
```

+-+
| |
          SCIENCE AND FAITH
+-----+ +-----+
+-----+ +-----+          Vol 3, No. 2 September 1997
          | |          A publication of
          | |          The Gospel and Information Network
          | |
          +-+          ~    --

```

```

+-----+
| through |
|| Col    | Him  ||
|| 1:16   | and  ||
||        | for  ||
||        | Him  ||
|+-----+ +-----+|
|-----+ +-----+|
          O---
          O<-<-<
          /\ /
          <O--< |
          \/ \
          \ /
          O->-<---
          / \
          O _ /
          // \ \
          \o/
          !
          / \

```

Article archive available at www.mikelanderson.com

Unless otherwise indicated, copyright is held by the individual authors of the articles. This e-zine may be freely copied on condition it is done so in its entirety without alteration and free of charge.

To subscribe to Science & Faith put subscribe science_and_faith in the subject line of an e-mail message to scienceandfaith@mikelanderson.com

To unsubscribe to Science & Faith put unsubscribe science_and_faith in the subject line of an e-mail message to scienceandfaith@mikelanderson.com

Co-editors: Andy D Potts, Mike L Anderson

CONTENTS

Reflections of Heaven in the mirror of Nature:
 THE FIERY FURNACE(Frank Opie)

"Coming up the hill from Saldanha Bay to Vredenburg, I was overtaken by the sunset. Through a gap in the trees and hills, just before the water tower, I saw the sun set as never before ... "

Dr. Frank Opie is an Environmental Educationist at the Cape Town College of Education. Here he continues his series from his personal journal.

... A TIME TO LAUGH(From the Internet)

NEWS BRIEFS

- * Origin of asteroids believed solved by Hubble Telescope
- * Objects behaving as black holes discovered
- * New sub-atomic particle found.
- * Foxy fireflies
- * Medieval monks had medical prowess
- * The apostle Paul's detention site believed found in Israel
- * Archbishop wants warning labels on condoms
- * Whales and cows are cousins despite appearances
- * Fossil snake with legs found
- * 100 000-year old footprints of Eve found
- * Alleged sighting of huge serpent in Peru

GO TO THE BACTERIUM.....(Mike L Anderson)

"Do you ever find yourself working feverishly and wondering what there is to show for it? What is the antidote to burnout? Let me suggest that we go to the humble bacterium..."

Dr Mike Anderson is director of CAN.

ANECDOTES ABOUT SCIENTISTS

Fallacies and Fabrications in the Name of God and Science
 MISREPRESENTATION or CALLING A DUCK A CHICKEN
 >.....(Mike L Anderson)

Mike describes another specimen from his collection of fallacies.

QUOTES FROM MATHEMATICIANS

* * * Feature article * * *

SCIENCE AND CHRISTIANITY.....(Steven Schimmrich)

"Can I practice my chosen profession yet retain my salvation? As a geologist, must I accept young-earth creationism on the basis of my Evangelical belief in the inerrancy of Scripture? Or, is there simply no problem in being both a scientist and a Christian?"

Steven H. Schimmrich is a Geologist in the Department of Physical Sciences, Kutztown University, Kutztown, USA.
 E-mail address: schimmri@kutztown.edu
<http://www.uiuc.edu/ph/www/s-schim>

THE FIERY FURNACE 2/8/1995

Frank Opie

Coming up the hill from Saldanha Bay to Vredenburg, I was overtaken by the sunset. Through a gap in the trees and hills, just before the water tower, I saw the sun set as never before over Peace Mountain. I felt as if I were looking into the heart of a cosmic furnace that generated immense flames of brilliant orange cloud thrown into spectacular relief against depths of grey and blue sky. Through this glory the red sun sank into the western sea unseen. I took it all in at a single glance, wished for more, but had to turn my wondering gaze

back onto the busy road ahead. Yet in that moment that fire had kindled a fire within that painted itself into my mind more vividly than any artist or photographer could hope to capture.

