

Science and the Bible: A debate

1. Did God continue His creation of the higher animals gradually, step-by-step, over billions of years? (Progressive Creationism)

Reasons to Believe (R2B) Position: (Progressive Creationism)

God has increased the complexity of life on earth by successive creations of new/advanced life forms, gradually, over billions of years, as species became extinct from natural disasters, disease, predation, and mutation.

Based on the evolutionary view of the geologic record. [54 -149ff]

Rocky Mountain Creation Fellowship (RMCF) Position: (Biblical Creationism)

All Creation was completed in six literal days of earth rotation as documented by the eyewitness account of history in the Book of Genesis. [1-Gen.1] We are told that God finished His work and rested on the Seventh Day. The Creation was completed “Very Good”, without death, disease, or natural disasters.

R2B rejects the clear teachings of Scripture and the foundational doctrines of special creation in order to try to harmonize the Bible with the discredited uniformitarian theories of the evolutionary philosophers. [44]

2. Was Noah’s Flood a Local Flood or a World-Wide Catastrophe?

R2B Position. (Uniformitarianism)

The Genesis Flood was a local flood in the Mesopotamian region where the entire human population lived at that time. [44] Modern birds and land animals are not exclusively descended from creatures housed in Noah’s Ark (e.g. penguins). [61] [49-55]

Adopts the uniformitarian, biological-evolutionary view of the geologic strata, which presupposes that the vertical position of fossils represents their date of appearance on earth, contrary to scripture. This requires billions of years to be force-fit into the Scripture, with corollary of a local flood.

Since the upper layers of strata are assigned millions of years of earth history, Noah’s Flood left no evidence. [37-12]

RMCF Position. (Catastrophism)

Earth’s surface was entirely inundated by the Genesis flood, covering “all the high mountains,” and destroying “all” birds and land animals outside of Noah’s Ark. [1-Gen. 7] The Ark would have been unnecessary to avoid a local flood--Noah could have moved to higher ground.

Taking a catastrophic view of the earth’s geologic record, RMCF holds that the fossil record generally represents the position of rapid burial of organisms in the Great Flood of Noah, and is

random with respect to the order of Creation. The Global Flood destroyed and redeposited much of pre-Flood strata. To claim that it left no record is ridiculously unscientific. Turbidites and cross-bedded sandstones in the Grand Canyon prove this [19], as does the discovery of nautiloid mass kills (billions of organisms) in the Redwall limestone, showing it was deposited in minutes, not millions of years. [5]

The view that the fossils record billions of years of death/extinction/advance is not science, but pure evolutionary presupposition. Uniformitarianism has been falsified as a guiding principle of geology [46], both by scripture (II Pet 3) and by modern science (Neo-catastrophism) [10]

3. Is the Universe Billions of years old?

R2B Position: (Secular Astronomy View)

Estimates of the size of universe, the starlight from the distant galaxies, the cosmic background radiation, and other astronomical discoveries prove the universe is about 14 billion years old. [53]

Rejects all Biblical and scientific evidence to the contrary, including the Genesis account and the magnetic field decay, falsely claiming it is “sinusoidal.” [54-155]

RMCF Position: (Biblical Chronology View)

Biblical genealogies, including the NT genealogy of Christ, clearly demonstrate the Universe is approximately six thousand years old. The historical accuracy of the Biblical text is remarkable, and is borne out by archaeological science and extra-biblical texts. It is the undeniable Word of the Creator.

The scientific evidence for a young earth is overwhelming, with over 90% of models giving an “age” much less than assumed by evolutionary geologists [32]. These include the exponential decay of earth’s magnetic field (half-life 1400 years) [26], population of super nova remnants, amount of salt in ocean, and the amount of Carbon 14 in diamonds [15]. Radioisotope dates of igneous rocks have been scientifically proven to be unreliable and subject to false assumptions. [40]

General Relativistic models of starlight/time are under development. What we can say at this point is that several plausible mechanisms for how the starlight could reach earth during Creation Week have been demonstrated, with considerable observational and theoretical support. [28] [8]

Astronomers believe in a universe so large, that the Cosmic Background Radiation would not have time to traverse it, yet the same temperature is detected in all directions. [29-531]

In other words, light-travel-time is a difficulty whether we believe in God's Word, or man's opinion. So R2B might as well believe in God's Word!

4. Was Man Created in the Beginning?

R2B Position: (Secular Anthropology View)

Man was created approx. 30,000 years ago, billions of years after Creation and millions of years after the appearance of now-extinct, spiritless hominids, including the Neanderthals. This idea is claimed to be consistent with the Biblical record. [62]

Neanderthals were animals, and therefore it was part of God’s plan of Creation for them to die before Adam’s Fall into sin. [62]

RMCF Position: (Biblical/Scientific View)

Genesis clearly teaches that Adam was created on the sixth day of Creation Week, approximately six thousand years ago. Jesus, the Creator and eyewitness to history, teaches that Adam and Eve existed in the beginning, not billions of years after the dawn of Creation [1-Mark 10:6].

Pre-Adamite hominids never existed. Neanderthal remains indicate they were indistinguishable from modern humans. They created artwork, used tools, and buried their dead, and were contemporary with modern Europeans, and therefore are descendants of Adam and Eve. [34]

Scientific studies of mitochondrial DNA (the “molecular clock”) show that the female ancestor of mankind (Eve) lived approximately 6000 years ago. [52]

Age-dates (Carbon 14 dating) given by secular anthropologists for ancient civilizations are subject to a variety of error sources, including the rate of change of atmospheric carbon, contamination, instrument calibration, and anomalies due to the Flood [51] [9]. We should rely on the infallible Biblical record for our most accurate dates.

