

The Pronouncements of Science—A Review

(by: Steven J. Wallace)

It is with some apprehension that I place a review of David Mathews' article, *The Pronouncements of Science*. It is becoming taboo, so it seems, to actually speak out against something that has been written. Knowing full well of the possibility that some brethren will judge and speak maliciously of my intent, warning others and labeling me as a "watchdog" for committing a "cardinal sin" as it seems of actually reviewing and nakedly displaying the error that another person has taught; I will rather choose to have a clear conscience before my God and speak out against such a mendacity. The hypocrisy of such brethren is that they do not see themselves as being "watchdogs" when they bark to others about some who are allegedly "brotherhood watchdogs!" Perhaps they view themselves as pious "dog catchers" or even "dog trainers." Irregardless of such reproaches, I will speak out. "Then I said, 'I will not make mention of Him, nor speak anymore in His name.' But His word was in my heart like a burning fire shut up in my bones; I was weary of holding it back, and I could not. . . all my acquaintances watched for my stumbling, saying, 'Perhaps he can be induced; then we will prevail against him, and we will take our revenge on him.' But the LORD is with me as a mighty, awesome One. . ." (Jer. 20:9-11). The Lord is with those who stand on his word and therefore with confidence do we speak. Let all men fear lest that which was spoken by the prophet be true ". . . Behold, the word of the LORD is a reproach to them; they have no delight in it" (Jer. 6:10).

Assumptive "Facts"

The title of the article should be "Assumptions of Fallible Man" rather than "The Pronouncements of Science" for there were no proven pronouncements given. True science cannot pronounce that the oldest city in the world is Jericho at 9000 years old or that the universe is 10-20 billion years old as Mr. Mathews would like us to believe. When people make such absurd statements they show ineptitude of the boundaries of true science. Science deals in the present! It's foundation and authority for knowledge is by things that can be seen, touched, heard, smelled or tasted. For true science to prove anything it must be observed and repeated. My questions to Mr. Mathews or any uniformitarian are "Were you there?" and "Can you repeat your findings?" God asks, "*Who is this who darkens counsel by words without knowledge? Now prepare yourself like a man; I will question you, and you shall answer Me. Where were you when I laid the foundations of the earth? Tell Me if you have understanding.*" (Job. 38:2-4). This is my question to anyone who says the earth is 4.6 billion years old and the meteor crater, an internationally known landmark in Arizona is 50,000 years old. Were you there? How can you disprove the earth is 4.7 as opposed to 4.6 billion years old? If you were not there, then how do you know what went on? Present us with your scientific evidences of observation and repeatability! The creation was a singularity and cannot be repeated, therefore if cannot be proven by science. It takes as much faith to believe the world is 4.6 billion years old as it

The Pronouncements of Science—A Review

takes to believe it is 10,000 years. The only way we can know, with any degree of certainty, is by revelation. This means that someone must have been there who wrote things down and was a credible source. Who more credible than God?

Here are some assumptions that Mr. Mathews gave but never found a way to entertain us with evidences:

- The universe is between 10 & 20 billion years old (what proof did he cite to show that it could not be younger than 10 billion or older than 20 billion?).
- The earth is 4.6 billion years old (not 4.5 or 4.7 but 4.6).
- The Atlantic ocean is 200 million years old (not 199 or 201 but 200).
- Jericho is 9000 years old (still no proof).
- The vast majority of everything that has happened in the universe happened vast ages ago (but no proof).
- 6000 years ago civilization was advancing from the prehistoric to the historic (no proof and no definition of “prehistoric” vs. “historic.” How does this support the earth being 4.6 billion years old?)
- He writes “. . . empirical evidence has refuted the Young Earth position” (1 par.). I think Mr. Mathews means that empirical evidence has refuted the Young Earth position, which is false. He continues to make allegations and gives no proof or illustrations.

One could continue to show Mr. Mathews’ assumptions, but then one would have to nearly quote the entire article.