Later that evening I asked my audience if they had seen the sun set....amazingly none had! They lived under the western sea sunsets and had missed the glory. It took a visitor to notice the majesty of the fiery sky. I felt a sadness for their loss and a joy in my treasured memory. Something inside me had reached out to embrace the sunset. I had responded to a call that others had not heard. It was so clear and compelling that I am amazed that they missed it. Whatever it was I felt sure that something had intruded and blocked out the vision of the setting star for the many. Perhaps the insistent claims of earth called louder than the momentous skyscape dominating all horizons for that moment of time.

Yet in my world the palette of life is immeasurably enriched by the flamboyant designs of sky, sea, mountains, light and darkness mingling in a kaleidoscopic merger, interwoven with awe and wonder. A cosmic holding of the breath as the fragile majesty of the planet of life speaks with an unheard voice, calling the children home with infinite longings. A sweet scent, a fragrance, a half remembered flavour, a sense of mystery enveloping the soul in a response of sad-joy grasped at, only to watch it fade with the light and trickle away between my fingers.....and they missed it again?

Earths crammed with heaven, and every common bush aflame
with God;
But only those who see take off their shoes and worship,
The rest sit around and pluck blackberries

Elizabeth Barrett Browning

... AND A TIME TO LAUGH.

"Biology is the only science in which multiplication means the same thing as division."

A mathematician, a physicist, and an engineer were all given a red rubber ball and told to find the volume. The mathematician carefully measured the diameter and evaluated a triple integral. The physicist filled a beaker with water, put the ball in the water, and measured the total displacement. The engineer looked up the model and serial numbers in his red-rubber-ball table.

jwest@jwest.ecen.okstate.edu:

A mathematician, scientist, and engineer are each asked:

"Suppose we define a horse's tail to be a leg. How many legs does a horse have?"

The mathematician answers "5"; the scientist "1"; and the engineer says "But you can't do that!"

NEWS BRIEFS

* Origin of asteroids believed solved by Hubble Telescope

Astronomers believe they may have uncovered the origin of the asteroid belt. Photographs made by the Hubble Space Telescope of the mini-planet Vesta showed a huge crater 13 kilometres deep with a diameter (456 kilometres) almost as long as the planet itself. A collision a billion years ago spewed out the material that made the asteroid belt orbiting the Sun between Mars and Jupiter.

* Objects behaving as black holes discovered

Astronomers have found strange objects that pull in gas and then disappear as predicted would happen for black holes. Black holes are believed to be massive stars that have collapsed under their gravitation. The gravitational force is so strong that nothing, not even light, can escape from them.

* New sub-atomic particle found.

Physicists have found evidence of a new subatomic particle. The particle, an exotic meson, has helped to confirm modern theories. It took five years of research using a particle accelerator to discover it.

* Foxy fireflies

Female fireflies (*Photuris versicolor*) lure males of another species (*Photinus ignitus*) by imitating the female's mating signal. The males are then eaten. Noxious chemicals called lucibugins are sequestered from their victims to deter predators.

* Medieval monks had medical prowess

Evidence has been found in a site near Edinburgh that monks used crude disinfectants and anaesthetics such as opium and hemlock hundreds of years before anyone else.

* The apostle Paul's detention site believed found in Israel

Archaeologists have uncovered a Roman detention site in Caesarea where they believe the Apostle Paul was held 2000 years ago.

* Archbishop wants warning labels on condoms

Archbishop Norberto Rivera of Mexico said condoms should carry

warning labels because their use fosters a "culture of death." He warned that improper use carried health risks.

* Whales and cows are cousins despite appearances

Japanese researchers have found genetic evidence suggesting that whales, cows and hippos share a common ancestor from 60 million years ago. The study ties in with fossil evidence linking whales to terrestrial herbivores called Mesonychids.