5. Was the Universe generated by the Big Bang?

R2B Position: (Evolutionary Naturalism)

God used the Big Bang (BB) to create the universe 13.7 billion years ago. [53-91ff]

The Big Bang cosmology is a purely naturalistic theory, without God which imagines that all the matter in the universe was concentrated in a minute “cosmic egg” that exploded into the universe. As the matter cooled and expanded, it collapsed into stars, planets, and galaxies.

Unguided natural processes formed the solar system, as swirling gas clouds condensed under gravity into the sun and planets. The earth’s environment and atmosphere evolved randomly until it became suitable for life. The moon was formed “for certain” by ejecta from earth, forming the pacific basin. [12]

The sequence of creation in Genesis must be reordered to match the BB: stars millions of years before sun, sun before earth, sun before light, earth before water, etc.

Unbelievably, Hugh Ross claims that the Big Bang theory has been undeniably proven, and is in perfect agreement with scripture. Recent drastic changes to the theory are claimed to be “fine tuning.” [2]

RMCF Position: (Biblical Creationism)

God spoke the universe into existence [1-Gen 1, Ps 33] approximately 6000 years ago. The Big Bang is not Biblical, not only because of the natural cause and billions of years, but because it reorders the creation events described in precise sequence in the Book of Genesis: heaven before stars, earth and light before sun, moon and stars, water before dry land, plants before animals, etc.

If we modify the straightforward reading of Genesis to accommodate the atheistic models, why not do this with the Gospel as well? Ross’ fixation on unguided natural processes denies the power of God.

Consensus among astronomers is that there is no satisfactory, naturalistic model for the origin of the moon, corroborating the Bible that it was created on Day 4. [13] Scientists refer to Ross' writings on the moon as "lunacy," and "incompetence." [20]

The Big Bang never happened; not a science, but a theory about the past with arbitrary, philosophical assumptions, that violates the fundamental scientific principles of conservation of mass and energy.

The BB is a total failure. Instead of being proven, whole books have been written against it by renowned astronomers. [30] [25][3]

Some Big Bang failures: [33, et al]

1. Does not explain the rapid rotation of galaxies: they would literally fly apart.
2. Cannot form galaxies: not enough mass is observed to cause gravitational collapse of gas.
3. Cannot explain the clumpiness of the universe: great walls of galaxy superclusters extend unimagined distances, separated by vast voids in space.
4. The cosmic background radiation (CBR) is profoundly smooth; its anisotropy is not enough to explain the clumpiness.
5. Cannot explain the origin of elements other than the lightest.
6. Cannot explain the rate of expansion of the universe or the low angular momentum of the sun.
7. Requires a super-natural "inflation" of rapid space expansion (expansion ratio ten to power 23) of unknown mechanism. (Different laws of physics?) [39]

To save the BB from collapse, a crutch has been invented in the last decade: Cold Dark Matter (CDM) [14]. Cosmologists believe there must be a "halo" of undetected matter around galaxies and clusters to glue them together and prevent them from flying apart. Unknown matter that does not interact with atoms, but which somehow exerts only gravity on them! And this unknown, non-existent matter must constitute 96% of the stuff in the universe! [48]

The Big Bang theory was built on two pillars: the observed expansion of the universe and the standard model of particle physics [47]. The latter has no knowledge of "dark matter." Since evolutionists don't know what CDM is, it is impossible for the Big Bang to produce it from the standard model. New particles have been hypothesized; all but two have been eliminated. Scientists continue to search for them, to no avail. The CDM is a major departure from modern physics; to call it "fine tuning" is deceptive.

The rate of expansion has also been called into question, because of peculiar galaxies and quasars, which exhibit anomalous, quantized, and intrinsic redshift. In other words, estimates of the expansion rate and size of the universe are suspect. [3] [4]

6. Does the Bible allow the concept of death before Adam's sin?

R2B Position. ("Death is Good" Heresy)

Death, suffering, disease, mutation, and animal predation existed billions of years prior to Adam's sin, as recorded in the fossil record. God designed innocent animals to devour each other by the trillions. Death from natural disasters and harmful mutation occurred in the original creation before the curse. [49-13]

The scripture “The wages of sin is death” refers to spiritual death, not physical death. Animal death is fundamentally different than human death, since animals don’t sin. Therefore, animal death could occur before Adam’s sin. [53-61]

Animals must eat both plants and animal tissue to get energy. Animal and plant death is essential for the existence of all highly active animals. [63]

Death is good: “It’s not bad from God’s perspective; it is good; it is a gift.”
God uses death as a tool for redemption; Love is revealed through physical death. [54-174]
God is the author of all evil. [64]

RMCF Position: (Death from Sin Only)

Both Old and New Testament scriptures teach that death entered the world as a result of Adam’s sin. [1-Rom 5:12, 6:23] And, Rom 8:10 proves unequivocally that “death” refers to both physical and spiritual death:

And if Christ is in you, indeed the body is dead because of sin, but the Spirit is life because of righteousness -Romans 8:10

Both animals and humans have the “breath of life”, the *nephesh*, which is *soul-life*. [42] God placed the curse of death upon the world that Adam ruled. The whole creation (animals) *groans* under the Genesis curse, waiting to be delivered from the bondage they are in because of man’s sin [1-Rom 8:22]. Thus, the Adamic curse of physical death extended to animals.

