



SCIENCE vs. *The Bible*

BY MAC HAMMOND

WVA WINNER'S MINUTE
With Mac Hammond

Many people assume there is an unchangeable chasm between scientific theory and religious thought. The truth is, when rightly divided, science and the Bible are not irrevocably different. They truly do corroborate one another.

Science in itself is a good thing; it can be defined as a body of data arrived at and validated by repeated experimentation and observation. God wants us to reason, observe, and properly draw conclusions that lead us to the truth. Isaiah 1:18 says, “Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.” Our God-given rational capacity will take us to salvation and blessing if we begin with the right premise: God and His Word.

Reason is the heart and essence of science. Your rational capacity will lead you to God; it will stabilize and establish you in the faith and give you a basis of information with which to convince others of the same.

Science and the Bible, when properly understood, work together to help paint the bigger picture of our earth and its history. So when a question arises between the two, a correct answer must be available that agrees with both science and the Bible.

THE BIBLE CLASHES WITH THIS KIND OF SCIENCE

I do need to clarify that some science should be ignored; Paul warned Timothy in 1 Timothy 6:20 not to be moved or deceived by false science. There are some things that have come out of the scientific field that really haven't been the result of the empirical process. They have little to do with experimentation or observation, which proper science is based upon. We need to be aware of this distinction because false science and the Bible will contradict each other.

A great example of false science is evolution. It is a theory that has never been supported by experimentation or observation. It says that you and I came from a single-cell amoeba that gradually evolved into you. Evolutionists believe ionized and magnetized particles of dust in the void of space were drawn together, compacted, and began to revolve and rotate. Over billions of years, these particles evolved into solar systems, suns, planets, etc. Humanity eventually came into existence through this same evolutionary process.

The problem with this theory is that it has absolutely no empirical value; most scientists have discounted this theory because of it. One reason is because it violates the first and second laws of thermodynamics.

Evolution couldn't have happened as they suggest it did. It relies on a constant increase of energy, which couldn't be possible according to these two scientifically proven laws. That's why most scientists adopt the big bang theory of creation.

WHAT WAS THE "BIG BANG"?

Scientists who believe in the big bang theory say the world had a very clear beginning around 15 to 20 billion years ago. They don't really know how to describe what happened, except to say that it started with a "big bang."

Looking at this in light of scriptural truths, I'd like to suggest that "big bang" wasn't an explosion of natural particles haphazardly coming together. Nothing natural could have initiated the bang because nothing existed at that point; it had to have a supernatural origin. And what better explanation than to look back to what the Bible says:

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. (Genesis 1:1)

In my estimation, the big bang theory isn't in conflict with God's Word. Genesis 1:1 could very easily refer to the big bang that many people assume took place. God spoke. Creation was. There was a definite start to creation, just as the big bang experts have theorized. Plus, I think a supernatural answer is truly the only possible origin for creation that anyone can give.

WHAT IS THE EARTH'S AGE?

But what about the age of the earth? If Genesis 1:1 really does refer to the big bang like I'm suggesting it does, that means it happened billions of years ago, which is contrary to the time period many Christians give to creation. How can that difference be explained?

Well, genealogical records of Scripture do date Adam's creation back to around 6,000 years ago. But based on scriptures such as 2 Peter 3:8 and Daniel 9:24–27, we can see that God's days are much different than our days. Do we really know exactly how much time passed during the week of creation we see accounted for in Genesis 1?

In addition to that, there's a nuance in the translation of Genesis 1:2 that gives even more room for the fact that the earth could be billions of years old:

And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

Most people take this verse at face value, but if we study it a little further, we'll find something interesting. The Hebrew word for "without form" is *tohu*. That word is also used in Isaiah 45:18:

For thus saith the Lord that created the heavens; God himself that formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, he created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited: I am the Lord; and there is none else.

The phrase "in vain" is the same word *tohu* used in Genesis 1:2. That means Genesis 1:1–2 says God created the world and it was without form and void, and Isaiah 45:18 says that He created it with form and without void.

How can we explain this difference?

We can explain it by looking at the Hebrew verb for "was" in Genesis 1:2—*hayah*. No other place in the Bible is this Hebrew verb *hayah* translated as "was." Five hundred other times in the Old Testament, this verb is translated as "became" or "becamest." If we translated *hayah* in Genesis 1:2 as "became," which is consistent with the way the verb is defined throughout the Bible, the verse would then read, "The earth became without form and void." My guess is the King James translators couldn't wrap their minds around what was being said conceptually if Genesis 1:2 was translated as "became." So they decided to translate it as "was."

Don't be alarmed. I'm not changing Scripture. I'm using the Word to interpret itself. Remember, translations of the Bible are not divinely inspired. The "infallible Word of God" refers to the prophets who first spoke God's Word into this earth. Bible scholars bring their own prejudices to their work. The people who translated the Bible into the King James Version worked within their own natural understanding of the Bible while translating it.

If the earth became without form and void, God must have created the world to have form, just as Isaiah 45:18 said. That also means something happened between Genesis 1:1 and Genesis 1:2 to cause the world to lose the form and void God had given it. What was it?