* Fossil snake with legs found

The journal Nature has reported the discovery, in Jerusalem, of an early snake with legs.

* 100 000-year old footprints of Eve found

The footprints of a possible ancestor of all modern humans has been found at Langebaan in South Africa. The findings help to confirm the out-of-Africa theory.

* Sighting of huge serpent in Peru

Terrified villagers in the Amazon jungle in claim to have sighted a 40 metre black serpent with a girth of 5 metres which felled trees. This presents a view problems for orthodox Zoology. The greatest authenticated length for a snake is 10 metres for the Reticulated python in Africa, and the greatest girth is little more than a metre for the Anaconda. Perhaps developers laying a pipeline tried to frighten the locals.

GO TO THE BACTERIUM

Mike L Anderson

"Go to the ant," said Solomon, as an antidote to sloth. The trouble today, with many Christian workers, is not sloth, but burn-out. Pastors, church leaders, counsellors and lay workers frequently feel swamped by the need in their own church - never mind the whole world. Reaching the world for God seems too big to even contemplate. Do you ever find yourself working feverishly and wondering what there is to show for it?

What is the antidote to burnout? Let me suggest that we go to the humble bacterium. We will pop one into a glass of a milk and wait for it to do what bacteria do- turn the milk sour. Let's give it a time limit for the job- say 12 hours. Now, if a bacterium could think it might be daunted by this task. "How can little ol' me do this?" it might complain.

Instead, it happily sets about converting the milk into lactic acid. Imagine that it is a very productive bacterium, and in twenty minutes converts as much milk as its body mass into acid. At this rate it would take it 10 million years to do the job.

If it thought about it, it might decide to work faster, perhaps doubling productivity. It would still be 5 million years over the deadline. Now if we watch the bacterium closely we will see it pause. Pause! But there's work to be done. And then a remarkable thing happens. The bacterium divides through binary fission. Now there are two doing the job. Twenty minutes later there are four doing it and then eight. In 12 hours under optimum conditions the glass will be more than sour; it will be full of bacteria. The job is done.

Someone once showed that if bacteria were allowed to reproduce at this rate unchecked, the world would be knee-deep in bacteria within 48 hours. In a few thousand years the mass of bacteria would be equivalent to the mass of the visible universe and would be expanding outward at the speed of light! It is the bacteria's powers of reproduction that enabled them to accomplish their task.

Jesus has given us the task of sweetening the world by making disciples of all the nations (Matthew 28:19-20). We can accomplish this by following in the bacteria's footsteps:

1. Jump in the milk. Engage the world.
2. Convert the milk. Present the gospel (God does the converting).
3. Pause. Stop doing everything yourself.
4. Reproduce. Show young converts how to present the gospel themselves and how they can help others do the same.

There is no need to feel overwhelmed by the world's need. Reproduce yourself spiritually in just two others and let God sweeten the world through them and their spiritual descendants. Not only will you avoid burn-out, it is actually a far more effective strategy for reaching the world.

ANECDOTES ABOUT SCIENTISTS - from the Internet

* While Boltzman gave a lecture on ideal gasses, he casually mentioned complicated calculations, which didn't give him any trouble. His students could not follow the fast mathematics and asked him to do the calculations on the blackboard. Boltzman apologized and promised to do better next time. The next lesson he began: "Gentlemen, if we combine Boyle's law with Charles's law we get the equation $pV = p_0 V_0 (1 + \alpha t)$. Now it is clear that $\int_a^b f(x) dx = F(b) - F(a)$, then is $pV = RT$ and $\int_V^S f(x,y,z) dV = 0$. It is so simple as one and one is two. At this moment he remembered his promise and dutifully wrote $1 + 1 = 2$. Then he continued with the complicated calculations from his bare mind.

Justus von Liebig (1803-1873) one day was approached by his assistant who all excited informed him that he had just discovered a universal solvent.