Likewise, both mankind and animals were created as vegetarians [1-Gen 1:29]. Many people live as vegetarians today. Lions have been raised as vegetarians and pastured with sheep, so meat eating (or animal death) is not a nutritional requirement for God’s creatures. Plants don’t die; they do not have the *nephesh*, and therefore the eating of plants does not qualify as “death before sin.” [42]

Genesis records the first death, when God sacrificed animals to make a covering for Adam & Eve’s guilt (clothes). Hugh Ross has failed to show any scriptural basis for any prior death. The Garden of Eden was therefore not built on a fossil graveyard, as he believes.

The Eden sacrifice established the Blood Covenant, which extended to the Cross in Christ’s sacrificial death. In the atonement, the animal loses its life in the place of the human.

“Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin” (Heb. 9:22)

The **Crimson Thread** of the Blood Covenant continued to Calvary, culminating that last night in the Upper Room, when Jesus said, *“This is the blood of the New Covenant, shed for the forgiveness of sin.”*

What value would the sacrifice have if death had been going on for billions of years before the Fall? If death is not the penalty for sin, then Christianity is meaningless. Ross’ alleged billions of years of death before Adam **trivializes** the New Covenant sacrifice of Christ. If animal death existed before the fall, then the sacrifice of Christ on the cross was not necessary to pay the penalty for sin. “If suffering and death in the world are not the result of God’s judgment on sin, then the most reasonable inference is that the God of the Bible does not exist.” [31]

Death is not “good”; the Bible refutes this distorted view of God by calling death the “last enemy” [1-1Cor 15:26]. In the promised New Earth there will be “no more death” [1-Rev 21:4]. It follows that death must not have been a part of God's original plan. If God created through millions of years of death and suffering, then God is a cruel ogre and not the kind of god one would be inclined to serve.

Our perfect God created a perfect world. For Hugh Ross to claim that God is the author of evil, and uses death as a “tool of redemption” distorts the Gospel and calls into question his entire theology. Such a philosophy is a basis for most atheists’ and agnostics’ belief systems. To the contrary, Satan is the author of evil. [1-Gen. 3:4]

R2B statements on the Trinity are equally bizarre:

"And I would have to agree with the Muslim apologist who says [56 -147]

"Jesus claims to be . . . **identical to the Father**, also to the Holy Spirit, and the Father to the Holy Spirit"; other claims "simultaneously true" are that each member of the Trinity is "completely distinct and independent"

God is body, soul and spirit. Jesus had a physical body prior to the incarnation as a baby and that the fullness of the Godhead dwells in him [58]

It is amazing that R2B has any following in the Church with such false teachings. R2B may eventually be known as the “Science Cult,” or “The Scoffer Cult” in the last days, as prophesied in 2 Pet 3 :

Scoffers will come in the last day with scoffing, people who walk after their own fleshly desires and saying, “Where is the promise of His coming? For since the forefathers fell asleep, all things have continued exactly as they did from the beginning of creation.” [Uniformitarianism] For they willfully overlook and forget this fact, that heavens came into existence long ago by the word of God and an earth also which was formed out of water and by means of water, through which the world was deluged and perished. -2Pet 3:3-6 (Amplified Bible)

7. How long is a “Day”?

R2B Position: (Day-Age Theory)

Billions of years took place during the Biblical Creation Week. Each day is interpreted to mean eons of time, to correspond to the geologic ages. [54-141]

The order of creation is the evolutionary sequence of the Big Bang and the geologic column, contrary to scripture. The “Creation Days” are imagined to “overlap,” thus alleging the evolutionary sequence can be construed to agree with the Biblical order of creation. [28-33]

Mistranslates the Hebrew word for “made” to mean “appeared” as argument that the sun and moon were not created on Day 4 as the Bible says. [37-7]

R2B claims to adhere to the tenets of the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy (ICBI), in spite of their belief that Moses got it wrong. [65]

RMCF Position: (Direct Hebrew Translation Approach)

In chapter 1 of Genesis, each of the first six Creation Week days specifies “and there was morning and evening” for each day. The Hebrew word “*yom*” in this context and usage can only legitimately be translated as a single, 24-hr day. Hebrew scholars world-wide are in agreement with this fact. (Hugh Ross is not a Hebrew scholar.) [12] [32-31]

Exodus 20:11 reinforces the literal interpretation:

“For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, and the sea and all that is in them.”

God inscribed this scripture, the basis of the calendar week, on the tablets of Law given to Moses. It cannot be interpreted to mean millions of years.

Ross’ “overlapping days” model, invented to reorder the events of Creation, is “*vain babbling and oppositions of science (falsely so-called)*” that we are warned against in [1-1 Tim 6:20]. Adopting such devious constructs and intentional mistranslations make R2B’s claim of adherence to the tenets of the ICBI a fraud. Is Hugh Ross a wolf in sheep’s clothing?

8. Can mankind find salvation in the Cosmos?

R2B Position: (Canonization of Nature)

Science provides an accurate understanding of God and His plan for history. Holds the view that the plan of salvation as stated in Bible can be seen through observation of “Nature.”

"Without the aid of scriptures . . . [Job] discerned all the elements of the gospel, the good news of how man can find eternal life in God." -Hugh Ross, *Fingerprint of God* [p.181]

The “Facts of Nature” are like the sixty-seventh book of the Bible and are on “equal footing” to the written revelation of God. [53-57]

Accepts most interpretations of nature from secular science, and cavalierly reinterprets the Bible accordingly, which elevates science above scripture. R2B thus holds science and modern day rationalism in higher esteem than the Bible.

