

# Scripture and Science: How Well Do They Relate?

---

## **Introduction**

One of the major controversies surrounding Biblical Scripture is its often-assumed contradiction with the science of creation and evolution. We find this assumption odd simply because Biblical Scripture is the truthful and inerrant Word of God, and it covers creation all the way back to its very beginning. The science behind creation and evolution, on the other hand, is an ever-changing invention of man, and specifically, the current science of creation and evolution did not come about until thousands of years after the Bible came into being. And, unlike the Bible, the science of creation and evolution never covers how things started. We are not saying the science behind creation and evolution is necessarily wrong; we are simply pointing out the science behind creation and evolution is man's construct, not God's, it changes over time, it is incomplete, and frankly, as we will see, it has never technically been proven.

We believe science absolutely has its place, just not as a substitute for God. That said, when examining any apparent differences between the truthful and inerrant Word of God and science – and clearly, the debate between Scripture and science over creation and evolution contains a few differences – we think it best to see if there are any logical explanations that could resolve these differences. Why take this approach? Because God is never wrong, and man is not stupid. We therefore reject the zero-sum approach to resolving differences (where one party loses the exact amount another party wins), and instead, prefer the both-and resolution approach (where both parties win, though not necessarily equally) – assuming, of course, that a resolution can be found.

We acknowledge that creation and evolution are not the same events – creation being how the world came into being and evolution being how everything progressed once created. However, when comparing God's Word to the science behind creation and evolution, both creation and evolution become quickly intermingled. While science may separate the two as different areas of study, Biblical Scripture does not.

Our goal in this PDF document is to see how well the scientific principles of creation and evolution match up to God's explanation of both as defined in the Bible. Hint: We believe there is more of a match than most people think, and interestingly enough, science is now coming around to suggesting that God – or a power like God – is indeed behind both evolution and creation. But before we explain their concurrences, let's first address two important concepts: (1) confirmation bias, and (2) what qualifies as true science.

## **Confirmation Bias**

When exploring controversies, one must be cautious of a psychological information filter known as "confirmation bias", which is defined as only looking for or favoring information that supports your point of view, i.e., giving more weight to information that confirms your bias and less weight to information that does not confirm your bias. We have done our best to avoid confirmation bias and our efforts have been helped by two simple facts:

1. We fully understand that because we were not actually there when creation took place or evolution started, we cannot know with 100% "scientific" certainty how or why they took place. Regardless of what anyone else might say when weighing in on creation and evolution, it is important to note that they were not there either. From the only "*written*" evidence available (the Bible), we know that only God was present.
2. We do not approach exploring the differences surrounding how Scripture and science treat creation and evolution from a position that one belief is right and the other one is wrong. As noted above, that is a zero-sum strategy and one not conducive to accuracy. We approach the subject from the possibility that both beliefs have merit and, believe it or not, to a large degree, may be consistent with each other.

That said, our bias is with the Bible and God's explanation of creation and evolution. We wholeheartedly believe that the Bible is the truthful, inerrant, and occasionally metaphorical Word of God, and thus is 100% correct. Because of its almost supernatural consistency, we find the Bible, when it is sufficiently studied and understood, to be a document that can only be taken seriously. It is also thousands of years old and has stood the test of time, having been examined by generation after generation of exceptional scholars, many of whom were, in fact, scientists. Even recent archeological discoveries support what was written thousands of years ago. It is also the only document that clearly lays out how everything came about – from the very beginning. Frankly, given the choice, our bias is to accept the truthful and inerrant Word of God over any invention of man – even if man's invention, if contrary to the Bible, seems to make sense.

While we believe in God’s inerrant and occasionally metaphorical Word, we also believe in science. Anyone who denies true science is avoiding a lot of reality. When it comes to God and science, we think avoiding either is at our own peril. The mere fact that the Bible hasn’t changed in thousands of years while science never appears to be “settled”, does not mean that science isn’t a valuable tool for understanding how things work.