Liebig asked: "And what is a universal solvent?"

Assistant: "One that dissolves all substances."

Liebig: "Where are you going to keep that solvent,
then?!!!"

From: "Zoran Zdravkovski" <zoran@robigo.pmf.ukim.edu>

MISREPRESENTATION or CALLING A DUCK A CHICKEN

Mike L Anderson

"Einstein and people like Einstein said that the world was flat."

T. Lobsang Rampa (1967)

This example of misrepresentation is so off-beam its funny. It is also trivial. Most school-leavers know enough about Einstein to know that he is being less than accurately represented.

However, in an age of information, we cannot have every fact at our fingertips. We may not even be aware of authoritative opinion on a subject. We rely on others to faithfully reflect this authoritative opinion.

For instance, what is the official paleontological position on how well evolution stands up to fossil record? Let's make it easier. Forget the official position. Let's look at the position of just one of the world's most respected paleontologists: David Raup.

I could drag myself off to the library and dig this out I suppose. However, I happen to have an article from a Christian journal which mentioned his views. The writer, James C. (1), has a background in accountancy and theology. This is what he wrote(2): "It is believed by some scientists that the fossil record supplies virtually incontrovertible evidence for the truth of the theory of evolution. However, not only was this not true in Darwin's time, as he himself admits in his The Origin of Species, but it is not true today after the evidence has been hard sought for over a hundred years by an army of paleontologists. Dr. David Raup, one of the world's most respected paleontologists explains..."

End of story. Raup does not believe that fossil record supplies virtually incontrovertible evidence for the truth of evolution. Do I need to look any further? Admittedly James C. was writing outside his field. But, he was a Christian. He served nine years on the staff of Campus Crusade for Christ. He was sensitive to the possibility of interpreting data according to ones own presuppositions (this was a major point of his article). The journal is peer-reviewed.

What more could I want?

I checked anyway. It turns out that James C. had misrepresented Raup. Raup (2) had actually said in the article from which James C. quotes: "As I will show here, the rocks and the fossils say YES to evolution" (emphasis his). How it is possible that such a serious misrepresentation could occur?

How could he mistake a chicken for a duck? The charitable interpretation is that he was blinded by his own presuppositions. As I wrote in my response (3): "First, [James C.] mistook difficulties for Darwinian gradualism as difficulties for evolution (he saw what he wanted to see). There is a relative lack not absence of transitional forms in the fossil record. Second, he missed the two pages (pp.156-158) Raup devoted to showing why this lack is not a problem for evolution ([James C.] did not see what he did not want to see)."

The irony is that he had asked (and answered affirmatively) "can an unreserved belief in naturalism exert a blinding effect upon a scientist as he interprets the physical world he observes." He was quick to see blindness in others as they interpreted the physical world, and yet failed to see it in himself in the much easier task of interpreting a single article.

Exodus 23:1 says:"Do not spread false reports."

That the views of others should be reported accurately even if they are considered unpalatable seems so elementary. However, it is necessary to emphasise this in an age swamped with information. It would be sad if our age became known as the age of misinformation and Christians were known as major disseminators of that misinformation.

References and notes

(1) I have sometimes being criticised for conducting such critiques in public and for "getting personal" in mentioning names. It has been suggested on the basis of Matthew 18:15, that I should rather speak to the person privately. Such criticism forgets that the offense was committed publicly and therefore calls for a public response (Cf. 3 John 14). Nevertheless, I have chosen to omit his full name. The point of this article is not who did it, but what is being done. I confess I have done such things myself.

(2) C., James P. (1994) Faith, Fact and Philosophy: One Step Toward Understanding the Conflict between Science and Christianity." Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith 46(4):242-252

(3) Raup, D.M. (1983) The Geological and Paleontological Arguments of Creationism. In "Scientists Confront Creationism." L.R. Godfrey, (Ed.). W.W. Norton & Compaany, New York.