RMCF Position: (Limited knowledge from General Revelation)

God created nature and provided scriptural revelation. We have confidence in the observed, repeatable laws of nature. However, man can draw true knowledge about God from nature only if he interprets it in light of scripture, recognizing that the creation is cursed. To force interpretation of scripture based on fallible theories about nature is dangerous. Man is open to deception; when man ignores God, God gives him up to believe the lie. [1-2 Thess 2:11]

It is one thing to observe the heavens and experience the glory of God (Ps 19); it is quite another to regard as God’s Truth the theories of science about how the heavenly hosts came into being. To declare that sinful, fallen men using the fallible methodology of science, with an incorrect postulate (naturalistic materialism) can come to the truth about God is a falsehood. The Bible must sit in judgment over all of our naive and tentative ideas derived from science. [20]

[A theory of origins is not the realm of science.](#) Science makes observations in the present; the Big Bang is a theory about the past. Models concerning historical events are commonly based on highly speculative foundational assumptions. True history is recorded by an eyewitness account. Jesus Christ is the Great Eyewitness to Creation, and he told Moses what to write in Genesis.

Beware lest anyone rob you through philosophy and vain deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the elements of the world, and not according to Christ. - Col 2:8

[Science changes; God's Word changes not.](#) The history of science is littered with the wrecks of ideas that were at one time considered to be 'true', but have long since fallen out of favor. [20] So we ask, "What are the 'Facts of Nature'?" Elevating these changing theories above the Bible should alarm all Christians who are committed to the authority of Scripture. A classic example:

Einstein's General Theory of Relativity originally included a cosmological constant (CC, antigravity) to insure a static universe. After the Universal Expansion was discovered, he called this the greatest "blunder" of his career, and CC was removed. Recently, observations of distant galaxies have required antigravity to be restored to the theory, forcing a major change to the Big Bang theory.

In First Corinthians Paul addresses the unbelief which characterizes the intellectual and scientific leaders in any age. Whole systems of human thought can be wrong, and "*God chose what is foolish in the world to shame the wise, . . . so that no human being might boast in the presence of God.*" Scientists are easily deceived in the ways they interpret nature, and "the fact of evolution" is an infamous example, with devastating impact on our culture.

[General Revelation is limited.](#) Scientific truth is relative and limited; Biblical truth is absolute and eternal. [16] General revelation is sufficient to draw man's mind to the power of the Creator; but to really know God, one must rely on special revelation (God's Word).

But as it is written, "Eye has not seen, nor ear heard," nor has it entered into the heart of man, "the things which God has prepared for those who love Him." 1 Cor 2:9

The R2B teaching that the natural man, with his unregenerate mind, can come to salvation, simply by observing nature, places the ministry outside the mainstream of evangelical theology. Is the Great Commission a waste of time?

Nature reveals that there is a Creator, a Designer, and an awesome Intelligence behind things. Nature, however, does not tell us about sin, death, redemption, the incarnation, eschatology, or the nature of evil. Without the Bible, we would likely be animists or polytheists, totally confused and in great darkness about ourselves and the nature of the one, true God. [16]

[Summary:](#) The whole approach of R2B is to interpret the infallible Word of God to fit in with the theories of fallible men who teach billions of years. However, the Creation is cursed, man's heart is deceitful [1-Jer 17:9], and the thinking of a godless man is 'futile' [1-Rom 1:21]. Scripture itself is 'God-breathed' [1-2 Tim 3:15-17] and infallible. So, Christians should not re-interpret the perfect Word of God according to fallible theories of sinful humans about a nature we know to be cursed.

9. Progressive Creation or Theistic Evolution?

R2B Position:

- Rejects macro-evolution *per se*. Claims that God replaced extinct species with advanced life forms over billions of years. [53-83]

RMCF Position:

The teachings of R2B are largely the same as theistic evolution.

<u>Theistic Evolution</u>	<u>Reasons to Believe</u>
Big Bang cosmology, without God	yes
Denies Genesis order of Creation	yes
Eons of death before Adam, -Undermines the Gospel message	yes yes
Denies an Initial paradise "Very good"	yes
Alleges mutation and natural disasters In Eden	yes
Evolutionary, uniformitarian view of geology	yes
Gradual, step by step appearance of organisms -Over billions of years	yes yes
Evolutionary view of Fossil Record (order and date of appearance)	yes No
Higher taxa share common ancestors	No
Change driven by mutational advance	? [see 57]
Gradual increase in genetic information within species	No
"Gaps" in history of organisms	yes
At least hundreds of Millions of fossil Species, mostly extinct	yes
Denies Global Flood of Noah	yes
Rejects straightforward teachings of Genesis	yes
Re-interprets scripture to conform to "science"	yes

The main difference between the two philosophies is the mechanism by which God shaped new life - by using previous organisms (evolution), or from scratch (progressive creationism). Either way it took God billions of years of death and extinction to get it right in these two non-biblical models of origins.

Christians need to be aware of the fact that the teaching of R2B embraces the same basic compromise of Scripture with evolutionary theory as Theistic Evolution, and ultimately undermines the authority of the Word of God and the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

10. Does God require extra dimensions for His existence?

R2B Position. (Multi-dimensional existence and operation of God)

Claims that the String Theory (ST) research for a Grand Unified Theory gives us insight into a metaphysical extra-dimensionality of God. ST postulates that particles of matter can be expressed as energy vibrations similar to those of physical strings on musical instruments. (These strings are imagined to move in more than the normal three spatial dimensions.)