Another aspect of confirmation bias is one’s source of information. Most people only want to be influenced by that which confirms their beliefs. This is not a good start for seeking accuracy when examining differences. It is especially true in the comparison between Scripture and science as they relate to creation and evolution. Regarding science, we suggest you do not rely solely on what you may have been taught in school “way back when” as science has changed dramatically in recent years, especially on the subjects of creation and evolution. And to the contrary, Biblical Scripture gets validated more and more over time. Recent examples include perhaps finding evidence of King David’s reign over Israel <sup>1</sup> and finding evidence of the Siloam Pool where Jesus healed a blindman (John 9:7). <sup>2</sup>

Lastly, we suspect that many who support only scientific theories and decree that the Bible is simply wrong, have, for the most part, never fully read the Bible, much less studied it, or understood it. For the most part, they probably do not believe in a supernatural God either – or certainly not as a Biblical scholar might. To some degree, this makes sense as scientists are trained to only respect what can be forensically proven and repeatedly replicated. However, Archeology 101 will tell you, the absence of proof is not necessarily proof of its absence – sometimes we just need to keep on digging. Thus, we would ask, how can one speak coherently on a controversy having only studied one side of the controversy? It does not make one wrong, but it does make one’s argument rather circumspect.

## **What Qualifies as True Science**

The WordWeb dictionary defines science as the “Study of the physical and natural world using theoretical models and data from experiments or observation.” (emphasis added). We believe this to be an accurate definition of science because it explains that science itself is not fact, but rather a study of something using theory, experiments, and observation. A further expansion of this definition arrives at what most call “the scientific method”, i.e., hypothesis, experimentation, observation, recording, conclusion, and replication. Given this understanding of the scientific method, we contend that “science” becomes “fact” only when its conclusions can be repeatedly replicated using similar circumstances.

A perfect example of the scientific method producing “fact” would be the study of the temperature at which water freezes. Data from studies shows that this temperature is 32° Fahrenheit (0° Celsius) at sea level. What makes it “fact” is *not* that everyone has accepted this conclusion, but rather that the conclusion can be repeatedly replicated at different times, at different places (at sea level), and by different experimenters.

In short, “true” science is not merely an accepted conclusion, but rather a conclusion that can be repeatedly replicated under similar conditions, by different people, with equal results.

## **What Are Our Key Focus Areas?**

We believe there are primarily three questions that define the differences between Scripture and science as they relate to creation and evolution:

1. How did it all start?
2. Is there an Intelligent Design or do miracles just happen?
3. Did man evolve from apes or was he made by God?

### **How Did It All Start?**

Biblical scholars argue that it all started, in the beginning, with God creating the earth and the heavens. The Bible, of course, reveals this in its first book, Genesis, in chapters 1 and 2. Scientists (primarily physicists and astronomers) have come up with an explanation of how things got started called the Big Bang theory. That said, we will distinguish this difference in the comparison between Scripture and science as “God versus the Big Bang”. Let’s examine the Big Bang theory first.

---

<sup>1</sup> See “Archaeologists Just Found the Biblical King David’s Palace. Maybe.”, by Colin Schultz, smithsonianmag.com July 22, 2013

<sup>2</sup> See <https://www.biblicalarchaeology.org/daily/biblical-sites-places/biblical-archaeology-sites/the-siloam-pool-where-jesus-healed-the-blind-man/>

An article titled “*The Origin of the Universe, Earth, and Life*”, taken from *Science and Creationism: A View from the National Academy of Sciences: Second Edition*, says the following: “**Hubble’s hypothesis of an expanding universe leads to certain deductions. One is that the universe was more condensed at a previous time. From this deduction came the suggestion that all the currently observed matter and energy in the universe were initially condensed in a very small and infinitely hot mass. A huge explosion, known as the Big Bang, then sent matter and energy expanding in all directions.**” (emphasis added)

This is all well and good, and supposedly very scientific, but remember, the Big Bang theory, as stated, is only a man-made hypothesis based on deductions – and hypotheses and deductions are not proof of anything. More importantly, even if the Hubble hypothesis and deductions are correct, there remains a key question: Where did the “infinitely hot mass” come from? The Big Bang theory still does not address the actual question of creation.