Lies and Falsehoods

Mr. Mathews not only presents unproven assumptive propositions but he also states some assertive lies. For example, he writes, “The Bible does not contain a history of the Earth” (par. 2). Now compare that with what the Spirit of God had written, “This is the history of the heavens and the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens” (Gen. 2:4). Betwixt the two? God says it is a history; man says it is not? Who do you believe? God’s word said “in the day that you eat of it you shall surely die” (Gen. 2:17). The devil’s word said, “You will not surely die” (Gen. 3:4). Who was right?

Second lie: “Geology and evolution are two independent sciences” (par. 4).

It is laughable for one to consider evolution a science when it is based on seven unscientific assumptions! These assumptions prove beyond any “doubting shadow” that evolution is therefore a faith, an anti-God belief structure.

- Assumption 1: Organic material came from inorganic material. How much faith does it take to believe that nonliving material conceived the idea, mustered the confidence, gained the competence and then executed the course of action to create living matter? Should we be worshipping matter as God? That takes more faith than believing in the Red Sea crossing or the resurrection from the dead! At least with these there is a Living Source.

The Pronouncements of Science—A Review

- Assumption 2: Spontaneous generation occurred once and only once.
- Assumption 3: Viruses, bacteria, plants and animals are all interrelated.
- Assumption 4: The Protozoa gave rise to the Metazoa.
- Assumption 5: Invertebrate phyla are interrelated.
- Assumption 6: Invertebrates gave rise to vertebrates.
- Assumption 7: Modern amphibia and reptiles have a common ancestral descent.

All seven are not observed nor repeated and therefore not proven. Yet this is what evolution rests upon, and it is a science?

G. A. Kerkut wrote in reference to these assumptions:

“The first point that I should like to make is that these seven assumptions by their nature are not capable of experimental verification. They assume that a certain series of events has occurred in the past. Thus though it may be possible to mimic some of these events under present-day conditions, this does not mean that these events must therefore have taken place in the past. All that it shows is that it is *possible* for such a change to take place. Thus to change a present-day reptile into a mammal, though of great interest, would not show the way in which the mammals did arise. Unfortunately we cannot bring about even this change; instead we have to depend upon limited circumstantial evidence for our assumptions. . .” (emp. his)¹

Furthermore, to view uniformitarian geology and evolution as independent is to bury our heads in the dirt, literally. Geologist often date strata by the fossils found in it and then turn around and date the fossil by the strata in which it was found! The only way that we can truly know the past with any degree of certainty is by historical evidence, not scientific.

Third lie: “Christians ought to believe in an ancient Universe because all other positions are untenable as they are refuted by numerous independent evidences” (par. 4).

Where is the evidence? He also wrote, “When a theory’s predictions fail, or facts are discovered which are contrary to the theory, scientists must abandon the theory” (par. 4). Mr. Mathews is correct but many scientist merely give lip service to this rule. The evidence goes against evolution and uniformitarianism yet they continue to be taught as fact.. For example, when Mount Saint Helens erupted in 1982, it formed a 1/40 “scale model” of the Grand Canyon in five days with distinct rock layers.² It never took 500 million years. What about the evidence of human and dinosaur footprints in the same rock layer in the Paluxy River Bed?³ How could something had been so well preserved for 100 million years? How do

¹ G. A. Kerkut, *The Implications of Evolution* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960), 7.

² Gary Parker, *Creation: Facts of Life* (Green Forest, AZ: Master Books, 1994) 206.

³ John C. Whitcomb, Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1961) 167, 172-175.

The Pronouncements of Science—A Review

we explain human and dinosaurs living together by evolutionary and uniformitarian time tables? What about the so-called “living fossils” that were supposed to be extinct for millions of years but have been found living today? The Tuatara was supposed to have been extinct 135 million years ago but is living today. A span of 135 million years is a long time for no appearance in the fossil record and yet the living Tuatara looks identical to the allegedly 135 million year old fossil⁴ That is a long time with no evolutionary change! The Tuatara places evolution and uniformitarianism on a Titanic sized catastrophe! Space doesn't allow us to mention others and even older “living fossils” which are problematic with the standard evolutionary and uniformitarian model.

