

NATURAL SCIENCES

by Gordon Wilson, New Saint Andrews College

This is an excerpt from Omnibus V: The Medieval World, Veritas Press, 2010.

CRITICAL ISSUES

Historians and scientists love to systematize what they study. Taxonomists derive satisfaction from categorizing animals and plants. Historians enjoy pigeonholing people into certain philosophical camps and worldviews. To a certain extent, I have done this in this essay, but keep in mind that many of these scientists defy tidy classification. They don't neatly fall into certain camps. To a greater or lesser extent, many had a mix of worldviews, and even if you could interview them, they would still be difficult to label. Nevertheless, whether a scientist had a blend of ideas or was clearly in one philosophical camp or another, it has always been true that every scientist has preconceived ideas (starting assumptions or presuppositions) that frame how they see the physical world and how they frame questions and testable hypotheses. There has never been an unbiased (lacking a worldview) scientist. Good scientists, however, don't ignore or deny data even if it seems

difficult to fit into their worldview. They may need to adjust, modify, or simply discard their worldview or see if the data is able to be interpreted in a different way, but they should never discard the data. If their worldview is objectively true and the data is true (i.e., it was accurately obtained—no fudging or hallucinating), then there will always be a way that the two will harmonize.

The first major problem that continues to face Christians today is the apparent conflict between “science” and “faith.” As we did a flyby survey of some scientists and their philosophies, I hope you saw a clear trend towards a naturalistic worldview.

Today mechanistic philosophy has been replaced by Naturalism, which leaves no room for divine intervention. It doesn't just maintain that the universe is like a complex mechanical watch, which demands a Divine watchmaker (mechanistic philosophy). Instead, God has been removed completely out of the equation in matters dealing with matter. This didn't happen overnight. Over the centuries, particularly during the

Dr. Gordon Wilson is a senior fellow of natural history, responsible for the College's Natural History Colloquium and science electives. He received his PhD from George Mason University in environmental science and public policy in 2003. He holds a master of science degree in entomology and a bachelor's degree in education (secondary education-biology) from the University of Idaho. Dr. Wilson is author of the recent textbook, The Riot and the Dance: Foundational Biology (2014), and is a regular contributor at Answers in Genesis.

Enlightenment, the prevailing philosophy of science progressively became more and more mechanistic and then naturalistic, though much of it was mixed with elements of Aristotelianism and Neoplatonism. Since Darwin, however, Materialism or Naturalism has prevailed and grown stronger and stronger, at least in the sciences. Inexorably, it gradually began to push out any philosophies that gave any credence to the supernatural.

This has resulted in the redefining of science such that only naturalistic explanations are considered for any phenomena, and it artificially rules out supernatural explanations for all phenomena, including phenomena that seem to require divine explanations or causation. So if one asks questions like, “What is the first cause of life, or the solar system, or the galaxies, or the universe?” scientists trapped by modern naturalistic prejudices can only consider naturalistic explanations. If there is any reference to any intelligent agent that is beyond the physical realm (i.e., God), it is ruled out with disdain and considered highly unscientific because it has religious implications. Naturalistic scientists think that religion must be quarantined in its own separate realm of values, ethics, and meaning. They may view religion as useful to maintain ethical standards for the “ignorant masses” but a contaminant to science. They see Christianity and other religions as science-stoppers that stifle scientific curiosity and rigor. Many even consider all religion as superstitious nonsense. The current rhetoric is that science cannot allow faith to influence its inquiry. This is laughable when recalling the great pioneers of science we discussed above. The current scientific community has successfully banned Christianity from speaking with authority about how the physical world came to be.

This is a huge problem facing the Christian scientist. Faith (at least the kind that is in conflict with current “science”) is a belief in a supernatural being (God) who is the ultimate cause of the universe and life. This definition clearly is at loggerheads with the current definition of science because you can’t believe in only

natural causes and also believe in supernatural ones for the same phenomena. One of them has got to be wrong, and therein lies the problem.

