



## GENESIS & SCIENCE

LANGUAGE, BIAS, & SCIENTIFIC MISUNDERSTANDINGS ON THE TOPIC OF ORIGINS

---

*To provide students advanced critical thinking skills to navigate through the complex worlds of science, cultures, and beliefs by recognizing we live in a purposefully engineered world*



## 1: Abstract

It is estimated that nearly eighty percent of North American Christian youth are argued out of their beliefs at either high school or university. The arguments include scientific concepts portrayed as irrefutable facts, delivered with intense and passionate religious-like feelings.

It appears that churches and homes are failing to present the information rich language of Genesis in sufficiently appropriate and contemporary language; especially when it is compared to the carefully crafted narratives that support the big bang, evolution, and other culturally driven philosophies.

This thesis provides a scientifically constructed view of the early chapters of Genesis, as most arguments against Christianity are culturally and scientifically based. This demands a careful discussion on the way modern-day science and our culture actually functions.

## 2: Introduction

Referring to individual beliefs, C S Lewis said: "*Christianity, if false, is of no importance, and if true, of infinite importance; the only thing it cannot be is moderately important.*" The same thing can also be said about the first books of the Christian Bible. The opening chapters of the Book of Genesis – meaning *beginning* - discusses the origins of the world and all living things including humans. Written fourteen centuries before Christ human origins were at the time considered to be a philosophical subject; today it is almost exclusively considered to be a scientific topic, with this shift being at the root of the problem. Genesis also describes God's relationship with mankind, relationships between people, and the type of individual conduct that should be encouraged and also avoided. These relationship and moral issues have, quite recently, been annexed by academia and the social sciences by various suppositions, employment litmus tests, and censure means.

The social sciences have also demonstrated that people's interests and enthusiasms will cause their biases and paradigms to influence their reasoning processes. This human tendency is typically reserved for the uneducated and the religious, with academia always conferred an exception. This privilege however is only supported rhetorically with no scientific evidence. As a result it must be deduced that scientists are also influenced by their biases and paradigms as both academic and nonprofessional factions require essential assumptions to provide foundations for their beliefs and opinions. This thesis contends that by careful examination of biases and available language, the Biblical account of Origins is reliable and, at a notable level, is fully consistent with scientific observations.

It is noted that Christianity's view of knowledge and the universe is what led to the birth of modern science in Europe, which was predominantly Christian at the time. The Biblical mindset played a pivotal role in the development of the scientific method. One reason is that the Bible encourages students to test and meditate on the Christian text and also addresses topics that do have scientific implications.

However, for the followers of naturalism (and scientism - see below), the Bible is far from being scientific and is considered to be ridiculously wrong on virtually every issue.

### 3: Scientific Observations on Genesis 1 & 2

In order to defend against the typical arguments of Scientism (the unquestioning trust in the generally accepted work of science) that attack the trustworthiness of Genesis, this analysis will hypothesize that God genuinely intended this part of the Bible to convey reliable scientific information - perhaps deliberately obscured - in the conventional language of the place and time. It is understood that God may have had no intention of being scientifically correct, but it does no harm to explore this idea.

Hebrew, like any 3,400-year-old language, did not have any scientific words or terms to communicate technical ideas. In contrast people today, even young children, can be familiar with numerous technical words and concepts. This analysis also considers that chapters, verses and paragraphs were added later to the Bible texts despite use of these descriptors below.

With the main focus of Genesis being human's relationships with each other and their relationship and importance to God, Chapter One also provided humans some context concerning the created world.

As an architect God's first job as a meticulous reporter would be to define what is real – or the scope of His designed reality. The first paragraph of Genesis outlines three things: the earth, the heavens, and the Spirit of God. The earth included water – likely mentioned because of its importance to humans - but the earth had no actual shape or structure at this time. This defines reality as being: 1] material substances – or elements and molecules – along with 2] a spiritual world.

His next job would be to describe the necessary requirements and events similar to a modern-day technical flow chart with the steps that a good designer would use, including a quality control check method at the end of each design event. Light and Time were immediately introduced - with the created light *not* described as the sun (or the moon, stars, or fire). The characterization of light being “good” would likely indicate the concept of its hidden energy created for future plants, animals, and humans. The concept of time can be inferred by the passage of a day and a night. Light is a very small part of the entire electromagnetic energy spectrum, so it is implied that the invisible and unknown gamma and X-rays all the way to infrared and high frequency rays were included at this stage. The force of gravity and the nuclear forces were most likely created at the time of this electromagnetic force.

With light's energy, the earth's mass, and His designed speed of light (from time) the fundamentals of the physical and chemical scientific laws are now in place. They dictate the behavior of the energy concept and the material substances. The concept of Time also indicates that the creation was a process - a series of necessary events that occurred over a period - and not a spontaneous event; with the word “day” initially referring to light, not necessarily, or just, a 24-hour day. These three ingredients are those required for Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity and his formula  $E=mc^2$ .

