

“True Science”

A Bad Apologetic Method Rejected in the WELS

by Mark Bergemann, prepared for discussion by the Lutheran Science Institute (LSI) Board, as part of that board’s ongoing discussion of apologetics. Mr. Bergemann serves as a member of the LSI Board. Original draft distributed to the board on March 13, 2013. Second draft distributed to the board on April 18, 2013, with changes per suggestions made at the board’s meeting of April 13, 2013. Third draft: April 22, 2013 with an expanded introduction and other changes for the purpose of clarity, per the recommendations of several board members.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
1. What is Science?	4
2. “True Science” –Defined	6
3. “True Science” –A Flawed Apologetic.....	8
4. “True Science” –Living in the Past	11
5. “True Science” –A Danger to Faith	14
6. “True Science” –Outside the WELS.....	17
7. WELS Archive Search.....	18
8. “True Science” –Inside the WELS.....	19
9. “True Science” –Debated in the WELS.....	26
10. “True Science” –Opposed in the WELS	28
11. “True Science” –Rejected in the WELS	49

Introduction

Some Christians defend the creation account by using an apologetic which they sometimes call “True Science.” This paper examines that apologetic, and the use of, or opposition to, that apologetic by authors in the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (WELS). Over 110 WELS quotes on both sides of the issue are included.

The “True Science” apologetic defines science in a specialized way, so that science always agrees with Scripture. Many who defend use of the “True Science” apologetic, often consider it crucial to defending the Christian faith against the temptation of evolution. Those who oppose this apologetic, often consider this apologetic a danger to the Christian faith.

In chapter 1 we will look at how science is defined in our WELS schools and by the secular scientific community. Science is mankind’s attempt to explain nature. This very basic definition can be tightened and refined in many ways, such as by adding the ability to test and/or falsify, or by adding that a body of knowledge is accumulated, but it is still about people trying to understand the world around them. Science is a human activity, not an activity of God. It is an attempt to explain, not a final certain truth. It is a body of knowledge which must be communicated to others. Finally, it is a study of nature. Science is NOT nature.

Chapter 2 defines “True Science” as an apologetic used to defend creation, centering around a Christianized view of science. It often equates science and nature. It often includes a belief that God created the laws of science which we have discovered. It often holds that science can lead to truth (certainty). It often includes a belief that science can prove creation true and/or evolution false. “True Science” excludes from science, laws and theories that go against Scripture (excludes false science), leaving laws and theories that are true. “True Science” makes claims such as, “The Bible and science are in complete agreement when both are properly understood,” and “Evolution is not science,” and “There is no evidence for evolution.”

Chapters 3 and 4 present reasons why the “True Science” apologetic is a bad apologetic.

- Because modern science includes evolution.

- Because the laws of science are NOT the laws of nature. Nature and science are different.

- Because there is evidence for evolution.

- Because the basic premise of the “True Science” apologetic is an error in reasoning.

- Because “True Science” often attacks the person instead of the message.

- Because “True Science” often claims reason leads to certain truth.

- Because “True Science” attempts to take science back 200 years in the past.

Chapter 5 shows why the “True Science” apologetic is dangerous to the Christian faith. The previous chapters detailed reasons to not use the “True Science” apologetic. This chapter shows why the “True Science” apologetic MUST NOT be used. The “True Science” apologetic can greatly increase the temptation of evolution for some. Also, Christian creationists who embrace “True Science” thinking, may look to science and reason to support their faith.

If you read only one chapter of this paper, let that chapter be chapter 5.

Human Reason does have a Biblical place in apologetics, which is detailed by the author in another paper, “The Place of Reason in Defending the Christian Faith –with ministry ideas regarding creation/evolution.”

<http://www.lutheranscience.org/2012-ThePlaceofReason.pdf>

The “True Science” apologetic goes beyond this, and can lead to reason being given a place in creating and/or sustaining faith.

A search of WELS data bases yielded well over 1,000 articles/essays/books/statements addressing science issues (some as the main theme, some as a side comment). Those WELS articles were examined for “True Science” statements similar to those listed in chapter 2, and for statements making an opposing claim.

Chapter 11 shows the “True Science” apologetic is overwhelmingly rejected in the WELS, and has been for the past 30 years. Several methods are utilized to examine over 110 quotes from over 60 WELS authors. Each approach concludes that the “True Science” apologetic has been rejected in the WELS. Table 1b shows the “True Science” apologetic was considered and then overwhelmingly rejected in the WELS. Tabulated data shows the “True Science” apologetic has been rejected by generations of WELS leaders across the synod. Tables 4 and 5 show most WELS teachers supported “True Science” prior to 1982, but since then most WELS teachers have rejected the “True Science” apologetic. Finally the WELS Conference of Presidents (COP) has at least partially rejected the “True Science” apologetic in an official statement.

1. What is Science?

Science is mankind's attempt to explain nature.

This very basic definition can be tightened and refined in many ways, such as by adding the ability to test and/or falsify, or by adding that a body of knowledge is accumulated, but it is still about people trying to understand the world around them. Science is a human activity, not an activity of God. It is an attempt to explain, not a final certain truth. It is a body of knowledge which must be communicated to others. Finally, it is a study of nature. Science is NOT nature.

