

Political Science...or...Political Science ?

Target Truth Ministries.com

Evolution, Global Warming, & GOD

Pastor Gerry Box 1299, Ukiah, Ca. 95482

“Science Day” in America is November 9th. In most of the world, “Science Day” is February 28th, to honor Physicist Dr. Raman. Dr. Raman, from India, in 1928, made the discovery of what is known as the “Raman Effect,” where photons of light were shown to scatter—or be separated. What makes science science? It doesn’t matter whether you are a person of faith in God, or an atheist...we all approach science with a worldview (paradigm). Up until my mid-thirties, I trusted in science way more than Jesus. My worldview (or paradigm of life), was shaped by the education I had received up to that time. Academics can be very influential in a person’s life, because they speak with authority which comes from years of study. I had graduated from college after attending several different colleges over a period of about 12 years, as well as having obtained a Federal Electronics License as a result of my military training. I had learned to trust in science because of its validity, due to actual hard evidence. I did not stop believing in Jesus...I just couldn’t reconcile how the Bible could be so different from science concerning origins. Therefore, I never fully trusted in Jesus, or the Bible, and I never thought it important to be part of Christianity or any church. I thought of the Bible as a philosophy of life...not as absolute truth.

Science is rational and logical. This is because science relies upon verifiable evidence. In science, a theory, or hypothesis, remains just a theory until proven by verifiable evidence...or, so it used to be.

In my mid-thirties, I began to re-think both science and God. I could not reconcile the two, but there were more and more questions which science was failing at answering, and which only God and the Bible might be able to answer. I began to study outside the governmental college system, and any need for a degree—my goal was unbiased education (truth).

In college, there is an area of study directed at understanding and shaping politics and social behavior—it’s called “Political Science.” I soon discovered that that term also applies to many areas of science, as certain scientific fields have become political, due to the need for research money, and what the ultimate goal of that money might be. Follow the money, you might say.

So, what had happened that caused science to drift away from being a proof-based academia, to being a podium for issues and beliefs? Today, people of science still hold to theories being just that, until they can be proven by experimental evidence. But, those who pay the bill...those who supply the research money, have elevated certain theories and hypothesis to the level of accepted fact, and actually shun those scientists who oppose the conventional wisdom. Let’s explore two areas of science which have shaped our worldview...one in the past, and one in the present, to see how science is dealing with them.

Global Warming: Or, should I say...“Global Freezing?” When I was in my mid-thirties (1980), the issue of the day was the great freeze the earth was about to enter. Newspapers, magazines, TV, and radio all presented scientific evidence calling for the world’s governments to clamp down on people and control the environment to avoid a global freeze, where millions and millions of people would die. Some scientists linked the global freeze problem to the sun’s solar radiation and natural earthly causes (like volcanic activity), while other scientists linked the freeze problem to man-made environmental issues which government should control. Evidence from both scientific worldviews came in, but nothing could be fully developed, because after ten years, the freeze issue defrosted.

That was in my thirties...now I’m in my seventies, and the scientific issue for the world is Global Warming. Once again, the science is divided into two camps. One worldview is that the global temperatures “were” warming (but haven’t been since the year 2000), due to solar activity and natural causes. The other worldview is that warming is due to man-made environmental causes (carbon dioxide emissions), which government needs to control. The science seems very convincing on both sides, depending upon what your worldview is. If you want government to control people more, you tend to accept the science calling for a crack-down on man’s activities. If you are suspicious of more government control, you tend to be suspicious of their scientific claims,

and instead, look to other scientists which claim evidence shows that natural causes, not man-made causes, are the reason for any global warming...or cooling for that matter.