This concise description when compared to the scientific description of our origins involving the Big Bang is interesting. The big bang requires a concept of inflation over a minuscule

amount of time to produce a gargantuan amount of space. The big bang is claimed to be supported by irrefutable mathematics and numerical computer simulations. This is almost certainly correct but only after certain assumptions have been made. The mathematical support confirms the assumptions are rational but not that they represent the entire truth.

The text then introduces the earth's atmosphere and water vapor. It then implies a separation, or vault, between the material reality and the reality of heaven or the spiritual world.

The already created formless or amorphous "celestial body" was then carefully shaped and sculpted to create oceans and dry land for the first time. This too was designated as good because, identical to light which included energy, the earth's crust was then provided with materials useful for humans – many of which were visible at or near the surface to aid discovery. They include energy producing oil, coal, and gas; and the engineering materials of iron ore and bauxite. Further details such as the earth's geometry and present magnetic field were almost certainly formed at this time.

Genesis provides no information on the creation of the astral objects (including stars and planets). Science too provides little information other than the attraction of the unstructured "debris" from the big bang "explosion" to form the objects. This formation is assumed to be a result of the force of gravity and a minutely non-uniform distribution of exploded matter, which is a vague and imprecise explanation. Other parts of the Bible suggest the stars were numerous and likely made at the same time as all other matter.

Flora or plants (and presumably other closely related life forms) were then created. The text is consistent with what science now understands: flora is a distinct type of life, created before fauna; designed to be able to naturally reproduce, according to specie, by themselves (symbiosis and insect and bird assistance presumably came later). By the designation of being good it showed that herbs, fruits, and trees would be useful for humans – primarily for food, energy, and construction products.

The flora needed light energy to grow naturally, so the sun was immediately formed or made visible (Bible versions in English vary on this) along with the moon. These objects were designated as good – implying again their upcoming benefit to humans.

Animals were then created over a time period (2 days – perhaps implying a significant process) with them all being declared good (for humans) – for food, friends, or instruction. They were designed to include both male and female in order to naturally multiply around the earth.

Humans were then created by starting with the male; with the female being formed from the male. Male chromosomes are now designated as XY and female as XX, which tends to support the idea that the female could be formed from the male ([Check details](#)). The part of the male from which the female was formed was designated as the side or rib which, in

the absence of descriptive words, could be said to indicate the curved shape of a DNA molecule?

When humans were being created God used the expression, "Let us make man in our image", for the first time. This implies that God included Jesus who would later become a human. The equality of women was indicated by the humans being specifically described as male and female; and with a special functional and spiritual relationship to each other. Humans were clearly differentiated from animals at this stage and the Christian Trinity belief had been fully defined (by verse 26 of Genesis 1). Humans were then instructed to fill the earth and manage (subdue) it; and were granted authority and power (dominion) over every living thing.

In the now designated Chapter 2 the purpose of the sabbath for rest was introduced with an overview of creation and the important additional point that humans' bodies were fabricated only from the elements/molecules found within the earth (dust). This is consistent with scientific understanding – which does not address the spiritual or the nature of DNA "information" components. This chapter shifted abruptly from a technical description of material elements to discuss the spiritual world.

There is no indication on how long, and how many, humans multiplied before Adam & Eve were placed in the Garden of Eden – but later in Genesis it did make clear that when their children were adults there were settlements and sufficient people for future spouses. The spiritual aspect of humans was then introduced; and just like the material world it was presented from a human perspective. Scientific research is unconvincing on the creation of human morality and ethics – which implies a spiritual aspect – along with human language and consciousness. However, God made it clear His plan was for humans to trust Him and not to assume they could judge for themselves what is good for their lives both on earth and eternally.

Human history provides sufficient evidence to support the idea that the Biblical instructions for Christian behavior is essential for a valuable and acceptable life (to God). This second chapter also introduced the concept of evil spirits with their ability, in the absence of obedience to God, to significantly influence human behavior and cause them to be exceedingly unkind and judgmental towards fellow humans.

#### 4: Evolution and Other Philosophies

Scientists claim the Theory of Evolution categorically proves that God is not needed to explain human Life. Evidence for this claim falls extensively short of scientific proof. The current theories fail to adequately explain the origin of: first chemical life, the survival instinct, the many body plans, information in the DNA code, sexual reproduction, photosynthesis, human consciousness, human language ability, human virtues or artistic ability, including the capacity to wonder about the natural world (and to reach reliable scientific conclusions).

It is not often discussed that laboratory support evidence for evolution has never been provided, even after 90 years of artificially accelerated mutation and selection methods on rapidly reproducing fruit flies and other complex life forms. Likewise, despite many faulty attempts, legitimate mathematical feasibility for the DNA "information" in living cells is also absent. Some so-called proofs for evolution including variations within species, and the observable changes in animals and plants' instincts and appearances from human breeding, has been shown to be an adaptation of *existing* DNA information – not the creation of unique coded data.