A Martin Luther College (MLC) textbook for instructing our WELS science teachers how to teach science, defines science this way:

“Science, on the other hand, is an ever changing body of knowledge based on scientists’ attempts to explain the natural world. Some of these scientists might be Christian but many are not.”

[Martin Sponholz, Different!, in Discovering God’s Creation –A Guidebook to Hands-on Science, Edited by Paul Boehlke, Roger Klockziem, John Paulsen; The Printshop Martin Luther College New Ulm, Minnesota, 1997. page xvi, pdf page 17. previously presented at The Science Curriculum Workshop, Martin Luther College, New Ulm MN, July 22, 1995]

The MLC website has this book available for download so that teachers in the field can use it:

<http://mlc-wels.edu/divisions/math-science/discovering-gods-creation>

accessed March 11, 2013

Students at Wisconsin Lutheran High School are taught this definition of science:

“What is science? ...man’s assessment and organization about what he knows.”

[Al Greschner, WISCO Science PowerPoint: Science Introduction. What Is Science?, Wisconsin Lutheran High School, 2012]

<http://www.greschner.wiscoscience.com/worksheets/physics/intro/science%20intro.pdf>

accessed March 2, 2013

Students at Winnebago Lutheran Academy are taught this definition of science:

“Science is an attempt by mankind to grasp the concepts of God's creation.”

[Riley W. Westphal, Chemistry Course Description, Winnebago Lutheran Academy, 2013]

<http://www.wlavikings.org/inner.iml/academics/science>

accessed March 1, 2013

A Wisconsin Lutheran College (WLC) mathematics professor defines mathematics (a part of science) this way:

“Mathematics is man’s attempt to describe the order that God has placed in the universe.”

[Ronald A. Buelow, The Devine Proportion, 8 minutes into this PowerPoint presentation, Michigan Conference of Pastors and Teachers for the Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod (2010), faculty of Winnebago Lutheran Academy, Fond du Lac, Wisconsin (2000), Student Convocation, Wisconsin Lutheran College, Milwaukee, WI, (1986), WELS Wisconsin State Teachers Conference, Milwaukee, WI, (1984), Northwestern College Student – Faculty Discussion Group, Watertown, WI, (1983), created as a teaching unit and a presentation (1978)]

<http://faculty.wlc.edu/buelow/Home/HomePage.html>

accessed March 5, 2013

The definitions of science presented above are similar to that held by the scientific community.

The National Academy of Sciences puts it this way:

Science is a particular way of knowing about the world. In science, explanations are limited to those based on observations and experiments that can be substantiated by other scientists. Explanations that cannot be based on empirical evidence are not a part of science. In the quest for understanding, science involves a great deal of careful observation that eventually produces an elaborate written description of the natural world. Scientists communicate their findings and conclusions to other scientists through publications, talks at conferences, hallway conversations, and many other means. Other scientists then test those ideas and build on preexisting work. In this way, the accuracy and sophistication of descriptions of the natural world tend to increase with time, as subsequent generations of scientists correct and extend the work done by their predecessors. Progress in science consists of the development of better explanations for the causes of natural phenomena. Scientists never can be sure that a given explanation is complete and final. Some of the hypotheses advanced by scientists turn out to be incorrect when tested by further observations or experiments. Yet many scientific explanations have been so thoroughly tested and confirmed that they are held with great confidence.

[Science and Creationism: A View from the National Academy of Sciences, NATIONAL ACADEMY PRESS Washington, DC, SECOND EDITION 1999, page 1.] A free pdf of this book is available at: <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/6024.html>

The National Academy of Sciences presents the following definitions on page 2 of this same book:

Fact: In science, an observation that has been repeatedly confirmed and for all practical purposes is accepted as “true.” Truth in science, however, is never final, and what is accepted as a fact today may be modified or even discarded tomorrow.

Hypothesis: A tentative statement about the natural world leading to deductions that can be tested. If the deductions are verified, it becomes more probable that the hypothesis is correct. If the deductions are incorrect, the original hypothesis can be abandoned or modified. Hypotheses can be used to build more complex inferences and explanations.

Law: A descriptive generalization about how some aspect of the natural world behaves under stated circumstances.

Theory: In science, a well-substantiated explanation of some aspect of the natural world that can incorporate facts, laws, inferences, and tested hypotheses. The contention that evolution should be taught as a “theory, not as a fact” confuses the common use of these words with the scientific use. In science, theories do not turn into facts through the accumulation of evidence. Rather, theories are the end points of science. They are understandings that develop from extensive observation, experimentation, and creative reflection. They incorporate a large body of scientific facts, laws, tested hypotheses, and logical inferences.