Processes & Time = Reality (the gospel according to a Day-Ager).

This is the formula for Day-Agers. For evolutionists it is Processes + Time -God = Reality. For theistic-evolutionists and old-earth creationists it is God + Processes + Time = Reality. Mr. Mathews' has bought into this same formula for he said, “Interpreters of the Bible ought to keep in mind that the Bible does not present a . . .description of the *processes* responsible for the present form of the Universe” (par. 2). He later writes, “What is known is that God is not bound by any *time* constraints. Ten billion years is not a vast amount of time for an eternal Being” (par. 5). Yet, Mr. Mathews fails to see that 10 billion years is a vast amount of time for a super all powerful being to create the universe. Uniformitarianism weakens God to naturalistic strength! He also suggested, “Christians should keep in mind that it is much easier to *re-interpret* the Bible than it is to compress *billions of years* of history into a six or ten thousand year time frame” (Par. 4).

At least Mr. Mathews is honest to his readers in admitting that he is one who “re-interprets” the Bible to make it fit with uniformitarianism. He is one who would rather “re-interpret” the Bible than question a scientist, for scientists are our “high priests” of knowledge and objectivity. But this is what *long ages* and *processes* make one do—re-interpret the Bible. Such a statement indicates that billions of years is a fact and that the literal approach to Genesis 1 is fictitious. What will we re-interpret next? Will it be the virgin birth, the resurrection, the plan of salvation, sin? Where will it end? Is it ethical to “re-interpret” one's speech to make it mean the opposite of what it literally says? Yet many do this to the Lord and justify it as “interpretation.” May the Lord be patient with our slow and stiff-necked ways.

Why does our friend not want to re-interpret the Bible to accept evolution with uniformitarianism? He reminds us that, “A Christian may accept the geological evidence for an ancient Universe without obligating himself or herself to believe in Darwinian evolution” (par. 4). What if one says, “It is easier to *re-interpret* the Bible than it is to compress *billions of years* of evolution to a six day creation.”

⁴ Ibid. 177

The Pronouncements of Science—A Review

What is the logic of rejecting evolution because of its unproven assumptions but then accepting uniformitarianism when it too rests on unproven assumptions? For instance, how can one prove that all things have continued at the same constant rate throughout history when the first and second laws of Thermodynamics show that things are slowing down? Furthermore, I would like Mr. Mathews to show us in scripture how the creation and Noah's flood were "processes." Rather they were events and events that are not repeated. In essence it is not Time + Processes = Reality, but God + Events = Reality. When Jesus performed miracles in the New Testament, were they *processes* or *events*? Why then is the creation of the universe a process when it was done by the same all powerful God (Col. 1:16)?

Searching for Answers

Mr. Mathews' writes, "Geologists have traveled all over the globe in search of evidence and clues concerning the history of the Earth. Astronomers have pointed their telescopes everywhere in the sky in search for evidence of the history of the Universe" (par. 3).

We don't have to search throughout the universe to answer questions regarding origins; we simply need to open God's word and take it at face value. These geologists and astronomers seek and search but do not find God either, should we then reject the notion of God because He cannot be seen or touched today? That is the problem when men who seek after knowledge make such an endeavor without God. They spend millions of dollars to find evidence which they then interpret without God ever being in the equation. David on the other hand writes, "Where can I go from Your Spirit? Or where can I flee from Your presence? If I ascend into heaven, You are there; If I make my bed in hell, behold, You are there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there Your hand shall lead me. . ." (Ps. 138:7-10).

Dear reader, be content to stand on the written word of God. Jehovah is One who has always lived; He is always right and knows everything. Why "re-interpret" his word to make it fit with man who is mortal, is often wrong and doesn't know much about anything? The more we learn, the more we realize how little we know.

"Even so, come, Lord Jesus" (Rev. 22:20).