A LOOK BACK TO FILL IN THE GAP

God gave some of the Old Testament prophets a look back into what these events of the dateless past were. Look at Ezekiel 28:12:

Son of man, take up a lamentation upon the king of Tyrus, and say unto him, Thus saith the Lord God; Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty.

Most people assume Ezekiel is talking to the king of Tyrus, but that's not entirely accurate. If you'll read the rest of the verse, you'll actually see that couldn't be right. The king of Tyrus didn't seal up the sum of all wisdom; he wasn't perfect in beauty. No man has ever met that description. What is happening here is something called the law of double reference, which is common in the Bible. For example, Jesus once turned to Peter and said, "Get thee behind me, Satan" (Matthew 16:23). Did Peter suddenly turn into Satan? No. Jesus was addressing the spirit that was prompting Peter at that moment. The same type of thing is going on in Ezekiel.

Who then is he talking to? Look at verse 13:

Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold: the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created.

This is describing Lucifer in the Garden of Eden. Since this wasn't his condition when he showed up to tempt Eve, this refers to a time before Adam showed up. So even though Ezekiel was naturally speaking to the king of Tyrus, he was actually addressing the spirit behind the king of Tyrus, who happened to be Satan or Lucifer.

In verse 14, we find out why Satan was there in the Garden of Eden:

Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so...

God is an orderly God. When He creates, He sets up and establishes levels of authority, organization, and rulership throughout His creation. At the time this Scripture is referring to, God used the angelic hosts to do that. There are different orders and levels of angels such as cherubs and seraphim; archangels are the ruling angels and the highest level of authority in the kingdom of God.

Of the three archangels, Lucifer was one. Lucifer had rulership responsibility; he was anointed to "cover." God had anointed him to manage this segment of God's creation. We also know from verse 13 that he was a musician ("the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes") and had the responsibility of leading the hosts of heaven in praise and worship of the Lord. He was described as the Lord's most beautiful of all creation and was headquartered on the planet earth.

Verse 14 continues:

...thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire. Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee. By the multitude of thy merchandise they have filled the midst of thee with violence, and thou hast sinned: therefore I will cast thee as profane out of the mountain of God: and I will destroy thee, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire. Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty, thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness: I will cast thee to the ground, I will lay thee before kings, that they may behold thee. (Ezekiel 28:14–17)

We see more about this in Isaiah 14:12–14:

How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High.

Lucifer was so caught up in his own beauty that he decided (very much like Adam did) to elevate his status to that of God. And, as you know, he led one third of the angelic hosts in rebellion against God. God, of course, defeated that rebellion. Verse 15 says, “Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit.”

Isaiah 14:17 shows us that his downfall brought chaos to the world: “That made the world as a wilderness, and destroyed the cities thereof.”

Jeremiah 4:23 gives us another glimpse into this catastrophe of Satan’s fall:

I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was without form, and void; and the heavens, and they had no light.

That’s the same word *tohu* that we’ve seen twice already in Genesis 1:2 and Isaiah 45:18. In Jeremiah chapter 4, Jeremiah is seeing the earth as it was after Lucifer’s fall:

I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was without form, and void; and the heavens, and they had no light. I beheld the mountains, and, lo, they trembled, and all the hills moved lightly. I beheld, and, lo, there was no man, and all the birds of the heav-

ens were fled. I beheld, and, lo, the fruitful place was a wilderness, and all the cities thereof were broken down at the presence of the Lord, and by his fierce anger (Jeremiah 4:23–26).

Lucifer's rebellion had such a cataclysmic impact on earth that it literally destroyed life on the earth at that time, and the earth became without form and void. Never again will the earth be made without form and void by the Lord's fierce anger. This is the only time it happened. Now, did you see that Isaiah and Jeremiah both mention nations and cities that existed before Adam ever came on the scene? Something called man had walked the earth—a creature who most likely appeared as we do but wasn't made in God's image and likeness. (That didn't occur until Adam was created, as noted in Genesis 1:27.) If nations lived prior to Lucifer's fall, we can assume animals did as well.

When you realize that life existed before God's re-creation as accounted for in Genesis, you'll see plenty of room in the Bible for the fossil record which scientists often say disproves the validity of the Bible. I mean, these nations may have lived for millions of years prior to being destroyed by Lucifer's fall. There's room prior to Lucifer's rebellion for dinosaurs, all kinds of pre-historic animal life, and even human life such as the Neanderthal man and the Cro-Magnon man. God Himself told Adam in Genesis 1:28 to:

Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.

“Replenish” the earth. God didn't say “plenish” the earth for the first time. He said replenish it. It had already been populated with life! How long was there life on earth before Lucifer's fall? We don't know, but given the scientific records, I think it's completely appropriate to assume all of this took place billions of years ago. Why? Because when scientific facts and biblical truths are viewed correctly, they corroborate one another and are just another example of the magnitude and majesty of the God that we serve.

This is just one of many topics covered in Mac Hammond's book The Big Picture: Living Your Life in Light of Eternity. He also talks about whether or not extraterrestrial creatures exist, when the rapture will take place, and your vital role in God's big picture for mankind. You can order your own copy of this book [here](#).