The second major conflict between faith and science facing Christians today is Uniformitarianism. Currently, it is strongly linked to Naturalism and deals with measurable processes. It clearly attempts to explain phenomena naturalistically, but it added certain conditions. As you recall, this philosophy was formulated by James Hutton and popularized by Charles Lyell. It was a clear departure from the Scriptures. If certain processes happen slowly today, then we must assume that they have always occurred at that same slow rate. This way of thinking forced one to conclude that huge geologic formations must have been slowly deposited and sculpted over eons of time rather than through processes that could have shaped the earth rapidly during the timeframe laid out in Scripture. Not only did Uniformitarianism open the door for Darwin’s theory of evolution, it established a non-biblical and generous timeframe to compose a completely naturalistic story of the earth and life.

During the Enlightenment, the Word of God was gradually marginalized regarding historical matters and was considered authoritative only when addressing spiritual and moral issues (this began to dwindle too). Human reason was increasingly exalted and was effectively cut loose from scriptural truth. This allowed men of science to consider alternatives to biblical earth and life history. These philosophies, Naturalism and Uniformitarianism, both of which are free from scriptural authority, began undermining and eroding the trust people had in the Bible’s authority. This erosion occurred at different rates in different countries, but midway through the twentieth century, the scientific and intellectual community worldwide embraced a non-biblical earth history. After that point it was very difficult to go against the prevailing scientific consensus without looking ignorant, backward, naïve, and anti-intellectual.

The third big problem that the Christian faith must sort out is the confusion between historical science and empirical science. Empirical science is dealing with the present. In empirical science, that which is being studied is observable, testable, and repeatable. Conclusions are not as greatly affected by preconceived assumptions. Two scientists with completely different philosophical or religious worldviews can and do often arrive at the same conclusions within empirical science. If both were measuring the acceleration of a ball dropping (and they are using the same instrumentation and system of measurement, say metric) they can arrive at the same answer: 9.8 meters per second per second. Or if they are molecular biologists studying gene regulation in bacteria, both could come to the same conclusion of what proteins are involved to turn its genes off and on.

Historical science, on the other hand, is enormously affected by starting assumptions or presuppositions that can not be proven or tested. They just have to be held axiomatically as a framework to interpret circumstantial evidence. Historical science is an attempt to reconstruct the past by analyzing data in the present. In order to draw the right conclusion about the past, you must have the correct presuppositions. However, if you have the wrong presuppositions, it doesn't matter how carefully and accurately you collect the data; you will draw the wrong conclusions. For instance, say you're a paleontologist who has dug up a small, bipedal dinosaur in a sandstone deposit. If your presuppositions are Uniformitarianism and Darwinism, then you will conclude that the sedimentary rocks on top of that skeleton are either a partial or a complete record of millions of years of sedimentation. A Darwinistic view may cause you to conclude that this form evolved from other creatures lower down in older rocks, and that some of its descendants may be alive today but are not small, bipedal dinosaurs anymore, but rather birds, due to hundreds of millions of years of evolution. If you presuppose the biblical account, that the earth is 6,000

years old, then it will greatly change how you interpret that fossil's place in earth history and your perspective on how much time is needed to produce large amounts of fossil-bearing sedimentary rocks.

Problem number four. There will always be scientific unbelievers who doubt the Word of God and construct their own (naturalistic) "scientific" story explaining the universe. Unfortunately this is much more common now. Nevertheless, the distressing thing is that Christians begin to believe the secular "scientific" story. Why? The short answer is that they are in awe of the great accomplishments of science. Even though science grew out of a Judeo-Christian worldview, its huge scientific successes resulted in a collective pride and trust in human reason divorced from the Word of God. "Science" began to get too big for its britches. Interpretations of the past (using unbiblical assumptions) led to conclusions that contradicted Scripture. Rather than question the validity of these unbiblical assumptions, the people began to mistrust the Scriptures. Christianity is truly the mother of science. Her child, "Science," grew up and became very successful. She also became proud and cast aside her mother as ignorant and superstitious.