2. “True Science” –Defined

“True Science” is different than science as explained above. The term “True Science” has been used for over 50 years by some in the creation-science movement, to describe their specialized view of science. “True Science” is an apologetic used to defend creation, centering around a Christianized view of science. It often equates science and nature. It often includes a belief that God created the laws of science which we have discovered. It often holds that science can lead to truth (certainty). It often includes a belief that science can prove creation true and/or evolution false. “True Science” excludes from science, laws and theories that go against Scripture (excludes false science), leaving laws and theories that are true. So the “True Science” apologetic defines science in a specialized way, so that science is always in complete agreement with the Bible.

Seminary Professor R. Gurgel provides a quick definition of "True Science" in an FIC article on a completely unrelated subject: "Don't confuse this creationism [one theory for the origin of the soul] with the more common use of the word for the belief that true science supports creation not evolution."

(Richard L. Gurgel; QA - At The Foot Of The Cross -The Origin Of The Soul; Forward In Christ, April 2007)

<http://www.wels.net/news-events/forward-in-christ/april-2007/qa-foot-cross-origin-soul>

1970s LSI President David Golisch said “True science is defined as that which does not disagree or negate Scripture.” [David Golisch in an October 1, 1978 letter to Martin Sponholz, point 44 in this seven page letter.]

[also quoted by David A. Kipfmiller; Fighting The Good Fight; Presented to the pastors of the Capitol Circuit, meeting at St. Paul's Ev. Lutheran church in Marshall, WI September 21, 1982; page 4]

<http://www.wlssays.net/node/1077>

A definition can be gleaned from this statement by a WELS Lakeside Lutheran High School teacher.

“When the Christian separates the facts of true science from the false theories of modern evolutionary teaching he sees that there is no conflict and he has no difficulty in accepting, through faith, the Scriptural account of man’s creation.”

[Robert W. Adickes, Man versus Animal --part one –Man Distinct From The Animal, in Is Evolutionism The Answer?, NPH 1967, page 64. Previously published in The Northwestern Lutheran, 1965-1966]

The president of the Institute for Creation Research (ICR) says: “While many scientists may be anti-God, science itself is not. All true science is creation science.”

[Morris, J. 2008. True Science Is Creation Science. Acts & Facts. 37 (4): 3.]

<http://www.icr.org/article/3762/>

"True Science" includes statements like the following (all from within WELS):

These are some quotes from WELS authors as listed chapter 8.

"There is no confrontation between creation and true science."

"True science agrees with God's Word about creation"

"The first two chapters of Genesis ... nowhere conflict with true science."

"There is no real evidence for the evolution concept."

"Our faith in the Bible as the Word of God cannot be in opposition to properly conducted scientific investigation."

"in which he proves the scientific impossibility of the theory of evolution. "

"the pseudo-scientific dogma of evolution"

""science falsely so-called,' named 'Evolution'"

"From a scientific standpoint, then, evolution must be regarded as a myth."

"No genuine scientific facts will contradict the Word of God"

"The First Law of Thermodynamics ...God first created mass and energy and then put this law into effect."

"No one can point to a single fact of science ...that conflicts with a literal reading of the Bible."

"Macro Evolution is NOT scientific."

"True science will not contradict what the Bible teaches."

"Honest science will not treat an unproven theory as a fact."

"The theory of evolution: unbiblical, unscientific."

"advanced by so-called scientists."

"a theory proposed by a would-be scientist."

"The Bible and true science never contradict each other."

"God created the laws of science."

"The theory of evolution is not scientific."

3. “True Science” –A Flawed Apologetic

In chapter 2 we saw that the “True Science” apologetic defines science in a specialized way, so that science always agrees with Scripture. “True Science” also defines evidence in a specialized way, so that evolution has no evidence. In addition, “True Science” confuses and even equates the study of nature (science) with nature itself.

In this chapter we will look at some of the problems caused by these specialized views, then in chapters 4 and 5, we will look at additional problems caused by this apologetic.

Modern Science Includes Evolution

Some otherwise great articles by WELS authors include a short comment about evolution not being scientific. Such thinking is a part of “True Science.” Evolution is based upon an *a priori* belief in naturalism and materialism, which eliminates a creator god. Evolutionists then use science to develop the best stories they can about origins without a creator god.

Evolutionists claim that creationists are unscientific because they invoke miracles, and some creationists (those advancing “True Science”) claim evolutionists are unscientific, because they go against Scripture. In fact, evolutionists and creationists both use science. The creationist makes scientific observations and draws scientific conclusions based on a belief in the Creator God of the Bible. The evolutionist makes scientific observations and draws scientific conclusions based on a belief that there is no creator god. The majority of evolutionists in the USA are Christians who DO BELIEVE in a Creator God, but they usually do their evolutionary science as though there is no creator god.

Laws of Science are NOT Laws of Nature

The laws of science are simply mankind’s attempt to explain nature. God upholds the universe so that things usually follow a systematic pattern. Some call that pattern the laws of nature. We use our human reason (science) in an attempt to understand these laws of nature, but the best we can do is make laws of science. If a theory or law of science consistently makes correct predictions, then we agree to use that theory or law. We know many of our theories and laws of science are probably not completely correct, or might even be based on a total misunderstanding of nature, because we constantly replace our theories and laws of science with new ones.