The Bible, on the other hand, makes things very clear as to how everything came into being:

***“In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. The earth was formless and void, and darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was moving over the surface of the waters.”*** Genesis 1:1-2

***“Then God said, ‘Let the waters below the heavens be gathered into one place, and let the dry land appear’; and it was so. God called the dry land earth, and the gathering of the waters He called seas; and God saw that it was good.”*** Genesis 1:9-10

These Scripture verses from Genesis are quite rich in meaning. They tell us that both God and His Spirit existed before any “creation” took place. This is critical because logic tells us you cannot cause something after its creation.

Of course, saying so doesn’t make it so, much like a hypothesis or deduction isn’t true evidence. So, it really comes down to who you are going to trust – a source who takes credit for creation and was there to cause it, or a man-made scientific hypothesis and set of deductions that were made long after the fact leaving the key question of how everything started unanswered?

With science and the subject of creation, the problem always boils down to “... and where did that come from?” We call this the “from scratch” problem. So far, in all that we have read, the only entity and documentation that actually explain how the universe and everything in it started, are – you guessed it – God and the Bible.

Some scientists argue that the universe was not “created” at all, but rather was just the result of a random event starting from nothing. Such a belief, if it were true, would not only explain a lot, but would also prove Biblical creationists are “deniers”. However, Sir Roger Penrose, a British mathematical physicist, philosopher of science, and Nobel Laureate in Physics, proved that a random creation of the universe from nothing could not have happened. In fact, he calculated that the odds of the universe, as we know it today, being created by “chance” from nothing are: “1 part in 10 to the power of 10 to the power of 123, that is 1 followed by 10 to the 123rd power zeros (or  $10^{10^{123}}$ ).”<sup>3</sup> Penrose said this number is so large that if you put a zero on every particle in the universe, you wouldn’t have enough particles to represent such a large number - “not even close”, as Penrose concluded. Penrose’s calculations render the possibility of our universe being created by chance and from nothing at zero.

Another aspect of the universe that calls for some form of “intelligent” formation (as opposed to random formation) is its perfection. Some scientific studies show that for earth to exist as it does in the universe, even tiny alterations in the gravitational pull of the universe would have rendered earth non-existent.<sup>4</sup>

Conclusion: While science offers theories on how the universe may have expanded over time, it has yet to offer a reasonable and provable explanation of how the universe was created. This is understandable because for something to be scientifically “proven”, it must also be capable of replication – and the creation of the universe is not something science can replicate. It can theorize, yes, but it cannot replicate. However, through Penrose’s work, science (using mathematical equations) has proven that the universe could not create itself randomly from nothing. Logically, this leaves only two possibilities: (1) Something or someone must have been behind creation, or (2) the universe has always existed (the oscillating universe theory otherwise referred to as the conformal cyclic cosmology, or what we call the “ever-existing” universe). The only source that covers both possibilities is the Bible.<sup>5</sup> Hence, we contend that Scripture is the accurate explanation of how the universe was created.

---

<sup>3</sup> *The Emperor’s New Mind*, pg. 341-344. Penrose’s conclusions were echoed by Cambridge University astrophysicist and mathematician Fred Hoyle and the senior astronomer at the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, Owen Gingerich.

<sup>4</sup> See Ethan Siegel’s Dec 19, 2019 Forbes article “*The Universe Really Is Fine-Tuned, And Our Existence Is The Proof*” for a good explanation.

<sup>5</sup> Genesis 1:1 tells us “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth”, and Revelation 21:1 tells us that after the 1,000-year Millennial Kingdom of Christ, God creates a new earth and heaven.

## Is There an Intelligent Design or Do Miracles Just Happen?

Scientific evolutionists have offered explanations of how things evolved and why. Their “why” is simple – it was necessary for survival. Their “how” is also simple – reportedly over millions of years, they adapted. Okay so far. But we must ask two important follow-up questions: (1) What, if any, “process” was behind the adaptation, and (2) Where did this biological imperative to survive come from?