(4) Anderson, M.L. (1995) Misunderstanding the Conflict Between Science and Christianity. Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith 47(3):218.

QUOTES BY MATHEMATICIANS

* Poincare, Jules Henri (1854-1912)
"Science is built up with facts, as a house is with stones."

But a collection of facts is no more a science than a heap of stones is a house."

La Science et l'hypothese.

* Polya, George (1887-1985)

"There are many questions which fools can ask that wise men cannot answer."

In H. Eves (1988) Return to Mathematical Circles, Boston: Prindle, Weber and Schmidt.

* Pearson, Karl

"The mathematician, carried along on his flood of symbols, dealing apparently with purely formal truths, may still reach results of endless importance for our description of the physical universe.

In N. Rose (1988) Mathematical Maxims and Minims, Raleigh NC:Rome Press Inc.,

Pascal, Blaise (1623-1662)

We are usually convinced more easily by reasons we have found ourselves than by those which have occurred to others.

(1670) Pensees.

SCIENCE & CHRISTIANITY

Steven Schimmrich
1 January 1997

The following was given as a talk to a group of Christians at Wednesday Forum, a weekly forum on faith issues sponsored by Hessel Park Christian Reformed Church on the University of Illinois campus.

Introduction

Are science and Christianity compatible?

Can I practice my chosen profession yet retain my salvation?
As a geologist, must I accept young-earth creationism on the basis of my Evangelical belief in the inerrancy of Scripture?
Or, is there simply no problem in being both a scientist and a Christian?

I also believe this is an important question because I've witnessed a lot of misunderstandings and hostility between Christians and those involved in science. As someone who has a foot in both worlds, and is sometimes the target of criticism from both, I feel I may have some insights on this issue. I don't have any answers, the problems are too complex for easy solutions, but perhaps I can help to clear up some

misunderstandings I see on both sides.

So, are science and Christianity compatible?

I suppose it depends on how you define each of these terms. Even a casual reading of texts on the philosophy of science will convince you that no two completely agree on a definition for science. One definition even stated that science is what scientists do. Not very informative. Similarly, ask a Roman Catholic, a Unitarian, and a Pentecostal to define Christianity and you're going to get three very different answers. Give me any definition of Christianity and I'll name a self-professed Christian group which would dispute it.

Science

I would define science as a method for obtaining knowledge about the physical world. We're all probably familiar with the so-called scientific method - observation of natural phenomena, formulating hypotheses to account for the phenomena, gathering data to test these hypotheses, and developing an explanatory falsifiable theory. Of course, this simplified view is mostly a caricature of how science actually works in the laboratory and in the field.

Many textbooks and scientists still teach that science operates this way - as an impassionate Mr. Spock-like search for the truth usually referred to by the philosophers as logical empiricism. In actuality, science is a human endeavor and, like all human endeavors, is fraught with biases, prejudices, passions, infighting, egotism, and competitiveness. Scientists choose which hypotheses are worthy of testing based on the consensus of the scientific community they belong to. For example, a geologist studying the formation of folds in a mountain belt would seek to explain their formation in the context of a plate tectonic framework and not in terms of older abandoned ideas such as the expanding earth model.

The beauty of science is that, even with its flaws, it seems to work very well. Science, as a successful method for learning about the natural world, should not be confused with scientism, a common philosophical belief promoted by many scientists.

Scientism

Scientism is the belief that science is the only reliable method for obtaining knowledge. Stephen Hawking wrote, in *A Brief History of Time*, that the eventual goal of science was to provide a unified theory that completely describes the universe we live in (1988, p. 13). I don't think most Christians would support Hawking's belief that God, if He even exists, could be boiled down to some quantum mechanical mathematical equations!

The late science popularizer Isaac Asimov, who interested many young people in science with his wonderful books, was also an avowed atheist and a strong supporter of scientism in that he

believed that science and technology had the power to solve all, not some but all, of the problems of mankind.