There certainly is a difference between a scientific law, theory, and observation, but here Martin Sponholz, a now retired MLC professor, explains that all three are similarly biased:

There is no difference between law, theory, or observation. Theory and law defines the observation, theory and law identifies desirable observation, and theory and law interprets observation. In turn, observation confirms the same theory and law. It is we as teachers and future teachers who memorize the laws of science and make them so unchangeable and proved. We foster the wrong idea of science being an approach to truth when few scientists would dare be so bold. A scientist becomes a Nobel laureate by developing new and different laws, never by confirming old established laws. Science must be taught as the imaginative artistry it is. Like the poet who chooses words for a poem, the scientist chooses formulas and natural impressions to develop his laws.

[Martin Sponholz, Some Truths of Science, presented at Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary, Mequon, Wisconsin on March 7, 1979.]

This WELS Lutheran Science Institute (LSI) board member and LSI author, who now resides in heaven, made a clear separation between the laws of nature and the laws of science.

“God, indeed, brought order into our world and into our universe by establishing the many laws of the natural world. We rarely discover them; we approximate them. Even our erroneous approximations often give great benefit to our daily lives.”

[Cleone H. Weigand, Creation –God Made All Things, people’s Bible Teachings, NPH 2000. page 121.]

There is Evidence for Evolution

I have been told that there is no evidence for evolution, because there can only be evidence for things that are true (like creation) and not for things that are false (like evolution). I have also been told that if something is evidence for both creation and evolution, then that is evidence for neither. These are specialized “True Science” type definitions of the word “evidence.”

I personally find the evidence for evolution amazingly poor, because I am aware of the many holes and unsupported presuppositions in the evidence for evolution. In my opinion, the scientific evidence for creation is so much stronger. We need to proclaim that message. That said, there certainly is plenty of evidence for evolution, and many people (and many scientists) find that evidence very compelling. Let’s list a few of the many evidences for evolution:

1. People and many animals have four appendages which could indicate ancestry. Of course we believe it indicates a common design by the Creator God.
2. Nearly 100% of major university science professors believe in evolution as certain fact (although they may disagree on the details). Of course truth is never decided by majority vote. Also not mentioned is that any science professor who is found to be a creationist is nearly always removed from his university position. I may add, that in my own field of science, engineering, creationists and evolutionists are happy to work side by side. I have been told by doctors that this is also true in medicine.
3. The majority of Christian churches teach evolution. As a matter of fact, the majority of evolutionists in the USA are Christians (sometimes called “old earth creationists”). Again, truth is never decided by majority vote.
4. I think Darwin was correct in noticing the various finches on the Galapagos Islands came from a common ancestor. That is simply genetic variability built into birds by God. In addition, random DNA mutations can cause favorable characteristics for better survival in certain environments, and their dependents may inherit these characteristics. Creationists accept natural selection as true. We can watch natural selection happen today. It produces new species of plants and animals, but never a new Biblical kind. People (un-naturally) select animals and plants to produce new dogs, fish, grass, corn, etc. The problem is that evolutionists ASSUME natural selection can make new Biblical kinds of plants and animals, even though there is little or no evidence of that ever happening.
5. Richard Dawkins in his very famous book, “The Blind Watchmaker,” opposes the thought that evolution is a random process. He calls evolution a natural “sorting” or “sieving” process which is not random. Dawkins’ book is a strong general argument for evolution. While this can be considered evidence for evolution, it is just very general speculation.
6. Stellar “Nurseries”: We have beautiful photos of gas nebulas far larger than our solar system. The Eagle Nebula (M16 – The Pillars of Creation) is an example.
http://www.nasa.gov/images/content/137747main_hubble-eaglenebula-browse.jpg
http://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/herschel/news/herschel20120118.html
accessed March 11, 2013.

The Eagle Nebula and other nebula show stars that fit evolution's idea of "young stars" (their color shows they would probably burn out in only millions of years) being "formed" in gas clouds. To see these photos, and be told by PhD scientists (from NASA and major universities), that this shows new stars being formed, is compelling evidence. Of course the star forming process is thought by evolutionists to take millions of years, so we actually see NOTHING happening. There are also several scientific problems, such as the hope that gravity can collapse gas into a ball so dense as to start nuclear fusion, even though the gas laws (as we know them) would probably prevent this from happening. That is NOT the point. Most people do not know this, and may not accept it even if told. There are plenty of experts confirming evolution as solid and unquestionable. The fact is that the photos "fit" the evolution story. THIS IS EVIDENCE, and it is compelling evidence to at least half the population.

Error in Reasoning

The basic premise of "True Science" is logically wrong (a logical fallacy – an error in reasoning). We would proclaim that "nothing in science contradicts the creation account," because we have redefined science "as that which does not disagree or negate Scripture." (Definition per 1970s LSI President David Golisch, as quoted in chapter 2). Why would we use such deception in our apologetic?