Currently, scientific inquiry interprets data in the light of an entirely different paradigm; one based on Naturalism and Uniformitarianism, with human reason exalted over and severed from Scripture. Scientists no longer have to answer to the Scriptures or to the church. The liberal churches surrendered to secular science quite awhile ago, while the conservative church has lost most of her ethos with the intellectual community and with the public at large. The public has become very enamored with the power of empirical science, and rightly so. Unfortunately, the public often believes that scientific proclamations in the realm of historical science are just as authoritative as its conclusions in the realm empirical science. Secular science has truly won the high ground. It has become the guardian of knowledge, the high priesthood of truth about the natural world.

When one thoroughly embraces Naturalism, it results in the view that science is really the high priesthood of all reality. To win the high ground back, we must make the distinction between historical and empirical science and expose the erroneous philosophies they use when doing historical science.

As the author of Hebrews might put it, “And what more shall I say? For the time would fail me to tell of Francis Bacon, who developed the scientific method; of Antony van Leeuwenhoek, who unveiled a whole new world of microscopic animalcules with a simple microscope, making himself the father of microbiology; of Louis Pasteur, who finally put to rest the idea of spontaneous generation, and who, along with Robert Koch, developed the germ theory of disease; of Gregor Mendel, who discovered the principles of inheritance and became the father of modern genetics; and many, many others.” This was a hop, skip, and a jump through an enormous field of study—the history and philosophy of science. I have only scratched the surface of the discoveries and philosophies of a handful of scientists spanning many centuries, but I trust that this brief overview shows a few key pioneers of science and the importance their philosophies played in guiding their thinking and scientific work. Keep in mind, most of these scientists believed in a Supreme Being as the ultimate cause of the universe in all of its diversity and complexity.

A CHRISTIAN RESPONSE

Beware lest anyone cheat you through philosophy and empty deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the basic principles of the world, and not according to Christ (Col. 2:8).

We’ve looked at some philosophy and history of science as well as some of the clear problems and tensions that have arisen between science and the

Christian faith. We have seen that people (as well as brilliant scientists) not only adopt philosophies through which they interpret data, they are also “herd” animals. Most of them find it very difficult to hold views contrary to the mainstream scientific community. But some brave scientists do break away from the mainstream and come up with a new way of looking at the world. Now is the time for Christians to cease their chameleon-like nature in matching our surroundings. The mainstream church since the nineteenth century has caved to the demands of secular science. Although a few brave Christians have taken a critical look at the hollow and deceptive philosophies that shape their scientific conclusions, most do not. Many clergy and theologians are cowed by the dictates of the historical sciences. They no longer strive to see what truths God was actually communicating to us in the Scriptures. Instead they first see what the prevailing views of historical science are and then fall all over themselves to find a hermeneutic that interprets the Bible so that it doesn’t disagree with this assumption-laden form of science. This is revoltingly obsequious, bending over backwards to avoid any perceived disagreement with historical science. What this kind of science claims as fact changes every few years and the Scriptures don’t. In whom do we trust, the word of man or the Word of God? Christian students need to reject two errors. The first is that of being too easily swayed by secular historical science by not understanding the highly speculative nature of it. The second error is that of becoming reactionary and throwing out the baby (empirical facts) along with the bathwater (certain secular theories) that these scientists produce. We must be circumspect—innocent as doves and wise as serpents.

Pulling down strongholds

“For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting

down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ . . .” (2 Cor. 10:4–5)

Naturalism is the first stronghold that needs pulling down. This philosophy, over the last couple hundred years, has become very strong indeed. Its practitioners (scientists) have exalted it against the knowledge of God in almost every facet of life. Darwinism (which is a naturalistic view of how life arose) is not just ruling the roost in biology—it has infiltrated every “ology” or science dealing with living creatures: psychology, anthropology, sociology, agricultural sciences, and medicine, just to name a few. The list goes on and on. Christians must cease being lapdogs for our materialistic masters.