Scientism is not science but rather a belief about science and, as such, falls into the realm of philosophy. Another philosophical belief often confused with science is naturalism.

Naturalism

Naturalism is a belief that the natural physical world is all that exists. It is, by definition, an atheistic view of the world since it leaves no room for the supernatural. Many Christians confuse this philosophical naturalism with methodological naturalism, an indispensable tool of science.

Methodological naturalism is an axiomatic assumption in science that all natural phenomena should be explained in terms of natural processes. Mountain belts, for example, are explained by geologists in terms of tectonic forces and not by postulating that a million angels came from heaven and pushed them into that position.

Some have tried to argue that scientists should abandon methodological naturalism because, in so-called origins research, this method will not allow for the intervention of God in the creation process. One of the most notable critics is Phillip Johnson who wrote *Darwin on Trial and Reason in the Balance*.

The proper role of methodological naturalism in science is a real problem for Christians. If God did indeed create the universe and all within it, then scientific inquiry will never discover that because the rules of science will consider any naturalistic explanation, no matter how far-fetched, superior to any explanation invoking the actions of a deity. But what's the alternative? Most of the advocates of doing away with methodological naturalism in science are philosophers, lawyers (such as Phillip Johnson), and theologians. Most practising scientists, even Christian ones, see no viable alternative to methodological naturalism, which works extremely well, and are thus reluctant to abandon it.

At what point should a scientist say "Here a miracle occurred" and cease searching for naturalistic explanations? Some Christians may say that we've gone too far when science contradicts the Bible, but how do we know that our interpretation of the Bible is correct? A belief in a 6000 year old earth, for example, is not obtained directly from Scripture, but rather from an interpretation of Scripture.

Scripture

So how do we interpret Scripture? The answer to this question will greatly influence what we believe about the results of modern science.

The creationist movement is solidly based within the evangelical Christian community. This hasn't always been

true, the book Darwin's Forgotten Defenders by David Livingstone (1987) documented how many 19th century evangelicals accepted, in some form or another, Darwinian ideas on evolution and a great age for the earth and how young-earth creationism is really a 20th century phenomenon.

So, is a belief in young-earth creationism and a literal interpretation of Genesis 1-11 an integral part of being an evangelical? As an evangelical, I don't think it is and I have the support of others in the evangelical community as well. I would refer people, for example, to works such as Donald Bloesch's two-volume Essentials of Evangelical Theology (1978). He holds that Scripture certainly is inerrant in matters of faith and practice but not that every verse should be interpreted literally.

No one, even the most ardent Biblical literalist, reads the Bible and doesn't recognize that some of it is in poetic, figurative language. Would anyone claim that Isaiah 55:12, where mountains and hills will burst into song and trees will clap their hands, should be read literally? Would many evangelical conservative Protestants interpret John 6:53, where Jesus says "unless you eat of the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you have no life in you," literally? I happen to believe that the creation story in Genesis is written in poetic language. An opinion even shared by St. Augustine back around AD 400.

That doesn't mean the creation story is a fantasy or a lie. One can portray great truths with poetic language. Some of the truths expressed in the creation story are that God created all things, that He created us in His image, and that we are all born with a natural propensity to sin (to separate ourselves from God). It's not, however, a science textbook and attempting to make it such will only base Scripture upon the shifting sands of human knowledge for science is a dynamic changing body of knowledge and ideas.

Young-Earth Creationism

As a Christian geologist, I'm often asked about my ideas regarding young-earth creationism. I'm not a biologist, so I'm not going to speak about evolution other than to say that I believe it to be the best scientific model we have to explain the change in the diversity of life through time on this planet. I will however briefly address the age of the earth and the idea of a recent global flood. And for those wondering, yes I have read what young-earth creationists have written on these topics including, most recently, The Young Earth by John Morris and The Grand Canyon: Monument to Catastrophe by Steve Austin.

