memorize and believe as basic truth his "fact" that nothing can be said about the age of the universe. They come into our science classes with their feet braced like a Missouri mule.

The distances to the "height of the heavens" are truly uncertain and the uncertainty increases with the distance. What I have taught continually for years is that the "heavens declare the glory of God, the firmament shows His handiwork," that we are to "consider the heavens how high they are," that the stars "wax old, but Thou art the same," that the sun is a star and that the stars are suns, and a multitude of other concepts that are in direct agreement with the Scriptures. To make our sun appear as a faint star it must be placed 10 parsecs away, a distance of 32.6 light years. Fainter stars and galaxies are obviously much more distant.

Astronomy shows a Creator who has lived for uncountable years, a Creator whose influence is from one end of heaven to the other, it shows a beginning of the heavens, a heavens that is "stretched out" that "fled from God's face" if the quote in Revelation can be applied. It is a universe with a history, with stars that are aging and that will ultimately burn themselves out with old age, while God remains eternally old without aging.

Thus astronomy is a fantastic proof. Yet our students have the most negative attitude toward science that I've seen, unless among the Mennonites and similar groups. Yet those groups do not want the fruit of science and our students do. They all look forward to a high-powered car with power steering, power windows, AM-FM radio with cartridge for playing taped music, easy-eye glass, safety glass, beautiful upholstery and on and on it goes.

Mr. Hegvold emphasized this negative attitude of our students with regard to science in his paper some years ago. Our science instructors frequently bring up the problem. Yet the die is already cast in too many cases; the student is already convinced that science courses are out of the question for anyone interested in serving God. Yet the heavens are the "work of His fingers." It seems incredible. Surely as sons, we ought to be about our elder Brother's and Father's business.

The typical theology-versus-science author is strongly motivated by the nominal Christianity of Protestantism and Catholicism. It is that spirit that permeates their writing. The Catholic Church has been antisience for two millenniums. It opposed elliptical orbits for the planets because only circular orbits would be "perfect" the way God would make them. It opposed sunspots because anything God made would not have spots on it. It opposed moons around Jupiter because there are seven heavenly bodies just like there are seven holes in our heads, no more. It opposed anything that disagreed with the demon-led Aristotle. Scientists of the Dark Ages were in the same peril as the true Christian and the various other "Christian" sects. And many among the leading scientists were obviously Jewish. One scientist in good humor wrote that one way to go to the moon would be on a broomstick, only to have his mother accused of being a witch and threatened with being burned alive.

The typical theology-versus-science writer is against everything that scientific procedure has ever discovered, be it true or false, legal or illegal, moral or immoral. And in his arguments uses all the cunning and subtlety of the spirit that guides those churches. Truth mixed with error and a complete lack of appreciation or understanding of God's Creation.

I want to go over this book The Genesis Flood carefully page by page with others in the science field. Its section on thrust faults is completely untrustworthy. And it seems apparent that the author knew better when he wrote it. His astronomy lacks a polite word to describe it. These samples cast doubt on his honesty as a writer all the way through. Yet the book contains a wealth of factual material. But all of it must be doublechecked for accuracy and especially for the logic and fairness of the conclusion he reaches.

The temptation in the garden of Eden, what was it that Adam and Eve did? The Catholics say they partook of sex. The man on the street says they each took a bite out of an apple. The antiscience writers say they partook of science, especially experimental science. Experiment illegally and at the recommendation of Satan they did. But does that condemn the careful, allowable experiments that we do on campus today with radio stations, with types of ink and paper, with methods of teaching.

The scholar comes to conclusions by carefully comparing written authority with written authority. And looks down his nose at the scientist who looks at God's Creation checking his observations repeatedly to make sure they are right. How did information get in the books and the scholar uses as his proof? From observers, some careful, some just the run-of-the-mill newspaper reporters of the time. Some ancient books are the chronicles of the king and written the way he wanted it written. All "knowledge" in the Dark Ages was checked with Aristotle for accuracy.

Why atheism had its period of growth during the Reformation? Men turned away from the only religion they knew, from the Catholic Church. "If this is Christianity (they said then and many say today) we don't want it." They never had contact with the true Church of God. College students (in the world) are exposed for the first time in their lives to the truth about the horrors of the Dark Ages and the continuing practices of the Catholic Church. Believing that church to be the central core of Christianity, they turn away. In humor I would say they are halfway toward conversion.

The science courses I have taught and that are taught by others, so far as I know, take the written Revelation as Truth and what men see with their eyes as truth, and put the two together to come up with a valuable understanding of the Creation, even of the unseen Creation. But the problem I

have seen among many students is that they seem to believe nothing that is not in the Bible. Ask them for an evaluation on a topic and they routinely say they do not know, and they do not know how to find out, unless it is in the Bible. Yet the Apostles and early Christians believed both their eyes and the reports of eye witnesses as to the resurrection, and that was not written in the Bible till good many years later. Not only is the Bible Truth but also "that which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, which our hands have handled."

This is the concept that escapes so many of our students who somehow have come to hate science. They equate it with explosions, with "Lost in Space," confuse it with atheism and astrology. The vacuum in their thinking attracts psuedo-science and superstitions. Instead of a growing appreciation of God's handiwork they tend toward the monk's withdrawal to a tiny barren cubicle with two buckets, one for water . . . .

Will give this book a thorough going over as I promised you I would do about three or more years ago. We need our own, though Deluge Story in Stone was a valuable text.