

## The Bible Must Harmonize with Science if it is to Qualify as Truth

The Bible makes bold claims pertaining to both the natural order (science) and our relationship to it. For example, Psalm 19:1 declares as **true** that both the starry heavens above and the array of living creatures and inanimate things below, in themselves, “*declare the glory of God.*” The positive assessment this verse assigns to nature’s witness boldly underscores its’ innate trustworthiness. Furthermore, Romans 1:18-20 warns that it is sinful to **suppress** truths derived from our observation of nature, specifically as they pertain to God’s existence.

The Bible also, everywhere and without exception, assumes<sup>1</sup> as valid the *Law of Non-Contradiction* which holds that **contradictory** propositions cannot both be true in the same way and at the same time. Also, Scripture demands our obedience to truth in this sense, both in our consciences and in all social interactions.<sup>2</sup> Consequently, young-earth creationism (**YEC**) cannot be correct **if** it rejects evidence the universe is billions of years old based on data that is shown to be unassailable. Even in legal courts, testimony must reconcile with facts and not vise/versa. Indeed, despite YEC claims, the Bible never asserts its truthfulness by shunning knowable facts, but rather urges us to affirm its truth by testing it in light of the facts of science and history.<sup>3</sup>

Scientific facts DO NOT undermine the Bible. Indeed, the text of Genesis 1 harmonizes far better with Big Bang Cosmology (**BBC**) than it does with the YEC interpretation.<sup>4</sup>

## Scientists Too Must Reconcile their Views with Science

Yet it is not only Christians who must check their sources, but also scientists! They too are vulnerable to error even in their own fields. Just like the rest of us, they have biases and shortcomings. So they too must heed both the principles of *scientific methodology*<sup>5</sup> (**SM**) and the validity of their data in order to ensure their conclusions are correct. Yet many, (not all) of them corrupt their perceptions by insisting on the **non-provable materialistic** presumption that God (and other *soulish* beings) cannot exist. This bias leads them to evade *all* scientific indicators of that beginning, **solely** because it logically infers the reality of a *transcendent*<sup>6</sup> *personal* God. Materialists also deny that humans (“soul-less machines”) have *rational* minds even while they ironically laud the insights of its champions (which contradict their very own tenet).

## Scientific Forces Cannot Possibly Have Created our Universe

While scientific data gives virtually unassailable evidence *that* our universe began out of nothing at the BB,<sup>7</sup> the *cause* of that beginning cannot have been a *scientific* force. Since prior to its zero-volume singularity there existed **neither** matter, **nor** energy, **nor** space, **nor** even

---

<sup>1</sup> Aristotle *clarified* but did not *invent* the principles of logic. Renford Bambrough, ed. *The Philosophy of Aristotle*. (Mentor, 1963) p. 160f.

<sup>2</sup> *Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*. (Thomas Nelson, 2001) lists over 900 biblical references which affirm this concept of truth.

<sup>3</sup> Request my paper, “The Pervasive Employment of Apologetics in the Bible,” at my email address, gjensen549@gmail.com.

<sup>4</sup> See my two papers, “How Genesis 1:1 Easily Accommodates the Big Bang,” and “15 Clues from Genesis 1 that Creation is Ancient.” Op.cit. (3).

<sup>5</sup> Ernst Nagel describes SM as “*the persistent critique of arguments [using] tried canons for judging the reliability of the procedures by which [evidence is] obtained, and for assessing the probative evidence on which conclusions are based.*” In summary, although there is no single set of principles that apply to every context, SM calls for methodical care. J.P. Moreland. *Christianity and the Nature of Science*. (Baker, 1989), pp. 57f.

<sup>6</sup> To “transcend” is to stand entirely outside creation. See my paper, “Was the Big Bang the Big Beginning?” Op.cit. (3).

<sup>7</sup> Hugh Ross. *The Creator and the Cosmos*. (RTB, 2018), pp. 85-107. \*\* William Lane Craig. *Reasonable Faith*. (Crossway, 2008), pp. 126-150.

time,<sup>8</sup> **nothing material** could conceivably have created it.<sup>9</sup> Physicalist cosmologists seek to evade this problem by resorting to *abstract speculations as opposed to* testable measurable evidence.<sup>10</sup> Yet this ploy rules out their proposed cause from qualifying as *scientific* since, by definition, it lies outside the realm of objective scientific investigation. Consequently, science cannot provide an answer, let alone, address the cause of nature. Its' cause then can only logically be God, the *transcendent*<sup>11</sup> *Creator*.

## What is at Stake in the Weight that Christians Give to Science?

The question of scientific authority has no bearing on any measure of God's power or competence, but instead seeks for the relevant data of nature to indicate *how* God may have *chosen* to fashion it. I believe God could easily have fashioned the universe in an instant had He willed to. But the evidence from nature (which Romans says is true) indicates that He did not.

I instead endeavor to rekindle a robust biblical delineation of the validity of the categories of both facts and biblical revelation and their relationship to each other. I also seek to assist parents in offering a more constructive reply to their children who say that the science they are learning in school contradicts what they were "told" from the Bible. On the authority of the Bible, I affirm both realms to be valid and, at the very least, do not necessarily conflict. As for the circumstances when they *do* seem to conflict, two things may be said. Firstly, a **careful** study of the text of Genesis 1 shows that nothing specific is said as to exactly *how* anything was created or formed except to say that God created, or formed, every bit of it! Secondly, truth can be conveyed in not only scientific language but also in daily conversational speech. For example, the lines, "*You put the right ingredients together and bake them at the right temperature*" (science), and "*Aunt Matilda loves to bake cakes*" (religion), can both be factually true with respect to the question, "*Where did this cake [on the table] come from?*"<sup>12</sup>

But what must NOT be done is to insist that the Bible demands the last word. I earlier established that it commands us to trust the witness of nature as a vital means by which God convicts the world that He is its creator. I then established the impossibility of material forces causing the creation of the universe from nothing (material). In summary, while the Bible blesses scientific insight and discovery, in light of section 3 the latter must also bow to God as the *only* conceivable cause cosmic existence. Consequently we believers in the Bible ought to highlight scientific evidence as opposed to hiding it "*under a bushel*" (Matthew 5:15). For if we fail to affirm science as an arena of truth, it will be impossible to gain the attention of intellectuals, or continue our children in faith in the truth of the Gospel, that God holds out to all!

Gary Jensen, Pastor, © November 3, 2020

Holy Trinity Lutheran Church (NALC), Berlin, PA, USA

In addition to my M.Div. from Luther Seminary in 1982, I also received an M.S. with Honors in *Science and Religion* from Biola University in 2016

---

<sup>8</sup> William Lane Craig. Reasonable Faith. (Crossway, 2008), p. 140, states, "A watershed of sorts seems to have been reached with Borde, Guth, and Vilenkin's formulation establishing that any universe which has on average over its past history been in a state of cosmic expansion cannot be eternal in the past but must have a spacetime boundary."

<sup>9</sup> Frank Tipler. The Physics of Christianity. (Doubleday, 2007), p. 2, says that "Many physicists dislike [an absolute beginning] because it requires the universe to begin in a singularity. That is, they dislike it because the theory is consistent only if God exists."

<sup>10</sup> Hugh Ross. The Creator and the Cosmos. (RTB, 2018), pp. 85-107. \*\* William Lane Craig. Op.cit. (8), pp. 126-150.

<sup>11</sup> To transcend is to stand entirely the system or circumstance that is under consideration.

<sup>12</sup> John C. Lennox. God's Undertaker: Has Science Buried God? (Lion, 2009), pp. 207-8.