The "True Science" apologetic commits "The 'No True Scotsman' fallacy: when an arguer defines a term in a biased way to protect his argument from rebuttals. ...Person A asserts that no Scotsman puts sugar in his porridge. Person B refutes this claim by providing a counter example: 'Angus is a Scotsman –and he puts sugar in his porridge.' But person A responds by saying, 'Ah, but no *true* Scotsman puts sugar in his porridge.' He has essentially redefined the term 'Scotsman' in a way that his original claim cannot be wrong. But since the definition is fallacious, so is his argument." Jason Lisle, *Discerning Truth –Exposing Errors in Evolutionary Arguments* (Green Forest: Master Books, 2010), 78.]

Attacking the Person Instead of the Message

Some of the WELS "True Science" quotes listed in chapter 8 are Ad Hominem attacks questioning the credentials of scientists ("so-called scientists" and "would-be scientist"). Again, why would we use a logical fallacy in our apologetic? In addition, many of the quotes from WELS pastors, teachers, and laity ridicule evolution as "so-called science," "the fiction of science," "false science," "pseudo-scientific dogma," "not genuine science," "pseudo-science," and "from a scientific standpoint ...myth." Is this the apologetic we wish to use? It is certainly correct to say that evolution is false and a lie because it contradicts Scripture. But the "True Science" apologetic declares evolution false because the "True Science" apologetic claims evolution contradicts science.

Claiming Reason Leads to Certain Truth

At times, the "True Science" apologetic elevates human reason to the unbiblical position of being able to lead to certain truth: proving creation is true, proving evolution is false, proving God created the "true" laws of science (1st & 2nd law of thermodynamics, biogenesis, etc.), and others. If these claims were presented as strong evidence it would be one thing, but they are often presented as certain truth.

4. “True Science” –Living in the Past

Prior to 200 years ago, scientists in western Christian countries viewed science from a Christian perspective. In the early 1800s, science shifted to its current anti-god stance, and was fully there by Darwin’s time (1859). Young earth creationists existed after this time and to the present, but they were and remain a minority, rejected by the mainstream of science.

Even when science was viewed from that earlier Christian perspective, science and nature were NOT the same. Science was still no more than mankind’s attempt to explain nature. Even during that era, when scientists viewed science from a Christian perspective, the laws of science which were discovered were not laws God created, but laws that man devised. Many of the theories and laws of science from these former times have been replaced by new theories and laws, just as much of our scientific knowledge will probably be replaced in the future. Science was not a way to find certain truth in the past. Science will never be a path to certain truth.

“Only when Christians dominated the western world did science take on that lovely aspect of desiring to see God's works in nature.” “By the time of Charles Darwin, God's order was no longer looked for in nature. Science again was like that of the Greeks, very independent of, even antagonistic to, God's Word.”

[*Teaching and Unteaching Evolution: The Fossils Say Nothing*, Prof. Martin P. Sponholz, Math-Science Division, Martin Luther College. This paper was originally presented to a Teacher’s Conference October 24, 1985. It is updated and presented as a handout with additional readings added for a Workshop on Instructional Methods in Lutheran High Schools, July 5-10, 1999. MLC, New Ulm, Minnesota. pages 3, 5.]

Ken Ham, founder and President/CEO of Answers in Genesis (AIG), writes in the 25th anniversary edition of his very influential book, *The Lie*, about how science (biology and geology) turned against the Christian view.

“In this era of history, a particular attack on God’s Word (an attack that began in Genesis 3) began to change the way that people looked on the Bible. In the late 1700s and 1800s, the belief in millions of years for fossil bearing strata began to be popularized. This belief came out of naturalism (atheism).” [footnote: “For more on the popularization of naturalism, see terry Mortenson, *The Great Turning Point*.”]

...“Then in 1859, Charles Darwin, building on this supposed millions of years in geology, applies the idea to biology and claimed that the little changes observed in species were part of the mechanism for biological evolution. ...Darwin’s beliefs about evolution are historical science –a belief about the past.

...And so this evolutionary view of geology and biology origins began not only to permeate our society but also to permeate the church.”

[Ken Ham, *The Lie: Evolution/Millions of Years*, 2012 edition, pages 156-157]

Dr. Mortenson documents the Bible believing geologists in Britain from 1820-1845, and their losing battle to keep geology grounded in young earth creation instead of old earth naturalism. Science became an “atheistic framework” by the time of Darwin.

“This book analyses one such controversy, and an extremely important one at that, during the first half of the nineteenth century in Britain, which has sometimes been called the ‘Genesis geology debate.’ At that time a tenacious and denominationally eclectic band of scientists and clergymen (and some were both) opposed the new geological theories being developed at the time, which said that the earth was millions of years old. These men became known as ‘Scriptural geologists,’ ‘Mosaic geologists’ or ‘Biblical literalists.’” [page 11]

“So the Scriptural geologists were fighting against a major paradigm shift transpiring in both theology and geology (and generally in science and society) during the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Another way this new world view was expressed was in the increasing insistence both by liberal theologians and scientists that all things must be

explained only by the laws of nature. This meant that miraculous interpretation of the normal course of nature were ruled out *a priori*.” [page 227]

“As the 19th century progressed, the question of origins (astronomical, geological, and biological) was moving rapidly away from assumptions rooted in Christianity to a semi-deistic, agnostic or atheistic framework. The rear-guard action of the scriptural geologists was too little and too late to stop this cultural shift in world view. By the publication of Darwin’s book in 1859 the Scriptural geologists had almost become an ‘extinct species’ of the human race. Lyell’s uniformitarianism had conquered geology.” [page 236]

[Terry Mortenson (AIG speaker/researcher since 2001), *The Great Turning Point –The Church’s Catastrophic Mistake on Geology –Before Darwin*, Master Books, 2004.]