But...which is really true? There is so much money pushing for government control of people, that their scientific claims almost suffocate the minority report of naturalism--money talks. As I write this, 40 years have passed with no global temperature increase. Oops, wait a minute...The scientists who support government involvement just announced that the data they were collecting for the last 40 years was in error, and that the temperatures were actually increasing after all. Oops, wait a minute...Other scientists insist that the data was correct all along. How can we really believe all this? Science has established a “loose” correlation between increases in carbon dioxide and temperatures rising, but this correlation is not by any means always true. In recorded history, sometimes the temperature has gone up when carbon dioxide levels are low, and sometimes the temperature is low when carbon dioxide levels are high. Still, the accepted wisdom is that government controlling mankind will be able to control the temperature—with enough money, of course.

During this same period of time, others scientists were questioning why there is not a long historical direct correlation between global temperatures and carbon dioxide (if carbon pollution by man is causing the temperatures to rise). And, as it turns out, new scientific evidence points to atmospheric pressure being the link to increasing global temperatures, which is influenced by oxygen levels and solar activity—not carbon dioxide. You probably won't hear of these scientific studies, but they are published in the scientific academic papers (*Christopher Poulsen and Clay Tabor, University of Michigan Dept. of Earth and Environmental Sciences; Joseph White, Baylor University Dept. of Biology; Daniel Peppe, Baylor University Dept. of Geology Terrestrial Paleoclimatology Research; and Dana Royer, Wesleyan University Dept. of Earth and Environmental Sciences*). These studies don't create headlines or monetary support, because the data points to solar radiation and natural causes, which will not generate any revenue for government, because government cannot control the sun, etc. No revenue to be gained by government and business means no dollars for more extensive research. Even so, these studies do find a historical direct correlation between solar activity, atmospheric pressure, and oxygen (*not* carbon dioxide), causing increases in global temperature...and the correlation turns out to be in exact agreement with the changes in global temperatures up and down, over eons of history. Yet, even as this data is being published, the world is advancing on an agenda to put more controls on man's activities, thus, raising money for research to prove just the opposite of where the scientific evidence is actually pointing. Hence, my hesitation on trusting too much in science...especially theoretical, hypothetical science controlled by government. Call me when the hard evidence is in, and when the scientific community is in agreement. Actually...science knows that all CO₂ can be removed by planting TREES...as trees remove CO₂ from the atmosphere – its nature's answer...no government needed.

The acceptance of theoretical, hypothetical ideas by science, governments, and schools is nothing new, especially if money is involved.

Evolution: If you attend college, the academic community (and your grades), demand an acceptance of the theory of evolution. I've been there. And, to be truthful, the arguments for the theory seemed sound. The science is clear and provable concerning what is known as “micro-evolution,” where there is change within a life form such as color, and size, etc. But, it turns out there is no evidence to support what is theorized as “macro-evolution,” where a life form can transform over time into a substantially different form (such as science theorizes from a bird to a dinosaur, or dinosaur to a bird, etc.). Have you been following the dinosaurs remains discovered all over the world that still have actual bone and soft tissues even after hundreds of millions of years? (see the book “Science, Origins, & Ancient Civilizations—Scientific Evidence Withheld from School Textbooks” at *Target Truth Ministries.com*). As it turns out, discoveries of flesh and dinosaurs dates back to the late 1800's, and science has catalogued this evidence since the 1970's, and more is uncovered every year, but it has been a “secret” for some reason to the general public. Macro-evolution is a theory that relies upon “ages” of time (theory--there is no testable evidence or proof of macro-evolution). Macro-evolution seems a rational and logical theory (given millions and millions of years), but today, actual scientific evidence (compiled since the 1970's no less), refutes the conventional understanding—yet no money goes into research opposing macro-evolution.

What has happened since the days of Darwin, is that the examples Darwin gave of micro-evolution (which no one denies), have been theorized by science to also explain the great diversity of all life—macro-evolution—not needing a designer, such as God. Darwin wrote that the fossil evidence would prove that his theory of macro-evolution was correct. The problem is that the fossil evidence has shown just the opposite—no transitional fossils. Over the years, the theory has also been accepted by many to explain even the very origin of life—a rational extension of the theory accepted by the general public, but not by scientists. Regardless of the evidence against macro-evolution, the theory has evolved, and our universities thrive upon the dollars which are generated by the need to discover how it works, and to be able to control it. Depending upon your worldview (God or no God), monies for research will go to support either “natural” science, or “supernatural” design. In America, man’s “wisdom” wins, and God’s “truth” loses.