The adaptation process is often explained as DNA replicating itself, but with a mutation, to create a more useful form, i.e., one that enhances the likelihood of survival. Example: Evolutionists claim that over time, as the grass on the plains became more and more scarce, giraffes developed longer necks so they could avail themselves of vegetation on tall bushes and trees. This evolutionary adaptation not only preserved the giraffes, but also made the grass more available for those that did not adapt. Makes sense, doesn't it? We think so. But the big question is what was behind the DNA “properly” replicating itself, i.e., mutating to result in a successful adaptation? Did it just do it by itself, simply because it had to, or was another process involved? If no other process was involved, that would imply DNA can think for itself with its own will and purpose, and we know that's not possible.

Science confirms that DNA cannot, *with will and purpose*, mutate on its own accord. DNA is simply the information that defines a cell's purpose and changes can only occur due to mistakes (mutations) in the replication process.<sup>6</sup> Also, bear in mind that identifying a mutation is simply recorded observation, not evidence of causation. In other words, science can only observe and report that a mutation occurred. Science cannot explain why a particularly successful mutation, out of a myriad of possibilities, occurred. In simple terms, science cannot tell us why DNA mutated in this way, and not that way. We contend, “because it had to”, would not satisfy most scientific scrutiny.

Historically, in response to the question over causation, evolutionary scientists claim that the necessary DNA replication mutations required to get us where we are today in the evolution of our planet simply occurred randomly over billions of years. However, recent analysis by Dr. Stephen Meyer explains that this random theory of evolution is impossible because the odds of “useful” DNA proteins adapting on their own to make up the organizational mutations inherent in the history of the planet, simply by trial and error, are 1 to the 10 trillion, trillion, trillionth.<sup>7</sup> He further concludes billions of years would have been nowhere near enough time for such successful random mutation to have occurred. Given that random mutational replication cannot account for the evolution of our planet, the scientific theory of evolution and adaptation has to rest on the “Miracle Happens Here” scenario. Frankly, that is not a bankable *scientific* explanation, but it would certainly be possible for God.

Where did the biological imperative and will to survive come from if not from random adaptations over time? Can the will to do something be “baked into” one's DNA? If so, who baked it in? Scientists/evolutionists cannot answer these questions, but the Bible can. Here is what Genesis 1:20-25 tells us:

*“Then God said, ‘Let the waters teem with swarms of living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth in the open expanse of the heavens.’ God created the great sea monsters and every living creature that moves, with which the waters swarmed after their kind, and every winged bird after its kind; and God saw that it was good. God blessed them, saying, ‘Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let birds multiply on the earth.’ There was evening and there was morning, a fifth day. Then God said, ‘Let the earth bring forth living creatures after their kind: cattle and creeping things and beasts of the earth after their kind;’ and it was so. God made the beasts of the earth after their kind, and the cattle after their kind, and everything that creeps on the ground after its kind; and God saw that it was good.”* (emphasis added)

We believe the Biblical terms “*after its kind*” and “*after their kind*” are commands from God to procreate within a “kind” (a biological boundary) and the term “*Be fruitful and multiply*” is a command from God – using the language of science – “to reproduce and increase in population.”

Darwin's big problem is that he couldn't define how those “adaptations for survival” occurred. Because the technology behind DNA replication had not been discovered yet, all Darwin could suggest, using only observation and hypothesis, is that species “adapted”. Darwin could only prove that adaptation occurred, but not how it occurred. However, with respect to God, we believe that when He commands something, He always “bakes in”

<sup>6</sup> See <http://www.nature.com/scitable/topicpage/dna-is-constantly-changing-through-the-process-6524898>

<sup>7</sup> Dr. Stephen Meyer, Director of the Center For Science and Culture at the Discovery Institute, outlines his ground-breaking analysis in his books *Darwin's Doubt* and *Signature in The Cell – DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design*.

the way to make it happen.<sup>8</sup> And this is all by design – God’s design. Some call this Intelligent Design; we call it Divine Design. And yes, with God, miracles are common for He can speak anything into existence.