First, I believe that the earth is 4.6 billion years old. The reasons I, along with virtually all geologists, accept this age are numerous and complex. Suffice to say that many observable features on this earth give evidence of having formed over very long periods of time. Many different radiometric dating methods, all with different initial assumptions, done on earth, lunar, and meteoritic rocks all yield ages approaching 4.6 billion years. In addition, the

science of astronomy provides additional support for a multi-billion-year-old solar system and universe. Unfortunately, I don't have enough time to get more specific since I could teach a semester-long course on this topic.

Secondly, I don't believe in a geologically-recent global flood since there's simply no evidence for it. I look at real rocks for a living, in the Hudson Valley region of New York State, and I am absolutely convinced that there's no way these rocks could be flood deposits. Once again, I wish I could say more on the matter but time constrains me.

Creation Science

As a matter of fact, I don't even believe that young-earth creationism is science. It's instructive to compare the statements of faith ascribed to by the Creation Research Society, a young-earth creationist organization, and the Affiliation of Christian Geologists, an organization which I'm a member of.

The Creation Research Society believes that:

1. The Bible is the written Word of God, and because it is inspired throughout, all its assertions are historically and scientifically true in the original autographs. To the student of nature this means that the account of origins in Genesis is a factual presentation of simple historical truths.
2. All basic types of living things, including man, were made by direct creative acts of God during the Creation Week described in Genesis. Whatever biological changes have occurred since Creation Week have been accomplished only changes within the original created kinds.
3. The great flood described in Genesis, commonly referred to as the Noachian Flood, was an historic event worldwide in its extent and effect.
4. We are an organization of Christian men and women of science who accept Jesus Christ as our Lord and Savior. The account of the special creation of Adam and Eve as one man and one woman and their subsequent fall into sin is the basis for our belief in the necessity of a Savior for all mankind. Therefore, salvation can come only through accepting Jesus Christ as our Savior.

The Affiliation of Christian Geologists believes that:

1. We accept the divine inspiration, trustworthiness and authority of the Bible in matters of faith and conduct.
2. We confess the Triune God as affirmed in the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds which we accept as brief, faithful statements of Christian Doctrine based upon Scripture.
3. We believe that in creating and preserving the universe

God has endowed it with contingent order and intelligibility, the basis of scientific investigation.

4. We recognize our responsibility as stewards of God's creation to use science and technology for the good of humanity and the whole world.
5. We subscribe to the understanding that investigation of the Earth and its history through geological methods is a valid enterprise that must be pursued with integrity and faithfulness to the canons of sound science.

It's hard to take young-earth creationists seriously as scientists if they themselves admit, before even looking at the evidence, what their results are going to be (a recent creation and global flood).

I wish I had time to get into young-earth creationism a bit more since I really do believe that their evidence for a young earth and a global flood are based upon misunderstandings of modern geology, the use of outdated data, and, unfortunately, in some cases downright deception.

Definitions

One of the major problems in the creation-evolution debate is simply that both sides tend to misunderstand and misrepresent one another. Examples of these misunderstandings and misrepresentations are given in a highly-recommended book written by Del Ratzsch (1996) titled: *The Battle of Beginnings: Why Neither Side is Winning the Creation-Evolution Debate*.

Evolutionary scientists, such as Stephen Jay Gould in his essay entitled *Evolution: Fact and Theory*, state that evolution is a fact of science, not only a theory. This is a statement often misunderstood by creationists.

In a popular biology textbook (Curtis & Barnes. 1989. *Biology*), evolution was defined as "any change in the frequency of alleles within a gene pool from one generation to the next" where alleles are pairs of genes located at the same position on both members of a pair of chromosomes and which convey inheritable characteristics from one generation to the next. And the evolutionary biologist Douglas Futuyuma (*Evolutionary Biology*, 1986) gives the simple definition that "the changes in populations that are considered evolutionary are those that are inheritable via the genetic material from one generation to the next."