Hugh Ross says in "Beyond and the Cosmos" that St. Augustine erred when he claimed that God operated outside of time. Instead he proposes that in order to operate as He does, God must possess at least one additional time dimension. Along with the 7 extra space dimensions of ST, this gives a total of twelve dimensions in which God works. Ross then proposes solutions to ageless theological questions, and as in his usual style he overstates the case. [20][18]

Example: How can God hear everyone's prayers?

Answer: God has a dimension of time *perpendicular* to our time (as if time was a Euclidean dimension, which it is not). Thus, while an instant occurs in our time, an infinite amount of time could exist in which God could easily hear everyone's prayers. The same reasoning is used to show how Jesus could have suffered on the cross for each of us individually. Meanwhile, Christians had simply assumed that God had the infinite capacity to do this. [21]

Other examples include omnipresence, predestination, and the problem of evil and suffering. Ross claims that only in the 20th century when scientists grasped new ideas of physics, were we able to understand these concepts.

R2B's claims about the Trinity (see Issue No. 6 above) are particularly objectionable: Ross dismisses all the traditional explanations of the Trinity and claims that only extra-dimensionality is adequate to understand it. [17] Thus, Hugh Ross has redefined the word Trinity to include a modalistic version of the Godhead that is "absurd" unless understood in light of his multi-dimensional theories of God and heaven.

RMCF Position: (Keep the Simplicity of Christ, 2Cor 11:3)

The thesis of "Beyond the Cosmos" that only modern physics research has enabled us to understand many great theological questions is erroneous and dangerous. We concur with philosopher/theologian Dr. William Lane Craig's assessment of Hugh Ross' extra-dimensional deity in "Philosophia Christi" [20]

"I find his attempt to construe God as existing in hyper-dimensions of time and space and to interpret Christian doctrines in that light to be both philosophically and theologically unacceptable." [11]

Any claim R2B makes that the topology of strings models the Trinity and aspects of the supernatural attributes of God is completely false and designed to take glory unto themselves [24]. Using these structures to model God's supernatural aspects is closely related to pantheism. Orthodox theology holds that God is One in essence (or substance) but Three in Person, that God's oneness and threeness are not in the same sense.

"The Doctrine of the Trinity is not self-contradictory. This it would be, only if it declared God to be three in the same numerical sense in which he is said to be one. This we do not assert."

- Strong, Systematic Theology (1907) p. 345 [45]

String Theory is controversial and tentative. To base one's theology on untested scientific theories subjugates scripture to fallible human philosophy. To base doctrine on such tenuous ideas as ST is a deceptive device to beguile unwary Christians that science has unlocked the mysteries of the Bible.

But I fear lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve in his craftiness, so your thoughts should be corrupted from the simplicity due to Christ. -2Cor 11:3

In other words, "Keep it Simple." The Holy Spirit reveals the truth of scripture [I Jn 2:27], truths that are spiritually discerned [1Cor 2:14]. Our knowledge of God need not come from a detailed and imaginary human explanation as to how God created, but rather from an appreciation for God's immense creative power. [1-Rom 1:20] We see in the universe, as it exists the simple truth that the universe exhibits a kind of beauty and design that can only be attributed to a higher intelligence. [24] Our response should be humble acceptance of how He says He created: "In Six Days."

What is String Theory? In particle physics, It is convenient to describe the way that subatomic particles (quarks) combine to form larger structures (protons) as vibrating strings of energy containing the quarks at its ends. The branch of mathematics employed to work out the rules for how these quarks combine is known as topology. In the late sixties it was found that this field of mathematics contained equations of the form of Einstein's gravity and those of Maxwell's laws describing electromagnetic force. So physicists have tried to use the equations to produce the long-sought-after link between the theory of gravity and particle dynamics in search of a "theory of everything". The task has proven extremely difficult, and after decades of work, a satisfactory understanding has eluded physicists.

. . . "it would predict all possible outcomes and thus fail to offer a meaningful approach to any problem."
- "Steven Hawking's Universe," p.261 [23]

The mathematics of ST incorporates extra-dimensional changes to describe the dynamics of strings--up to ten spatial dimensions plus time. These do not manifest themselves in every day life. Most scientists found such an idea extremely difficult to accept, and treat it with much skepticism, and there are other competing theories.

And there is a problem: strings are theoretically so small, that they can never be observed. So their existence is more philosophy than science. So far, no testable predictions have resulted from the theory, so it cannot even be regarded as science.

"String Theorists are focused on questions which experiment cannot address . . . It's a kind of physics which is not yet testable. It doesn't make predictions that have anything to do with experiments that can be done in the laboratory or with observations in space or from telescopes. I still believe physics is an experimental science --that deals with results of experiments." -Sheldon Lee Glasgow, Boston U. [18]

And yet, In "Beyond the Cosmos" Ross speaks of ST as if it were scientific fact [21], a typical R2B deception. Work on ST continues, lead by Ed Witten, a physicist at Princeton with extraordinary mathematical skills, who continues to search for simplifications that might result in physical insights.

In the meantime, R2B has produced a beguiling “dog-and-pony show” scenario, complete with video graphics, of how God used strings and gradual introduction of multi-dimensions to create the universe [2]. Such nonsense can be described as a fairy tale, like much of Ross’ so-called “science.”

On the February 1, 2004 Ankerberg Program, Ross made the outrageous statement that if the total mass of the universe was one part in one “trillion trillion trillion trillion trillion” different than it is, the universe would not be able to support life. This is false. Cosmologists have in the last decade revised their estimate of the matter in the universe upwards by a factor of 25, and by approximately six percent this year alone [S/T Feb 04 p.18]. But the gullible moderator (Ankerberg) called it “mind-blowing science.”