Naturalism says that God is not necessary to explain the universe. Romans 1:20 says, “For since the creation of the world His *invisible attributes are clearly seen*, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse . . .” (emphasis mine). From this verse alone we know Naturalism is wrong. If the universe and life can be explained without God, then man has an excuse to reject God. To regain the high ground back, it is essential to not only proclaim the Word of God but also demonstrate through general revelation, that naturalistic processes are unable to explain the cosmos. Why? This verse also says, “His invisible *attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made . . .*”(emphasis mine). It doesn’t say “being understood from the clear reading of Scripture.” In other words we can draw the correct conclusion that God made the universe apart from Scripture by examining the things that are made.

Naturalism can’t explain first causes

The Law of Cause and Effect essentially maintains that for every effect there must be a sufficient cause.

When we examine the vast universe *we must* infer a Creator, because naturalistic causes are properties of the naturalistic universe. How can the universe be produced by natural causes that only can exist within a universe that does not exist yet? In other words, how can nature create itself? Something beyond nature must exist prior to nature. If the universe is an egg, naturalism says that the egg created itself from processes at work within the egg. Hold on a minute, it is not logical to form an egg from nothing but processes understood within an egg.

Also, the naturalistic formation of the universe cannot be explained in light of the First and Second Law of Thermodynamics. In a nutshell the first law states that matter cannot be created or destroyed. So from where did the point singularity that exploded in what is called the Big Bang, come from? Did it come from nothing? If so, that violates the first law which says that matter cannot be created (from nothing). If it was eternal, then you run into problems with the second law of thermodynamics. It maintains that in any ordered system, differences in the temperature, pressure, and chemical potential in matter or energy tend to even out (the measure of this evening-out or disordering is called *entropy*). If the matter in the universe was from eternity in the past, then the universe should have petered out and become completely disordered by now.

A simple cell is an oxymoron

Through the latter half of the twentieth century, our understanding of the inner workings of the cell has exploded. The basic unit of life can no longer be thought of as a simple blob of protoplasm. Even the simplest cell is far from simple. It is a marvel of complexity that astonishes our most brilliant mechanical and software engineers. The genetic information alone defies naturalistic explanations. Bill Gates, when referring to DNA, the cell’s information storage and retrieval system, says, “DNA is like a computer program but far,

far more advanced than any software we've ever created." Whenever anyone encounters any informational code, whether written language, spoken language, Morse code, binary code, etc., it is assumed that an intelligent agent created the information. All evidence points to the fact that every information-bearing system has been generated from intelligence. But due to the pervasive grip of Naturalism, our brightest biologists must insist that the DNA (or RNA), the code of life, arose naturalistically in or prior to the first cell and evolved into the assembly instructions for hundreds of thousands of different species alive today. Does the evidence point to a naturalistic explanation? Definitely not! However, scientists still must hold that position because the current philosophy demands it. Any professor that is outspoken about the inadequacy of naturalism in the life sciences is very lucky if he retains his employment.

Michael Behe, a biochemistry professor at Lehigh University, was one such dissenter. He wrote a book called *Darwin's Black Box*. The book is one sustained argument of why certain highly complex systems like flagella or blood clotting mechanisms in living cells could not form naturalistically through Darwinian processes. He coined a phrase called "irreducible complexity." In other words, they are complex, and they can not be reduced or subtracted from and still be operational. They are systems composed of multiple components where each part is required for its proper function. Remove one part (often out of dozens), and the system does not work. Biological cells are loaded with just such systems. Behe proposes in his book that these systems are too integrated and interdependent to have arisen through aimless Darwinian processes. In Darwinism each part is the result of a random mutation. If it is to be preserved by natural selection within an organism, it must grant some advantage to the owner of the mutation. The problem is that many of these irreducibly complex systems have dozens of

intermeshing, interdependent parts like a complex factory machine. Having the fully operational machine arise all at once is too miraculous for a naturalistic scientist to swallow. Each part presumably arose independently through random mutation and began to accumulate in the cell. They would then have to be retained in the cell for countless generations until the next part randomly evolved. Once all the parts had all accumulated, they assembled themselves into a complex cellular machine. The problem with this scenario is that each component would not be selected until the machine was fully operational. In real life, useless proteins are not kept around, because they disrupt other cellular processes and are wasteful to the cell's metabolic resources. In the struggle for life, those cells which are more efficient in using energy and raw materials out-compete cells making useless stuff. In the long run, cells making useless stuff (which may eventually become part of a wonderful innovation for the cell) are eliminated long before the wonderful innovation could ever arise. In addition, all these parts require genetic information, and again there is no naturalistic mechanism that generates totally new genetic information from scratch.