Henry Morris and Duane Gish tried to lead Christians to again embrace the Christianized view of science from 200 years ago. The institution founded by Morris and now led by his son and grandson, The Institute For Creation Research (ICR), still promotes “True Science.” Some creation groups, such as Answers In Genesis (AIG), are opposed to many parts of “True Science.”

Ken Ham continues in the 25th anniversary edition of his seminal book to describe how science is biased and changes. He describes evolution as not proven (instead of saying he can prove it false). Instead of talking about proving creation true, or proving evolution false, Ken talks about using scientific evidence to bring people to listen to the Gospel. At times Ken sounds like a Lutheran. I include these quotes by Ham, and the following quotes by Lisle, to show that this very large Reformed group does not normally advance “True Science.” These are not isolated comments by Ham and Lisle, their books are filled with dozens of pages of similar comments.

[Ken Ham, *The Lie: Evolution/Millions of Years*, 2012 edition.]

Ham writes:

“No human being, no scientist, has all the evidence. That is why fallible scientists change their ideas continually. As scientists continue to learn new things, they change their conclusions.” [page 50]

“I taught them [his public school students] that all scientists have presuppositions (beliefs, particularly in regard to historical science) that they use in interpreting the evidence.” [page 65]

“Some may say that if the evidence is so overwhelming that God created, surely people would believe this. In Romans 1:20 we read, ‘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.’ The Bible tells us that there is enough evidence in the world to convince people that God is creator and to condemn those who do not believe. If that is so and the evidence is all there, why do people not believe it? Is it because they do not want to believe it? The Apostle Peter stated that in the last days men will deliberately forget that God created the world (2 Peter 3:5). This means there is a willfulness on their part not to believe.” [page 74]

“We also need to make sure we never divorce Romans 10:17 from Romans 1:20. Romans 10:17 states, ‘So then faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God.’” [page 75]

“Whenever we are using evidence, we should always do it in a way as to point people to the Word of God. It is only through the Word of God that a sinner is saved. ...(Rom 3:11) ...2 Cor 4:6) ...In other words, it is God who opens our hearts to the truth.” [page 75]

“I want to make it very clear that we do not want to be known primarily as young-earth creationists. The biblical creation movement (involving organizations such as Answers In Genesis) and its main thrust is not young earth as such; the emphasis is on biblical authority. Believing in a relatively young earth (i.e., only a few thousand years old) is a consequence of accepting the authority of the Word Of God over fallible man’s word.” [page 126]

Astrophysicist Jason Lisle, was with AIG when he wrote this book. Now he is Director of Research at ICR. The title of his apologetics book, "The Ultimate Proof of Creation," may lead one to think he expects to use science to convince evolutionists that evolution is false and creation is true, yet he says that "Many people refuse to accept a very good argument simply because they do not want to believe its conclusion" and "people are (unfortunately) often persuaded by very bad arguments" [page 11]. Lisle argues that we must use Bible first apologetics, NOT evidence first.

[Jason Lisle, The Ultimate Proof of Creation –resolving the origins debate, Master Books 2009.]

Lisle writes:

"When used properly, scientific evidence can expose devastating weakness in secular models of origins. ...In fact, the scientific evidence is so compelling that many creationists simply cannot understand how anyone could possibly believe in evolution. But scientific evidence by itself will not settle the matter, as we will shortly see. ...They do not actually prove biblical creation, nor do they utterly refute evolution or billions of years. The reason is that an evolutionist can always invoke what we might call a 'rescuing device.' That is, an evolutionist can invent a story to explain away apparently contrary evidence. ...Perhaps there is some kind of unknown mechanism that has contaminated the diamonds and other samples, creating new C-14 in them –in which case things can be very old after all. Perhaps there is some as-yet-undiscovered mechanism that produces new information in DNA. ...The reason that mere evidences do not persuade people is that people can always invoke the *unknown*. This is why the above arguments do not really prove creation. *Any evidence* can be explained away by invoking a rescuing device. Is a rescuing device unacceptable? Should we criticize the evolutionary astronomers for inventing a mere conjecture to rescue their opinion of vast ages rather than simply accepting the evidence at face value? My response may surprise you. The answer is: no –a rescuing device is not *necessarily* wrong. [pages 15, 18, 22 - 24]

"The evidence-first approach would have us attempt to show that the Bible is true by starting from another (neutral) standard. But the Bible clearly teaches that there is no other standard for knowledge than God's Word (Prov. 1:7; Col. 2:3). ...The Bible affirms that people do not come to God through secular reasoning: 1 Corinthians 1:21 states, 'For since in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom did not come to know God, God was well pleased through the foolishness of the message preached to save those who believe.' (NASB). ...So we must always guard ourselves against an evidence-first approach. ...Jesus understood the necessity of taking a Bible-first approach. He illustrated this principle with the story of Lazarus and the rich man (Luke 16:19-31). ...But Abraham's response was 'If they do not listen to Moses and the Prophets, they will not be convinced even if someone rises from the dead.' ...The rich man had an evidence-first mindset. [pages 158 - 160]

"Far too many Christians put more confidence in their personal assessment of evidence than they do in the infallible Word of God." [page 163]

5. “True Science” –A Danger to Faith

Use of the “True Science” apologetic is a danger to the Christian faith.