Evidently Christians like Ankerberg are so hungry for scientific evidence for Creation vs. evolution, they will accept Ross’ anti-biblical doctrines because of the beguiling attraction of his “science” propaganda and his pretext of anti-evolutionism. (It should be noted there are obviously other incentives as well: Ankerberg is selling copies of the show and other R2B materials for over \$100 per package!)

Ross’ claim on the show that the solar system is in the “just-right position in the galaxy for life” is based on the anti-biblical claim that it must be located where there is enough gaseous matter to form planets (the disproved nebular theory of planet formation). We know from scripture that the earth was created before galaxies, *ex nihilo* and not from galactic Hydrogen gas and dust. Ankerberg is apparently ignorant of the fact that the Big Bang cosmology is a purely naturalistic, atheistic model, denying the power of God, and violating the first principles of science and scripture, and that there is not enough gravity in Hydrogen gas to form planets, stars, or galaxies. Meanwhile, scientists waste millions of research dollars looking for new laws of physics and non-existent “dark matter” to support their atheistic models.

11. Conclusion

R2B claims to believe in the fundamental truths of Christianity, but accepts *a priori*, naturalistic scientific theories as factual. Biblical creation accounts disputing those tentative theories are loosely reinterpreted in an attempt to harmonize Biblical accounts with scientific theories, thus undermining the authority of scripture and causing widespread unbelief in the Church. Ross combines a low view of science [Evolutionary Uniformitarianism] with a lower view of scripture [Day-Age theory], and produces total confusion that challenges faith in God’s Word.

RMCF believes true science and Scripture are 100 percent compatible; this principle constitutes a criterion for “true science.” Theories of origins are based upon unprovable assumptions, which may be true or false. The theories proclaimed by R2B as “truth” are steeped in evolutionary philosophy and naturalism, which RMCF considers to be false precepts.

The Genesis account is factual rather than poetic or figurative. We must ask ourselves, “Did Moses and God deceive us by using the word “day,” when it really was a long period of time?” RMCF holds to the traditional Protestant position as exemplified by Martin Luther, who said:

“When Moses writes that God created Heaven and Earth and whatever is in them in six days, then let this period continue to have been six days. . . .If you cannot understand how this could

have been done in six days, then grant the Holy Spirit the honor of being more learned than you are.” - Martin Luther

The bottom line is, we can have no confidence in God's Word if the Day-Age view is held.

Significant, erroneous theological and scientific claims are generally consistent throughout the materials of Reasons to Believe. In spite of objections by scholars, Ross continues to teach these errors, and is thus leading people down a wrong and dangerous path to a loss of faith in God's Word.

If Genesis is not considered a factual account, where does Scriptural truth begin? The logical result is a cafeteria-style approach where individuals decide which portion of the Bible to accept and which portion to ignore. Such a *laissez-faire* approach to Scripture allows fleshly desires to dominate one's thinking. Instead, we should follow the teachings of the Blessed Savior, who taught a literal Genesis.

[Jesus is a Biblical Creationist.](#) There are over 200 references to the Book of Genesis in the New Testament. Perhaps the most important are the passages like John Chapter One and Colossians One that tell us Jesus is Creator.

“In the Beginning, there was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God, and all things were Created by Him -John 1.
”

Christ is the Great Eye Witness to the Creation. John 3:16 tells us this blessed Truth:

“For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that Whosoever believes in Him shall not perish, but Have Everlasting Life. -John 3:16
”

If we think about what it means to “Believe in Him”, it becomes clear that to Believe in Him is to accept the claims of Christ. He said in Luke 16: 31:

“If they do not hear Moses [i.e. Genesis] and the Prophets, they will not be persuaded, even though one rose from the dead.”,

speaking of Himself. We cannot receive the blessings of Eternal Life, unless we believe what Christ says--He is the Living Word of God. These are the words of the Master:

For if you believe in Moses [Genesis], you would believe in Me, for he wrote about Me, but if you do not believe on his writings, how then will you believe and trust My teachings? -John 5:46

The Lord rebuked those who doubted the writings of Moses as indicating they could not believe Him either. And Jesus taught that Noah's flood was a worldwide flood, too.

*And the people of Noah's day did not know until the flood came and swept them all away
-Matt 24: 39*

But if Geological Evolution is true, the Global Flood of Noah could never have happened.

R2B teaches that creatures lived and died for billions of years before Adam. But Christ clearly refutes this philosophy of theistic evolution. If you need a proof text to counter theistic evolution or progressive creation, here it is. When Jesus was asked about divorce in the tenth chapter of Mark's gospel, he referred to the creation of man thusly:

From the beginning of Creation, God made them male and female. -Mark 10:6

You see, God did not wait millions of years until cave men extincted and then replaced them with Adam. He created Adam in the beginning, according to our Lord Jesus Christ. Since the genealogy of Jesus establishes that Adam lived only a few thousand years before Christ, the Creation is recent as Genesis says.

[An Appeal to Believe in God's Word](#): Mankind is indebted to Abraham, for he reestablished belief in God's Word. The scientists of Abraham's day probably scoffed when Abe said God had promised a descendant, because he was "certainly" too old and Sarah was barren.