Once the tools of molecular biology became available, science was finally able to understand how adaptation took place – it was through mistakes in DNA replication, i.e., mutations. But science now also understands that such a process leading to where we are today could not have randomly occurred on its own. Through Dr. Meyer’s work, science has recently proven something Biblical Christians have known all along – the possibility that evolution through adaptation/mutation could occur on its own is zero and thus must have Intelligent Design behind it.

*Conclusion:* Adaptation within “its kind” occurs. An obvious example would be dogs living in cold environments having heavy coats and dogs living in hotter climates having lighter coats. However, we believe it is likely adaption did not occur of its own accord, but rather had an external influence guiding the necessary adaptations required to arrive at today’s complex proteins that make up current life forms. We believe that only God, with His unimaginable and incomprehensible power, was and continues to be this external influence.

## Did Man Evolve from Apes or Was He Made by God?

Evolutionists claim that man evolved from the ape family millions of years ago. Biblical creationists have a real problem with this issue for good reason. The Bible clearly states that God made man. The Bible also clearly states that God made man in His image – a perfect moral being with a conscience – and the Bible also makes clear that animals were not similarly made. Thus, for Biblical Creationists, man came from God, not from apes that “evolved” supposedly over millions of years into modern man.

*“Then God said, ‘Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; and let them rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over the cattle and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.’ God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them. God blessed them; and God said to them, ‘Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it; and rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over every living thing that moves on the earth.’”* Genesis 1:26-28

*“Then the Lord God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being.”* Genesis 2:7

According to Scripture, God made man, and He made man from dust, not from apes. There are really three issues at play in this area of debate between Scripture and science over the creation of modern man: (1) Image, (2) Process, and (3) Timing. Here are our thoughts on these three issues.

### On The Issue of Image

- The Bible tells us that God made man and beasts separately.

*“Then God said, ‘Let the earth bring forth living creatures after their kind: cattle and creeping things and beasts of the earth after their kind’; and it was so. God made the beasts of the earth after their kind, and the cattle after their kind, and everything that creeps on the ground after its kind; and God saw that it was good.*

*Then God said, ‘Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; and let them rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over the cattle and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.’ God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.”* Genesis 1:24-27 (emphasis added)

There are two very important things to take note of in these verses: (1) God made “beasts” first and subsequently made “man”, and (2) God made beasts “after their kind”, but no such reference is made to man. God made man in His image, and there is only one such image – and it does not evolve. And, as Dr. Meyer has proven, there simply would not have been even close to enough time for man, as we now genetically know him, to have “evolved” from the ape family.

Also, we do not believe that God, as an unimaginable and incomprehensible, eternal and infinite power, has a particular or defined “physical look” – at least not one imaginable by man. Thinking that God looks like man (two arms, two legs, two eyes and a brain the size of a man’s brain) is rather arrogant on man’s part, don’t you think? That a power, limited by the physical characteristics of arms and legs, etc., could have ever created the

---

<sup>8</sup> God commanding Moses to lead His chosen people to the Promised Land is a perfect example of God “baking in the solution”. God issued the command for Moses to lead His people to the Promised Land and then provided the “pillar of fire” to light the way at night and the “pillar of cloud” to lead the way during the day. He allowed Moses to get water from rocks, and God sent manna from heaven for food.

universe with all its galaxies, planets, and suns, is highly unlikely. No, we believe the premise that God physically looks like man is a myth promulgated by Michelangelo, who, in his Sistine Chapel painting, made God in the image of man, not the other way around.

