

Science Falsely So Called 1 Timothy 6:20-21

Introduction:

- After giving Timothy six chapters of instruction, Paul tells him to “*keep*” all the things that had been committed to his trust. The word “*keep*” in this verse means “to guard.”
 - Paul is warning Timothy to guard the teaching that he had been given from being polluted by the false ideas of the world. Paul then describes the kinds of things that he wants Timothy to guard his mind from.
 - He begins with “*profane and vain babblings.*”
 - The term “*vain babblings*” simply means “empty; useless conversation.” Have you ever known people who like to spend all of their time talking and thinking about the things that the Bible doesn’t clearly spell out? These are useless conversations. You will never be able to get a clear answer. Paul says to avoid these kinds of conversations.
 - Then Paul commands to Timothy to not only avoid “*profane and vain babblings*” but to also avoid “*oppositions of science falsely so called.*”
 - Paul’s literal intention of this command was for Timothy to avoid arguments from men who claimed that they had intellectual oppositions to the gospel.
 - Paul knew that many men would claim that their “wisdom” and “knowledge” kept them from believing the truth. But their so-called “knowledge” was not knowledge at all. It was “*falsely so called.*”
 - But while Paul’s literal intention for this verse was broader, we can certainly apply Paul’s point to the more specific subject of modern-day science.
 - For over 150 years now, ever since Charles Darwin’s *Origin of Species* was published in 1859 and evolution became the accepted theory for the origin of life, the mainstream scientific community has been in direct opposition to God’s Word and what it has to say about how the universe and life began.
 - Christians often become fearful and timid when they hear that “science” seems to contradict the Bible. Some allow their faith to be shipwrecked. Others just try to make the Bible fit with each new prevailing scientific theory, but we need not be intimidated.
 - We are not on shaky ground as believers. Those who claim to use science to refute the existence of God are the ones who are on shaky ground. Why?
- 1. In a universe without God, science has no foundation for truth.**

- The word “*science*” simply means “knowledge.” To “know” something means “to have full persuasion of its factual nature, to have full persuasion of its truth.”
- But how can we know anything to be true without acknowledging the existence of God?
- By doing away with God, we have removed meaning and value from life. If there is no God, then you and I are the accidental by-product of nature, a result of matter plus time plus chance. There is no “reason” for our existence.
- As William Lane Craig says, “*Modern man thought that when he had gotten rid of God, he had freed himself from all that repressed and stifled him. Instead, he discovered that in killing God, he had also killed himself. For if there is no God, then man's life becomes absurd.*”
- In the Christian worldview, we believe that a wise, loving, intelligent God created the universe and everything in it. Genesis 1:1; 2:4; Psalm 148:5
 - Colossians 1:16 states, “*For by him were all things created... all things were created by him, and for him.*”
- In this worldview, God is the standard of truth and morality. John 14:6 says, “*Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life.*”
- Without God, we have no standard for truth or morality.
 - We can say definitively that lying is wrong, because it contradicts God’s nature of truthfulness.
 - But how can we have any absolutes whatsoever without a standard to judge against?
- Let’s begin with morality. We are all born with an innate understanding of certain things that “should” happen. People “should” tell the truth. People “should” love others. People “should” take care of those who are sick and hurting.
 - But if humans are just chemical accidents living in a world that is the result of a mindless explosion, how can anyone prove that what they feel should happen in this world is really right?
 - Without God, how can you tell Hitler that his version of morality is wrong, and the rest of the world’s version is right? If there is no absolute standard of right and wrong, how can we say that our standard is more right than someone else’s?
- Now, let’s move to knowledge. A scientist may say, “I can certainly discover truth without God. I simply use my eyes to observe and my brain to understand the world around me.”
 - To this I would answer, “Yes, but how do you know you can trust your brain? According to your worldview, your brain is just a bunch of chemicals and tissue. How can you be sure that your brain is a trustworthy source of knowledge and that it isn’t giving you a distorted view of the

world? Apart from God, you can't really "know" that anything in this world is real or trustworthy."

- Can you see how absurd it is to seek knowledge in a godless world?
- Yet Richard Dawkins, one of the most well-known advocates of evolution and an eminent scientist at Oxford University, contends that Bible believers are the ones who are ignorant of the truth: *"It is absolutely safe to say that if you meet somebody who claims not to believe in evolution, that person is ignorant, stupid, or insane (or wicked, but I'd rather not consider that)."*
- The inherent contradictions in Dawkins's claim were apparent to John C. Lennox, Professor of Mathematics at the University of Oxford. He responded to Dawkins's argument, and his words are worth rereading:
"I confess to finding it curious that those who claim that there is no such thing as truth expect me to believe that what they are saying is true! Perhaps I misunderstand them, but they seem to exempt themselves from their general rubric that there is no such thing as truth when they are either speaking to me or writing their books. They turn out to believe in truth after all. In any case, scientists have a clear stake in truth. Why, otherwise, would they bother to do science?"
- Why is evolutionary philosophy "science falsely so called?" Because in its efforts to destroy God, it destroys the foundation for knowledge, and thus destroys itself, because science is all about knowledge.