Then later, after the promised son Isaac was spared from sacrifice, God repeated the promise saying, "I will multiply your descendants as the stars of the heavens and the sands of the seashore." (Gen 22:17) Surely the local astronomers scoffed, saying, "Come on Abe, we know there are only 2000 stars--we counted them last week" (there were no telescopes then). But a recent calculation by creation scientists has verified that the billions and billions of stars we now recognize agrees with a rough estimate of the number of grains of sand on all the earth's seashores! [13]

You see folks, science changes, but God's Word never changes. Abraham believed, and God counted it as righteousness. We at RMCF thank God that He has granted us faith to believe His Word, rather than trust in man's limited knowledge, and with that belief comes such a blessing. It is our prayer for the Church that God will allow all to believe, and He will count it to us all as righteousness.

Respectfully submitted

Bill Browning, Director and Treasurer/Librarian

Bibliography 2/05/04

Infallible Sources

1. Almighty God, "The Bible," (Old and New Testaments, in various translations),
Heaven: Holy Spirit Inspiration, from the Beginning, circa 4000 BC,
Canonized 4th cent. AD (NT).

Questionable, Human Sources (Scientists and Theologians)

2. Ankerberg, John, "The John Ankerberg Show," interview with Hugh Ross,
January 10, 2004.
3. Arp, H., Burbidge, G, Hoyle, F. *et al*, "The Extragalactic Universe: an alternative view,"
Nature Vol. 346, 30 Aug 1990, p.807
4. Arp, Halton, "Quasars, Redshifts, and Controversies," Berkeley, CA:
Interstellar Media, 1987.
5. Austin, Steven A., "Nautiloid Mass-Kill and Burial Event, Redwall Limestone of Grand
Canyon Region," *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Creationism*,
Creation Science Fellowship, Pittsburgh, PA, Aug. 2003
6. Battaner, E., and Florido, E., "The rotation curve of Spiral Galaxies and its Cosmological
Implications," U. of Granada, Spain, *Fund. Cosmic Phys.* **21** (2000), pp.1-154,
Available at <http://nedwww.ipac.caltech.edu/level5/March01/Battaner/revision.html>
7. Batten, Don, "Some questions for theistic evolutionists (and 'Progressive creationists')",
www.answersingenesis.org/docs/1273.asp, January 2004, posted 30 Oct 2000.
8. Batten, Don, *Ed.* "How can we see distant stars in a young universe?",
"The Revised and Expanded Answers Book," Chapter 5, Florence, KY: *Answers in
Genesis*, available on www.answersingenesis.org/docs/405.asp#8, January 2004
9. Baumgardner, John, "Carbon Dating Undercuts Evolution's Long Ages, *Institute for
Creation Research, Impact* Article No. 364, October 2003.
10. Coffin, Roger, "Origins by Design," (Geology Text), Hagerstown, MD: Review and
Herald Publishing, 1983, pp.98-116
11. Craig, William Lane. "Philosophia Christi," Vol. 21:1, Summer, 1998 *Journal of the
Evangelical Philosophical Society*.
12. Davidhauser, Borton, "A statement concerning the ministry of Dr. Hugh Ross,"
www.bible.ca/tracks/b-hugh-ross.htm, January 2004
13. De Young, Donald, "Astronomy and the Bible," Grand Rapids, Michigan:
Baker Book House, 1989.

14. De Young, Donald, "Dark Matter," *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, Vol. 36, March 2000, p. 177.
15. "Diamonds are a Creationist's Best Friend," *Institute for Creation Research, Acts and Facts*, Vol 33 No. 2, February 2004. For a summary visit www.icr.org/research/misc/aguconference.html
16. Dolphin, Lambert, "An Open Letter to Dr. Hugh Ross," 2/18/89, www.idolphin.org/ross.html
17. Donahue, Bill, "Open Letter to Dr. Hugh Ross of Reasons To Believe Ministries," 7/21/99, www.donahue.tv/cults/Hugh%20Ross/Open%20letter.htm
18. "The Elegant Universe," PBS Video, *Nova*, WGBH Boston; gives an assessment of the state of the art of String Theory.
19. "Evidences, The Record and the Flood," *Geoscience Research Institute*, Loma Linda, CA, video produced by Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1990.
20. Faulkner, Danny, "The Dubious Apologetics of Dr. Hugh Ross," *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal* 13(2), 1999, available at www.idolphin.org/Ross-faulkner.html
21. Faulkner, Danny, Book Review of "Beyond the Cosmos," by Hugh Ross, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, Vol. 34, March 1998, p.242
22. Faulkner, Danny, Book review of "Creation and Time," by Hugh Ross, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, Vol. 32, June 1995.
23. Filkin, David, "Steven Hawking's Universe," based on the BBC/WNET television series, New York: Basic Books Div. Of HarperCollins Publishing, 1997
24. Herrmann, Robert A., "Important Comments on the Ministry of Hugh Ross, Ph. D." www.serve.com/herrmann/ross.htm, January 2004, revised 23 Feb 2002.
25. Hoyle, F., Burbidge, G., and Narlikar, J.V., "Further astrophysical quantities expected In a quasi-steady state Universe," *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, Vol. 289, p. 729 (1994).
26. Humphreys, Russell, "The Earth's Magnetic Field is Young," *Institute for Creation Research, Impact* Article No. 242, August 1993.
27. Humphreys, Russell, "Answers about Ross and Starlight," personal correspondence with J.W. Browning, January 8, 2004, indicating that the Humphreys cosmology means there was an increased speed of light to an observer on earth in the past.
28. Humphreys, Russell, "Starlight and Time," Colorado Springs: Master Books, 1994.
29. Kaler, "Astronomy," New York: HarperCollins College Publishers, 1994, pp. 531-536.