Instead, we believe the “image” of God, in the biblical context presented in Genesis 1:26 (see above), is not one of a physical image, but rather one of a spiritual image – specifically, designed to be perfect and sinless, as all inhabitants in heaven have to be – but also with intellect, will, emotion and a moral character. That God is of a spiritual nature is confirmed in John 4:24 when Jesus speaks to the Samaritan woman at the well saying: **“God is spirit, and those who worship Him must worship in spirit and truth.”**

### **On The Issue of Process**

- Evolutionists believe that man, through various adaptations, evolved from the ape family into the only living species of modern man, Homo Sapiens. Dr. Meyer’s work proves this to be impossible and the Bible completely discounts it as well.
- If you ask most people if they believe apes are beasts, we suspect most people would say that yes, apes are beasts. However, we know from Genesis 1:24-25 that God formed the beasts as living creatures first, and then from Genesis 1:26-27, we know that God then formed man as a living being separately from the beasts. Since God formed man and beasts separately, and if apes are beasts, then we can logically conclude that man could not have evolved from apes because God made man as man and in His image, not man as beast/ape and its kind.

God also introduces the concept of ‘kind’ later in Genesis when He tells Noah how to populate the Ark:

**“And of every living thing of all flesh, you shall bring two of every kind into the ark, to keep them alive with you; they shall be male and female. Of the birds after their kind, and of the animals after their kind, of every creeping thing of the ground after its kind, two of every kind will come to you to keep them alive.”** Genesis 6:19-20 (emphasis added). Again note, God makes no reference to bringing Man “and his kind” into the Ark.

God makes it quite clear that His living creations can only beget their own kind, as opposed to evolutionary theory that allows reptile scales to mutate into feathers, and feathered reptiles to mutate into birds, which is cross speciation and not reproducing after their own kind. Science tells us that when cross speciation occurs, the offspring are infertile; thus, perpetuation of the species cannot occur. For example, cross breeding a horse with a donkey, results in a mule. The mule is sterile and cannot reproduce.

Now, it is often said by Biblical scholars that when God repeats something over and over again, whatever He is telling us increases in its importance. That said, we think God is really making His point that His creations can only beget their “own kind”. If God’s creations can only beget their own kind, and we believe this to be true, then where does that leave evolution as respects apes and man? Great question, and here is our answer.

We have shown where, in the Bible, God gave the instruction for all but one of His creatures to be fruitful and multiply *within their kind*. We believe that the population growth of “a kind” often requires changes for survival. We then pointed out that DNA cannot, with its own intent or purpose, re-imagine itself, and Dr. Meyer confirmed that the adaptations claimed by evolutionists could not have occurred randomly in the timeframe of historical earth. Lastly, we indicated that when God commands something, He always provides the methodology for it to happen. From all of this, we conclude: (1) God created the process behind the changes within “kinds”, (2) such changes could not have occurred in the timeframe hypothesized by evolutionists unless there was an external influence behind them, and (3) with respect to man, we have a unique creation. God did not create man “after his kind” like He did all other creatures, but rather, He created man in His own image.

### **On The Issue of Timing**

- Biblical creationists do have an extremely powerful chronological argument that Adam could not have originally been an ape if, as evolutionists speculate, it took reportedly millions of years for a member of the ape family (starting with the genus *Australopithecus*) to develop into someone who would have looked like modern man (species of *sapiens*) – a supposedly very recent member of the ape family but in the genus of Homo. This is simply because the traceable genealogy of Adam, as recorded in the Bible, might top out at 6,000 years, and not the millions of years needed for adaptations to occur as hypothesized by the evolutionists.

- As previously noted, Dr. Meyer’s work supports the fact that modern man could not have evolved from the ape family, as he concluded there would not be even close to enough time for such an evolution to occur, even after billions and billions of years, much less the millions of years that supposedly started with the genus *Australopithecus* as claimed by evolutionists.

## Summary

It is clear – from science itself – that it would have been impossible for creation and evolution to have occurred without the direct influence of an external force. We happen to call this external force God, the Father and Creator of all things. While some may find it hard to believe the Bible, we suggest it is much easier to believe the Bible than to believe theories such as a universe being sourced from nothing or random mutational evolution resulting in apes turning into man – both of which science has now proven to be impossible.

So how well do Scripture and science relate? Well, once you move away from historically “accepted” science, it is apparent that current “provable” science now confirms what Scripture has been telling us all along – God is behind creation and the adaptations that got us to where we are today. The problem with science is that it cannot prove God. Perhaps the real problem is our thinking that it should.