Today, DNA and other fields of science show that life does, in fact, require design from the very beginning. Even evolutionary scientists agree that without design, life as we know it, could never have started on its own. All scientists agree that design is necessary for life’s beginning, but the “natural” scientist now states the design comes either from another galaxy far, far, away, or from another universe, separate from our own universe (part of the multi-verse). In other words, no God designer is necessary, just some design which came from outside our earth environment. And, of course, if the design can be duplicated and expanded, then there is money to be made.

The problem for science is that the more we discover in the design of life, the more we understand that life’s design is even more complicated than ever imagined. If we accept that God is the designer, then we don’t need to give the universities more dollars to control the next stage in the diversity of life, because there is no next stage. And, we don’t need to fund more space adventures to discover where life came from. In other words, there is a lot of money to be made by promoting the notion that life is natural, and that we need to find out how and where it happened—Mars, perhaps. Certainly, the universities can help us understand the various kinds of life, and help solve puzzles around disease and health, but the issue of evolving to a higher life form, or where life came from, would be mute. Today, the money is definitely with naturalism, science, government, and universities, and not with God. See the book “Science, Origins, & Ancient Civilizations—Scientific Evidence Withheld from School Textbooks” at [Target Truth Ministries.com](http://TargetTruthMinistries.com).

Let’s now move from science...to God, and the *actual real evidence* for the supernatural...

The Bible: Why accept the Bible? One of the arguments a Christian often hears is that the Bible is too old to be accurate. Another complaint is that it has been translated so often, we can’t be sure of its original form and accuracy. Some think the Bible is too complicated to understand, and they prefer the clear teaching of the scientist (solar optical depth is expressed as $t(z) = kp^z$ where k (m²/kg) represents a mass absorption coefficient, p (kg/m³) is the density of the absorber, and z (m) is the thickness of the atmosphere—By the way...*this is one of the formulas to **disprove** global warming from carbon dioxide*—see list of scientists previously referred to).

In response, the following are points to defend the Bible. I would, however, point you to the most convincing arguments, which come right out of the Bible itself (*The prophecies*). There are about 3,850 verses directly, or indirectly, concerned with prophecy in Scripture—300 concerning Jesus alone (which were all *fulfilled*).

The Bible is the most scrutinized and authenticated historical document in all of human history. Thousands of manuscripts have been analyzed and compared, from a variety of languages and countries, which provide the basis for our being able to accept the authority of the Bible. Further, Jesus quoted from the Old Testament, which provides us with direct evidence from God Himself of its truth. Additionally, despite the fact that we have very little first century New Testament documents, about 97% of the New Testament can be reconstructed from the writings of the early church fathers, as they quoted from the books used in the Bible.

The archeological evidence (especially the Dead Sea Scrolls, which were discovered in 1948, and have been shown scientifically to pre-date the birth of Jesus by hundreds of years), is overwhelmingly in support of the

Bible's accuracy and prophecy acceptance. Also, there have been new discoveries. Within the last 20 years, evidence now shows that the long-held Egyptian time-line is actually off...by 200 to 300 years. This new evidence actually supports the Bible, all the way back, thousands of years, to the Genesis accounts. How much of this evidence do we receive in school? Zero! 0! Nada!

Yes, there are thousands of errors in the translations. Most of these are spelling and punctuation errors. NONE of these, however, affect the doctrinal position of the text, or the prophecies.