Michael Behe's thesis is very powerful because it rigorously shows why complex biological systems cannot arise through random processes. This is also why origin of life experiments are so depressing to the naturalist. The simplest cell is loaded with irreducible complexities, and early earth chemical soups experiments get nowhere close to a living cell. Although they have produced a number of biological building blocks, they never assemble into any biological molecules like DNA, protein, phospholipids, or carbohydrates.

This argument can be extended to include why more complex organisms cannot evolve from simpler organisms. When various creatures in an evolutionary tree are examined, the evolutionist points to all the similarities between the presumed ancestor and a more complex descendant. It could be similarities in anatomy

or physiology, or it could be similarities at the DNA or protein level. As interesting as these similarities are, they should pose no threat to a creationist who believes God created the various kinds. Similarity in anatomy, physiology, or gene sequences can easily be explained by common design rather than common ancestry. The devil's in the differences. The evolutionists can point to all the similarities between dinosaurs and birds to provide evidence for common ancestry. The creationist can acknowledge those same similarities and maintain that they were created according to a similar body plan. But what about the many differences? At some point something had to evolve feathers. An ancestor had to accumulate, through random mutations, the genetic material to code for a bird feather and a bird lung (and much more if it was able to fly). These are not trifling matters. Both the avian lung and feather are highly complex structures, whose development requires additional genetic information and new gene regulatory networks that orchestrate the development of such structures. When evolutionists draw the gradual changes in the overall shape of the body or skeleton of bird evolution, it can seem plausible to the uncritical mind.

However, when we consider all the additions of genetic information needed to account for all these anatomical and physiological changes, it is simply beyond the ability of random mutation. It's like thinking that randomly typing 1's and 0's on pre-Windows software could generate Windows software. It's not going to happen. Intelligent software engineers are required.

Scripture vs. Uniformitarianism

The vast majority of evangelical Christians have issues with naturalistic philosophy. At least they should if they believe in miracles. Most Christians (I hope) are firm in their belief that God created the universe from nothing, has intervened supernaturally many times

throughout the Bible, and has done so today in answer to prayer. Consequently, most Christians will at least take a stand for supernatural Intelligent Design and won't be too ashamed when strident atheists rally round and point the finger of scorn at believers in the supernatural. Unfortunately, many evangelical Christians are less likely to reject Uniformitarianism and publicly embrace young earth creation. Why? Old earth evolutionism and old earth creationism have one thing in common: the *old earth* part. Old earth (and universe) is so ingrained in our culture's psyche that to express views contrary to it is equivalent to being a self-proclaimed "flat earther." Many Christians don't have the guts to be labeled a Bible-thumping anti-intellectual so they just go with flow—whatever the scientific community says to believe, but then tack on God to the story. These beliefs are found on signs in national parks, plaques in museums, in the scripts of nature documentaries, and in secular textbooks. Many Christians don't have the time or energy to think through their claims critically and actually find out who is being anti-intellectual. Of course this is not true of all Christians who are not young-earthers, but it cannot be denied that this is what young-earth Christians are generally up against. And faithful Christians who want to maintain their old-earth convictions with integrity need to be doubly sure that they are seeking to ground their position on what the Bible plainly teaches and not be in any way beholden to the materialist assumptions that are pervasive in the world of science.

What does the Bible say?