Say we tell a person that there “is no evidence for evolution” and that “real science and the Bible are in harmony.” Then that person watches the Science Channel, or attends a science class at school, and hears what she considers compelling evidence for evolution. She sees a major conflict between science and the Bible. She may conclude “My church lied to me.” Evolution has now become a much larger temptation, thanks in part to a “True Science” message from us.

Christian creationists who embrace “True Science” thinking may look to science and reason to support their faith. The Bible teaches that only the Gospel in word and sacrament has the power to create and sustain faith. We must avoid encouraging people to look past the Means Of Grace to support their faith. (See the quotes that follow for examples.)

The following statement implies that the “True Science” apologetic removes the difficulty of accepting creation through faith. Can this be understood in any way other than as Calvinism, not Lutheranism? Propping up any article of the Christian faith through human reason is unbiblical. Amazingly, the following statement was written by a WELS teacher, approved for publication in *The Northwestern Lutheran* (now FIC), and approved for publication in an NPH book.

“When the Christian separates the facts of true science from the false theories of modern evolutionary teaching he sees that there is no conflict and he has no difficulty in accepting, through faith, the Scriptural account of man’s creation.”

[Robert W. Adickes, *Man versus Animal --part one –Man Distinct From The Animal*, in *Is Evolutionism The Answer?*, NPH 1967, page 64. Previously published in *The Northwestern Lutheran*, 1965-1966]

Seminary Professor R. Gurgel talks about the creation science danger to faith in a Q&A about our official doctrinal statement, “This We Believe.”

“At the same time some of the conclusions and analysis of creation science may be as flawed as those of evolution. In addition, Christians may begin to base their faith on human research instead of God’s revelation.”

[Richard L. Gurgel, *This We Believe –Questions and Answers*, NPH 2006, page 62.]

On October 1, 1978, David Golisch sent a letter to Martin Sponholz criticizing Sponholz’s Oct 27 & 28, 1977 presentation to the WELS Wisconsin State Teacher’s Conference, “Teaching Creation and Science.” Golisch’s seven page letter was on Huron Valley Lutheran High School stationary and Golisch signed as “science teacher – H.V.L.H.S.” and as “president – Lutheran Science Institute.”

We know from Scripture that God has chosen to strengthen and grow our faith only through the Gospel in Word and sacrament. However, Scripture does show that arguments from reason can help believers better understand spiritual truths. In places like 1 Corinthians chapters 9 and 15, Paul uses arguments from reason when addressing believers. Reason can also be used to help believers see the logical inconsistencies that are often apparent in unbelief. Golisch goes beyond this and actually says that faith can be strengthened through “True Science.”

Golisch writes (point 44): “There is no confrontation between creation and true science. (True science is defined as that which does not disagree or negate Scripture.) However, there is a big confrontation with this pseudo-science of evolution. The battle is lost with the new believer if he doesn’t learn of the True Science but instead is left with the conflict of pseudo-science and the Bible.”

Golisch writes (point 41): “Are you saying that a person with a new faith who still believes in evolution should not read Gen 1 & 2 about creation lest it damage his faith because he hasn’t heard about creation? The creation materials have just the opposite effect. When a person with a new faith learns of the contradiction that creation is of evolution, his faith is shaken, but when he learns that science has erred about evolution and that true science agrees with God’s Word about creation, his faith is strengthened.”

Golisch’ point 41 is apparently responding to the following words in Sponholz’s presentation: “If these become our ideas for science, I’m afraid we are building our own brand of pseudoscience and dangerously tying it to doctrine as the Roman Church did with geocentrism. Galileo Galilei faced the inquisition and science moved to the Reformation countries. What might we be doing to a new faith or to a person seeking comfort in Christ, but not familiar with all the Creation Science materials we have learned to accept without proof?”

The following Northwestern Lutheran (later called Forward In Christ) article says that what a Christian believes about the origin of the universe must agree with science! Why? Why should we as a church tell our people that their beliefs must conform to science? Do we think they need science to support their Christian faith?

“The origin of the universe is one of the most interesting and yet most difficult questions for any student of modern science. When that student is also a student of the Holy Scriptures, the problem becomes even more important. For the Christian, the final answer must not only agree with the facts of true science; it must also harmonize with the statements made in the Bible.”