30. Lerner, Eric J., "The Big Bang Never Happened," New York: Vintage Books, 1991.
31. Morris, Henry, "The Vital Importance of Believing in Recent Creation," *Institute for Creation Research, Back to Genesis* Article No. 138, June 2000.
32. Morris, John, "The Young Earth," *Institute for Creation Research*, Colorado Springs: Master Books, 1994.
33. Obershaw, Robert, "Cosmology Theory Compromised," *Nature* Vol. 346, 30 Aug 1990, p. 800.
34. Philips, Dave, "Neanderthals are Still Human!," *Institute for Creation Research, Impact* Article No. 323, May 2000.
35. Price, Randall, "The Stones Cry Out," video on 'What Archaeology Reveals About the Truth of the Bible,' Eugene, Oregon: Harvest House Publishers, 1997.
36. "Refining the Cosmic Recipe," *Sky and Telescope*, February, 2004, p 18."
37. Safarti, Johnathan, "Expose of NavPress' New Hugh Ross Book: 'The Genesis Question'," Florence, KY: *Answers in Genesis*, 1999.
38. Safarti, "Hugh Ross lays down the gauntlet!," 21 Nov 2000
www.answersingenesis.org/News/Ross_Gauntlet.asp
39. Smoot, George, "Wrinkles in Time," New York: Avon Books, 1993, quote p. 9:

"The universe at the moment of creation existed under very different conditions and probably operated according to different laws than it does today."
40. Snelling, Andrew, "Potassium-Argon and Argon-Argon Dating of Crustal Rocks and the Problem of Excess Argon," *Institute for Creation Research, Impact* Article No. 309, March 1999.
41. Stambaugh, James, "Hugh Ross, ICR, and Facts of Science," *Institute for Creation Research, Impact* Article No. 218, Aug 1991.
42. Stambaugh, James, "Death Before Sin," *Institute for Creation Research, Impact* Article No.191, May 1989.
43. Stambaugh, James, "The meaning of Day in Genesis," *Institute for Creation Research, Impact* Article No. 184, October 1988.
44. Stambaugh, James, "Hugh Ross, ICR and the Bible," *Institute for Creation Research, Impact* Article No. 217, July 1991.
45. Strong, "Systematic Theology", (1907) p. 345, cited in Donahue, [17]
46. Summerfield, Michael A., "Global Geomorphology, An Introduction to the study of

Landforms,” Essex, England: Longman Scientific and Technical (co-published with Wiley of New York), 1991; quote p. 17:

“... uniformity of rate and state, postulates rates of natural processes and material conditions that are essentially constant through time. This proposition involves a claim about the world which can be tested and which we now know to be false.”

47. Turner, Michael S., “The Hot big Bang and Beyond,” NASA/Fermilab Astrophysics Center, Batavia, IL, FERMILAB-Conf F-95/034-A astro-ph/9503017, 14 Mar 1995, see Proceedings of CAM-94 (Cancun 9/94). Available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/9503017>
48. Turner, Michael S. “Absurd Universe,” *Astronomy*, Nov. 2003, p.44
49. Van Bebbler and Taylor, “Creation and Time: A report on the Progressive Creationist Book by Hugh Ross,” Gilbert, Arizona: Eden Productions, 1996.
50. Van Bebbler and Taylor, “Progressive Creationist Hugh Ross, who is he and what does he believe?”, <http://christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-c014.html> January 2004.
51. Walker, Tas, “The Dating Game”, *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 26(1) 2004.
52. Wieland, Carl, “A shrinking date for ‘Eve’, *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal*; Vol. 12 (1), 1998, p.1. Available at www.answersingenesis.org/docs/4055.asp

Unreliable Sources

53. Ross, Hugh, “Creation and Time,” *Reasons to Believe*, Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress, 1994.
54. Ross, Hugh, “The Fingerprint of God,” *Reasons to Believe*, Orange, CA: Promise Publishing, 1991.
55. Ross, Hugh, “Beyond the Cosmos,” *Reasons to Believe*, Colorado Springs: NavPress, 1996.
56. Ross, Hugh “Creator & Cosmos,” *Reasons to Believe*, Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress, 1993.
57. Ross, Hugh, “God is One, Two, and Three,” Jan 16, 1991, tapes 1&2, side 1.
58. Ross, Hugh, TBN video broadcast Feb. 5, 1992, cited in Donahue [17]
59. Ross, Hugh, "The Question of Evil and Suffering," Nov. 30, 1989 (RTB audio tape set no. A8915) cited in Donahue [17].
60. Ross, Hugh, “The Genesis Question,” *Reasons to Believe*, Colorado Springs: Navpress, 1998.

61. Ross, Hugh, *Facts & Faith*, multi-part article on the Flood, parts 7&8 (1990).
62. Ross, Hugh, Lecture at W. Bowles Community Church, Denver, CO, June 3, 2001.
63. Ross, Hugh, "90 Second Radio News Spot", *Reasons to Believe* No. 48, 8th spot for February 1991.
64. Ross, Hugh, "The Question of Evil and Suffering," Nov. 30, 1989 (RTB audio tape Set no. A8915, tape 1)
65. Ross, Hugh, "What We Believe," *Reasons to Believe*, January 2004
<http://www.reasons.org/about/sof.shtml?main>
66. Ross, Hugh, "The Gospel According to Creation," "The Fingerprint of God," pp.179-183
67. Ross, Hugh, "Species Development," *Reasons to Believe*, audio tape, cited in Van Bebber [50], quote: "many of the changes that take place within the biological arena [are]. . . by natural process . . . natural selection, mutational advance...."
68. Ross, Hugh, "Open Line" Radio Program, (Moody Broadcasting Network, April 1994), cited in Van Bebber [50].