So Christians must first adopt the worldview that interprets the claims of science through the lens of Scripture, not the other way around. We must first find out what the Bible actually teaches and then interpret the physical data within the boundaries of Scripture. Those Christians who say that the Old Testament

can accommodate deep time as a valid interpretation should, in my view, seriously reconsider. Rigorous textual analysis of Genesis 1–11 shows that the genre is unequivocally historical. It is not poetry (although it includes some poetry and song). Nor is it apocalyptic literature or a collection of parables. Forcing Genesis into some other genre to accommodate the demands of secular science doesn't do justice to the biblical scholarship.

What does yom mean?

Some say that the Hebrew word *yom* in the Creation week can mean more than a 24-hour period. Yes, it can, but the vast majority of its use throughout the Old Testament is a regular day or a short period of time (at most a generation or so). If the authors of Genesis wanted to convey huge spans of time then *yom* is not the Hebrew word to use. *Yom rab* (a long time) or *olam* (eternity) would be much more appropriate.

What do the genealogies tell us?

The genealogies given in Genesis 5 and 11 always include the age of each person when he begat so and so. These are the only two times in the Bible where ages are given. This allows us, through simple arithmetic, to add up the ages and calculate the amount of time between Adam and Abraham, which is about 2000 years. Through piecing together other established historical dates, it is possible to give Abraham a pretty firm date of 2,100 years B.C. This adds up to the Creation being a little more than 4,000 B.C. If we cringe with embarrassment at this date, it shows us how thoroughly we are in the grip of secular thinking. Again, the central issue is not the date itself—the central issue is taking God at His Word. If God clearly stated in his Word that the earth was billions of years old and secular science pronounced otherwise, would we be embarrassed affirming an old date?

Assumptions, assumptions

Many have uncritically believed all their dates of millions of years ago because many think these have been scientifically proven. The innumerable dates that they generate are produced using Uniformitarianism. Whether it be rates of radioactive decay, rates of sedimentation, rates of erosion, etc., they are assumed to have always occurred at the same rates as measured today. The stakes are high. If their assumptions are correct, then these deep time dates of millions or billions of years are reasonable. Here is just one example out of many. The problem is no one can prove the validity of assuming constant rates through all earth history. In fact, there have been excellent studies (the RATE project, ICR) showing good evidence that radioactive decay rates of uranium²³⁸ in certain rocks may have been exceedingly rapid in early earth history. This rapid decay would explain many of the ancient dates we calculate using Uniformitarian assumptions.

Uniformitarianism is a sword that cuts both ways

If we use Uniformitarianism consistently we would run into many incongruities with the accepted age of the earth. In several examples like continental erosion, ocean sedimentation, carbon-14 concentrations in certain rocks, atmospheric helium concentration, etc., uniformitarian rates would actually give dates incompatibly young when compared to the dates demanded by the geologic time scale and evolution.

This is just a brief summary of the problems that arise when blindly accepting the philosophies and assumptions that secular scientists use in trying to reconstruct the past. If Christians are to regain the high ground, we must not be duped by their pronouncements of “scientific fact” regarding the unobserved past (historical science). Rather, we must “pull down their

strongholds and cast down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God.”

PULLING DOWN STRONGHOLDS

What are these strongholds? Naturalism (including Uniformitarianism and Darwinism) is, in my view, the most formidable stronghold that Christians of all stripes (young and old-earth creationists) must tear down. Naturalism must be exposed for what it is, a philosophy, not the heart and soul of science. Naturalistic theories on the origin of life, namely the genesis of cells with all their information and complexity, are lacking one major thing: evidence. They are completely bereft of naturalistic mechanisms to produce genetic information without intelligent design. Macroevolution faces the same problem. What were the naturalistic mechanisms to produce creatures with novel features when their supposed ancestors neither had those features nor the genetic information to code for them? Is it mutation and natural selection? Show me the evidence. I have yet to see it.

In particular, Darwinism may seem like a formidable fortress but in actuality, it's a house of cards built upon the sand. One only need exercise some critical thinking, question its foundational philosophies (Naturalism and Uniformitarianism), look at the fossil record and the complexity and information content of living cells, and then look at what mutation and natural selection can actually do. Look past the glossy surface, and you will see that it's an impressive façade with nothing behind it. It's a really empty worldview being sold by persuasive, highly-paid salesmen.