Biomimetics – where designers replicate detailed features observed in animals to engineer advanced engineered products – frequently provides patentable and energy efficient devices. This would lead scientists to the conclusion that the survival of the fittest is not only capable of creating feasible chemical and mechanical designs but does so elegantly and efficiently. One would expect a step-by-step process would develop Rube Goldberg jumble designs (intricate but seemingly impractical contraptions) and not to generate remarkably energy efficient solutions.

In summary: Current scientific knowledge shows that if any evolution theory is to be proven true, the driving force cannot be the natural selection of the fittest caused by error driven chance mutations. It must be verified by observations and descriptions of the molecular and cellular processes that can produce new information and permanent functional advantages in species, without resorting to sheer luck or God's intervention or inherent design.

Other philosophical or unscientific arguments against God include the multiverse theory and the anthropic principle explanations. These ideas - meant to explain away the unexplainable degree of precision of the scientific laws of physics/chemistry and the ideal nature of the properties of the earth for diverse and sustainable life - are abductively unpersuasive when considered in conjunction with the unexplained biological origin events and the ability and usefulness of the earth to support human welfare and progress.

The summaries of Genesis and Science above strongly support, not contravene, scientific data. It is only human biases and interpretations that can claim that science does not support God and the Bible; and this aspect of the matter is discussed below.

## 5: How Modern-day Science Functions

To understand science and technology it is essential to learn from its history. Its history teaches that the complete understanding of technical information is a process of trials, errors, omissions, and finally successes. Physics and chemistry knowledge progressed by the gradual improvement of facts and laboratory techniques. Structural and civil engineering knowledge progressed by tall buildings and long span bridges collapsing. Medical and surgery knowledge progressed by patients suffering and dying. Technology improved by step by step advances in: computational methods, the chemistry of materials, streamlined manufacturing techniques, and the reduction of costs.

To the casual onlooker it appears that science and technology is a list of independent and indisputable truths, but in reality, it is a series of developments – like going up a stepladder - progressing towards the limits of human understanding.

The world's most accomplished physicists support this history, and over the last hundred years have made the following comments about the world of science. Richard Feynman: *"If you thought that science was certain - well, that is just an error on your part. Science is a culture of doubt. The first principle (of science) is that you must not fool yourself and you are the easiest person to fool."* Robert Oppenheimer: *"The only way to detect (error) is to be free to inquire. We know that in secrecy error undetected will flourish and subvert."* Stephen Hawking: *"The greatest enemy of knowledge is not ignorance; it is the illusion of knowledge."* Albert Einstein: *"Information is not knowledge - the only source of knowledge is experience."*

Despite these well-founded and logical comments modern scientific theories are regularly taught as incontrovertible truths. This despite most modern-day topics asking significantly more complex questions, which necessarily require human interpretations. The reality about science is that (at least) two entirely different types of science are practiced. They can be described as High-Quality (or Foundational) Science and Complex (or lower quality or conjectural) Science; which can be differentiated by the procedures they use, and the nature of the questions being addressed.

The procedures for High-Quality Foundational Science are to: 1: Make every attempt to *disprove* any theory – and follow the evidence wherever it leads; 2: Make claims that are conservative & tentative; 3: Actively *welcome* constructive criticism in order to gain knowledge from others; 4: Reject consensus & advocacy so that Groupthink Bias is avoided; 5: Reveal all data, including the awkward so that other biases can be avoided. The scientific questions typically address objects and events that occur in the here and now and can be verified in a laboratory.

Questions that include aspects of the past (forensics, origins) or the future (financial, weather, and human health forecasts) both fall into the lower-quality group. This is due to the fact that the research has components that cannot be examined in a laboratory, so they must use less precise techniques. Human biases, scientific paradigms, legal, and cultural considerations are also involved in the mix (see Thesis #2 in this website). And unfortunately, the very nature of complex science requires assumptions for the investigation work to start. Any violation of the foundational scientific procedures above, demonstrates a lower quality type of science. So, theories for complex topics are rare and the status of the work should remain as a hypothesis until the conditions below are removed.

Any enquirer into the quality of scientific work should ask the following questions to get a grip on its reliability. Does the research work: 1: Start with an assumption and then focus on verifying its truth, as distinct from being motivated by a search for inconsistencies and anomalies? 2: Make claims that go beyond the evidence? 3: Reject criticism by narrative and argumentative explanations? 4: Use consensus & advocacy to convince colleagues and others to agree? 5: Conceal or obscure anomalies or awkward evidence to hide weaknesses in the work?

The theory of evolution fails all five of the high-quality scientific procedures, as do a number of other high-profile cultural beliefs that are promoted as incontrovertible facts.

Science does not, and cannot, comment about the existence of God – it simply pretends that it can.

November 2019

3,050 words

G V Francis

---

### Notes and Additional Topics under Consideration

*Current scientific knowledge shows that if any evolution theory is to be proven true, the driving force cannot be the natural selection of the fittest caused by error driven chance mutations. It must be verified by observations and descriptions of the molecular and cellular processes that can produce new information and permanent functional advantages in species, without resorting to sheer luck or God's intervention or inbuilt design*