Yes, there are some verses which have been added, and some verses which have been altered, or a word changed. These are all known, because of the comparison of thousands of documents. Actually, today, most Bibles note which passages have been changed, or added. Most modifications actually support the biblical text or are historical in nature (informing us about the traditions, locations, or history of the people), and thus, have been left in...but they are noted. If there is any conflict in understanding, it is easily resolved by reviewing other verses which bear upon the same subject matter. So, if one has a confusing verse, then one need only check out other verses to clarify it.

Yes, there are many translations to choose from. One must choose a translation which remains close to the original text—not a paraphrase, or a translation which has been deliberately altered (usually to support unbiblical concepts such as Jesus not being the uncreated eternal God, as used by various so-called “Christian” groups, such as Jehovah’s Witness, Mormon, and also faiths like Islam). Each of these so-called “biblical faiths,” which claim the Bible as the base for their faith, also claim the Bible has been “corrupted,” and therefore, they have written their own version, or even another book. However, there is no historical evidence, or foundation for their “corrections” (**Gal. 1:8-9**). The overwhelming majority of Christian scholars do not accept these.

So, the Bible is historically accurate, reliable, and documented by ancient parchments (like the Dead Sea Scrolls, and thousands of Greek, Syriac, Coptic, and Latin manuscripts, as well as the early Church Fathers writings). Still, people want some kind of hard evidence...something they can test.

There is a way to prove that the Bible is truly the Word of God: *Prophecies*. In **Luke 16:31**, Jesus states: “*If they do not listen to Moses and the prophets, they will not be persuaded even if someone rises from the dead.*” If prophecies, written hundreds of years before an event actually occurs, are accurate (in some cases even predicted to the very year...even the very day), this is startling evidence of supernatural knowledge (not just a good guess by some man).

The fulfillment of a prophecy is an amazing event. Only one source in all of mankind’s history has proven fully accurate in the fulfillment of prophecies: the Bible, God’s Word. Even mankind’s so-called great prophets outside the Bible, have only been shown to be accurate up to about 20% of the time, and this is only if the prophecies are “general” in nature, and do not require specifics, such as predicting a precise date.

Since the time of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, in 1948, we now have conclusive scientific evidence that prophecies from the Old Testament were actually written hundreds of years before the time of Christ—thus their fulfillment can be tested—verified by actual historical events.

Many of the Bible’s prophecies were fulfilled at the time of Christ’s arrival 2,000 years ago, and many more are being fulfilled today, including the prophecy of Israel becoming a country in 1948—exactly predicted in the Bible by Ezekiel (a prerequisite to the return of Christ—see the message “Great Prophecies,” or the book “Revelation, Apostasy, End Times, & This Generation” at *Target Truth Ministries.com*).

Still, even with all the evidence of the Bible being truly supernatural and correct, people choose to ignore it. Why? There is one primary reason for ignoring and rejecting the Word of God. Pride! If one recognizes that God is real, and the Bible is accurate and true, then one must decide to either submit to God and His ways, or decide to deny God, and remain separated from the need to submit and obey God. The world simply chooses to ignore God. No one wants to submit to another. It’s called being humble...and submitting is humbling. Those in authoritative and academic positions in the world seem to elevate and empower themselves, rather than admit

that there is a God of all creation. Rather than submit to God and His ways, and choose not to sin, most people choose sin, and choose this world. This world is Satan's domain for the time being, according to the Bible (see the book "God's Plan / Satan's Plan" at *Target Truth Ministries.com*). The world and its ways are fading away, but those who trust in God will abide forever (**1 John 2:15-18**). Verifiable scientific evidence actually supports the Bible. Ironically, verifiable scientific evidence does not support macro-evolution, or global warming. What is mankind trusting in? Governments and hypothetical science. What is mankind doing to truly discover truth? Ignoring God and the Bible, while funding theories. How long will science ignore evidence which is inconvenient? As long as the money keeps coming. Are we too prideful to be wise? Think about it! We each must make a choice. Science is becoming political, not science.

Target Truth Ministries.com