One might think that in this war of scientific worldviews embracing young earth creation is too rigid, too narrow. Isn't it too hard a pill to swallow for believers who have a wobbly faith and for unbelievers steeped in Darwinism? Won't a staunch young-earth view weaken one's credibility and ethos before the secular

world? Couldn't one be more influential if one took a more moderate view? Shouldn't we put the best foot forward, so to speak, and argue from only an intelligent design perspective? If these are reasonable questions, why am I a convinced young-earth creationist? Before I answer that question, I would like to preface it with the importance of not being a shrill sectarian. We should never break fellowship with sincere believers who hold a different view in the young vs. old earth debate. I have dear Christian brothers who differ with me on this issue, and they will remain so. I also use and endorse materials and books by old-earth creationists who are intelligent design advocates. As I said before, it's good for the two camps to be allied for the purpose of destroying Naturalism. However, I strongly believe in young-earth creation primarily because the Scriptures unequivocally teach it. Secondly, I have found that if one is not intimidated by being in the minority and is determined to look at the evidence using different presuppositions, the astronomical, biological, geological, and paleontological evidence harmonizes nicely with a young-earth model. I have also found that it offers a more comprehensive worldview that answers so many more important theological and scientific questions which are much more satisfying to me than the old-earth view. I have heard the best of the old-earth perspective and in my view, it compromises Genesis 1–11 far too much and cannot explain the physical evidence as well. This doesn't mean that there aren't any perplexing, unanswered questions for young-earth creationists to wrestle with, but in my view, young-earth creation is superior both biblically and scientifically.

RECOVERING THE HIGH GROUND

Know and trust the Scriptures even if you think there is no current satisfactory creationist explanation.

Don't be ashamed or apologetic of the biblical

creation account. It's true history, so show some backbone.

Understand the limitations of science. Know the difference between empirical science and historical science. Remember that the former requires rigorous observation and repetitive experimentation. The latter interprets and explains physical phenomena in the light of a particular worldview.

Scripture tells us that someone who excels in his work will get noticed by those in authority (Prov. 22:29). Conservative Christian students who go into the sciences, and are being trained in the secular academy, should take care to be the best in the class, excelling in their work, establishing a reputation for superb skills—instead of establishing a reputation for mocking evolution or deep time geology while maintaining a C minus average. As Christians, we need backbone and true conviction, which are not the same as bigotry and ignorance.

Be leaven in the loaf (Matt. 13:33). If you have strong scientific inclinations, be excellent in your field of interest. Don't be an obnoxious, contrary pain-in-the-neck to your secular professors. Be reformational in the sciences, not revolutionary. We need to take over the scientific academy by facilitating a grass roots movement of young, biblically grounded scientists. Think towards taking dominion in the sciences. Imagine a scientific community that is completely under the Lordship of Christ and work toward that end. Secular, naturalistic scientists are jealously guarding the gates of the scientific academy and are vehement about excluding any reference to God or any metaphysical intelligence that was causal to the universe and life. We must not take this sitting down. God is to be glorified and praised for His mighty work of creation not just within our church walls. The secularists are fighting "tooth and nail" to keep the high ground because they know how important it is. Do we? Pray that God would soon fill the scientific community with outstanding, God-fearing scientists so

that His glory will someday be proclaimed throughout the earth . . . including the halls of science.

FOR FURTHER READING

Pearcey, Nancy and Thaxton, Charles. *The Soul of Science*. Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway Books, 1994.

Behe, Michael. *Darwin's Black Box*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006.

Garner, Paul. *The New Creationism*. Darlington, England: EP Books, 2009.

Wise, Kurt. *Faith, Form, and Time*. Nashville, Tenn.: B&H Publishing, 2002.

Mortenson, Terry and Ury, Thane H., eds. *Coming to Grips with Genesis*. Green Forest, Ark.: New Leaf Publishing Group, 2008.

DeWitt, David A. *Unraveling the Origins Controversy*. Akron, Ohio: Creative Curriculum, 2007.