If one defines evolution this way, then evolution certainly is a fact. Most young-earth creationists, on the other hand, define evolution in very different ways often implying that it's an upward- directed process, or that it implies one type of organism should directly change into another, and that it's an atheistic religion. When one defines evolution in these ways, then it certainly is false but then creationists are only killing straw men of their own devising.

So, when a creationist or a scientist is talking about

evolution, it's advisable to stop and ask them to define what they mean by the word "evolution." The results may surprise you.

Harmonization

So, let me ask my original question once again: Are science and Christianity compatible? In my mind yes.

As I've said, I view the creation stories in Genesis 1-11 as being written in poetic, non-literal language. I also believe that God can and does intervene miraculously in our world and thus have no problems accepting the deity and miracles of Jesus Christ.

As for science, I believe it to be the best way to investigate the natural world but I recognize its limitations. Because it proceeds as a methodologically naturalistic enterprise, it has nothing to say about the existence or non-existence of God. And, when it comes to origins, science may well be wrong since it can not recognize God's role in creation.

Reconciliation

Finally, I have some advice for Christians when thinking about science and for scientists when thinking about Christianity.

Christians should recognize that scientists aren't all a bunch of atheists out to destroy their faith in God. There are many Christian men and women of good faith in science. The well-known young-earth creationist Henry Morris, for example, speculates that evolution was given to Nimrod at Babel by Satan himself (The Troubled Waters of Evolution, 1974) - a belief which strongly implies that Christians in science, such as myself, are nothing more than dupes of Satan - an implication I personally resent.

Also, one of my pet peeves is when creationists criticize science and scientists yet have little or no understanding of the issues involved. It takes a long time to become a scientist and a lot of hard work and study. It's not very humble to believe that by reading a couple of popular creationist books, you can single-handedly destroy the massive edifice of modern science with your arguments, most of which have been discredited numerous times before. If you're a creationist, read some science and read some of the books which refute creationism. A good place to start is Science and Earth History: The Evolution/Creation Controversy by Arthur Strahler (1987).

Finally, I think Christians should abandon creation evangelism, a term made popular by Ken Ham who spoke in town last March for the Answers in Genesis organization. Creation evangelism tries to convince people to accept Jesus Christ as their savior by convincing them of the truth of young-earth creationism. Creation evangelists believe that Genesis 1-11 is foundational to the entire Bible and to Christianity itself. I think this is a grave mistake for if their creationist arguments turn out wrong, which I believe they

are, then those evangelized by this method will suffer a very real crises of faith. My belief is that there's only one foundation, and that's Jesus Christ as Paul writes in 1 Corinthians 3:11.

My advice for those in science is to recognize science for what it is. A valid method for investigating the natural world but certainly not an infallible one nor one that can even address issues relating to God because of its foundational premise of methodological naturalism. For example, when the National Association of Biology Teachers writes in a Statement on Teaching Evolution that "the diversity of life on earth is the outcome of evolution: an unsupervised, impersonal, unpredictable, and natural process..." that they're making an unreasonable philosophical statement. They are, in fact, denying the very existence of God.

Scientists need to realize that all Christians are creationists, because all Christians should believe, in my opinion, that God is the originator and sustainer of all life. And, if one truly believes in God, this belief will carry over into all aspects of their lives, even the practice of science. Many scientists are of the opinion that it's OK to be a Christian, but only if one doesn't talk about it or let it influence them in any way which is an absurd idea. We all have philosophical beliefs, be they Christian or atheistic, and these beliefs strongly influence how we live our lives and, in the case of scientists, how they practice science.

Finally, scientists are people too and also need to hear the Gospel message of Jesus Christ. Christians should pray for those of us who are Christians working in the sciences that we may be used to bring our peers to Christ rather than fighting with us over what are ultimately unimportant issues relative to the eternal truths of God.