2. Science cannot answer the origin question.

- It is important to understand that there are two completely different types of science. Let's take a look at both and examine their differences.
- Observational science: Knowledge using the scientific method (also known as "Experimental Science").
 - This is the kind of science that we are involved in when we practice the scientific method.
 - Definition of the scientific method: "A method of procedure... consisting in systematic observation, measurement, and experiment, and the formulation, testing, and modification of hypotheses. This is the kind of science that produces technology."
 - We all have the same observational science! When it comes to observing scientific laws and applying them to technology, the creationist and evolutionist both have the exact same earth to study and learn from.
 - It doesn't matter whether you're a creationist or an evolutionist, you can be a great scientist by observing and studying the world around us. Whether

or not you believe in “molecules to man” evolution has nothing to do with developing technology.

- However, observational science is not the kind of science that most science textbooks or college professors are engaged in when they teach the theory of evolution. They are involved in another kind of science which we will look at next.
- Historical Science: Knowledge concerning the past. It seeks to answer the “How did we get here?” question, and this is the realm of science that the teaching of evolution falls under.
- Public school textbooks are using the same word “science” when talking about observational AND historical science, but they are completely different things.
- There’s one big problem with any discussion about the origin of our universe and life – none of us were there!
- While both creationists and evolutionists can use observational science to try to get an idea of things that have happened in the past, the truth is both sides must make assumptions in order to do so.
 - Many will argue that you can learn what happened in the past by observing things today, and they will use CSI work as an example of this. To an extent this is true, but there is one problem with this argument: re-creations of the past based off of current observations decrease in accuracy as time passes.
 - For instance, in the CSI example, a CSI agent may be able to learn a lot at a murder crime scene from a crime that took place less than 24 hours earlier.
 - But if you were to walk into that same crime scene after 24 years had passed, it would be much more difficult to accurately recreate the past from the current evidence.
 - What if some of the evidence had been tampered with? What if some evidence had been moved to a different location in the room or removed altogether? What if extenuating circumstances led to tests on the body not lending true data on how the crime occurred and when?
- This silly example does a good job of highlighting the problem with looking at current evidence, like rocks and fossils, and trying to use that current evidence to determine how old the earth is or how it came to be.
- Evolutionary proponents must assume that nature has behaved in a uniform manner throughout its entire history. This is the fatal assumption that is used in radiometric dating techniques.
 - But what if certain elements decayed more rapidly at different times in history? Or what if natural disasters and catastrophes (like a global flood)

could have dramatically sped up the process of decay in a short period of time?

- These are the types of questions that uniformitarians don't like to hear, because they don't want to listen to any arguments that might damage their worldview.
- The crux of the matter is that science relies on observation, and none of us were there to observe how this universe came to be. Any science book that claims to be able to do so is "science falsely so called."
- Only God can answer the question of origin, because He is the only One that was there.
- By definition, science can't answer this question.
 - Job 38:4 states, "*Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? Declare, if thou hast understanding.*"

3. Science cannot explain the information dilemma.

- Evolutionary teaching proposes that every living thing that we see on the earth today came from molecules that at some point made the enormous jump from non-living to living (inorganic to organic). They claim that all life on earth first began about 4 billion years ago as the simplest form of single-celled bacteria, called prokaryotes.
- Evolution teaches that every living thing on earth shares this common single-celled ancestor. Over millions and billions of years, using the sun as an energy source, and through the benefit of advantageous mutations, the prokaryotes evolved into ever more complex organisms, such as multi-cellular bacteria, then crustaceans, and then fish, followed by amphibians. Some amphibians evolved into reptiles, and some reptiles branched out and became dinosaurs like the Velociraptor, that has evolved into your Thanksgiving turkey. It is also taught that other reptiles evolved into mammals, like the red ape, which evolution teaches evolved into human beings.
- But there is a major problem with this theory. Of all the issues that can be raised regarding evolution, the biggest issue is this: "Where did the information come from in order to progress from simple life to complex?"
- As mentioned earlier, Darwinists claim we evolved from the simplest form of bacterial life to ever more complex forms of life.
 - The most basic bacteria had less than 500 genes; man has over 22,000 genes. The more complex an organism, the more information is needed. In order for bacteria to evolve into man, basic organisms would have to be able to add genes.

- The average single human gene is a piece of DNA comprised of 100,000 pairs of amino acids, all of which are perfectly sequenced. It is impossible for a new gene to appear by “chance” or by “natural selection.” Darwinists have never given us an explanation for how they propose an organism could increase its gene count.
- There is no genetic mechanism that allows the adding of a gene. This means that there is no mechanism for Darwinian evolution, a fatal flaw in the Theory of Evolution.
- We know that genes mutate, but a mutation is a change to an existing gene, almost always detrimental. Mutations never result in adding a gene.
- Genetic mutation is similar to corrupting a complicated computer program, in that just as the program is less capable or simply will not work, the organism with the mutated gene is damaged. That is devolution – a less healthy creature – not evolution.
- While mutations can cause changes to a way an organism works, they also result in a loss of information, never an increase in information. **Examples:** Wingless beetles on Island of Madeira and the sightless cave fish are creatures that have had a loss of information.
- Where does this new information come from? Information can only come from an intelligent source. But who or what is the intelligent source that has given the information to all of the living things in the world?
- Science can't answer this question. It can observe intelligent life, and it can help us learn how living things work. However, without acknowledging God, science can't explain where such amazingly complex designs such as the human eyeball or the human brain could have originated. Only the Bible can answer this question, and the answer is God. John 1:1-4

Conclusion:

- As Paul encouraged Timothy, do not be shaken by science falsely so called, but instead hold fast to the faithful Word of God.
 - Titus 1:9 states, *“Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.”*