[Ulrik J. Larsen, The Origin of the Universe, Truth Unchanging –Is Evolutionism The Answer?, NPH 1967, page 5. Previously published in The Northwestern Lutheran, 1965-1966]

“In the June 1982 cover letter of Acts and Facts Henry M. Morris shares part of a letter from an overseas pastor. Here is what he wrote: ‘I wish to express a word of appreciation for your work, and to let you know the impact your ministry has. Back in the summer of 1976, I attended your seminar on creation-science, and it has had a lasting effect on my life and faith. The clear scientific evidence you presented proved to be exactly what I needed to set me free to trust God without reservation, and to know that the rest of His Word is also factually reliable.’ ...I trust that this overseas pastor is not of our fellowship! Although it may sound good on first reading, it nevertheless displays a spirit contrary to sound doctrine. Upon what is this pastor’s “faith” based? On the Bible? On the sure clear words of Genesis 1 and 2? No! It is based on the “clear scientific evidence”! Even more revealing, this statement displays a lack of faith in the power and veracity of the Scriptures. Only after science was added did he feel “free to trust God without reservation”. Certainly, this is not the kind of attitude we wish to instill in our children.”

[David A. Kipfmiller; Fighting The Good Fight; Presented to the pastors of the Capitol Circuit, meeting at St. Paul’s Ev. Lutheran church in Marshall, WI September 21, 1982; page 5]

<http://www.wlssays.net/node/1077>

The following non-Lutheran pastor, Lee Strobel, says that the “supporting evidence” and the “facts of science” make coming to faith in Jesus “a step that’s fully warranted.” If we proclaim “True Science,” are we not encouraging this unbiblical belief?

“THE FUSION OF SCIENCE AND FAITH. Unfortunately, there’s a lot of misunderstanding about faith. Some believe faith actually contradicts facts. ‘The whole point of faith,’ scoffed Michael Shermer, editor of The Skeptic Inquirer, ‘is to believe regardless of the evidence, which is the very antithesis of science.’ However that’s certainly not my understanding. I see faith as being a reasonable step in the same direction that the evidence is pointing. In other words, faith goes beyond merely acknowledging that the facts of science and history point to God –a step that’s fully warranted due to the supporting evidence.”

[Lee Strobel, The Case For A Creator, 2004 Zondervan, p. 285-286.]

Here Paul Boehlke, a science professor at WLC (formerly at MLC), warns about the danger of “True Science.” “We must remind ourselves that many Creationists are of a different spirit. Lutherans and Calvinists have had this difference before over the nature of the elements in communion. We believe in Creation by faith and by Scripture. Do we not confess in Luther’s Third Article that by our own “reason and strength” we would never come to God and faith? Do we not sing “All my knowledge, sense and sight lie in deepest darkness shrouded”? Let us apply this in science: My science cannot not make me believe in God. My science cannot bring me to God. The Spirit does not work through test tubes and microscopes. Scientific creationism is well-meaning, but misguided and dangerous.” [Paul Boehlke, Preface, to *Discovering God’s Creation –A Guidebook to Hands-on Science*, Edited by Paul Boehlke, Roger Klockziem, John Paulsen; The Printshop Martin Luther College New Ulm, Minnesota, 1997. page xiv. pdf page 15.]

<http://mlc-wels.edu/divisions/math-science/DiscoveringGodsCreationweb.pdf>

Doug Sharp writes, "... yet each one [the scientists whose stories are in this book] has had his faith in God strengthened by scientific evidence for creation.”

[Introduction to “Persuaded by the Evidence”, Doug Sharp & Dr. Jerry Bergman, editors, page 15]

6. “True Science” –Outside the WELS

Here is an LCMS book that is sold by NPH and was used for a Bible study at my WELS congregation.

“In reality there is harmony between science and religion.”

“The conflict between evolution and creation is not, in its essence, a confrontation between the teachings of science and the doctrines of creation.”

“First, without any reference to the Lord God, to a god, or to the gods, there is a 100% certainty that intelligence of some kind is responsible for the origin of life.”

Third, the model of creationism is more scientific than the model of evolution.”

[Michael L. McCoy, A Christian Perspective on Creation vs. Evolution, CPH 1996, pages 27, 28, 29, 39]

“All the genuine facts of science support biblical creationism.”

(Morris, H. 2008. The Principles of Creationism. Acts & Facts. 37 (3): 10.)

<http://www.icr.org/article/Creationism-Principles/>

“With the rise of evolution and naturalism, ‘science’ has become the enemy of Christianity, but true science ‘declares the glory of God’ (Psalm 19:1). ICR desires to return science to its proper, God-glorifying, position.”

(John L. Groenlund, Th.D., What Is The Purpose Of Creation Ministry?)

<http://www.icr.org/article/1141/>

“God’s word is Truth. If ‘the facts’ disagree with the Bible, then there must be something wrong with either our perception of the facts or our perception of the Bible. ‘It is a frequent dictum in works on Bible and Science for the writer to affirm that the Bible never contradicts “true” science.’”

[R. Russell Bixler, Earth, Fire and Sea –God’s Story in Genesis, 1999 Destiny Image Publishers. The last sentence quotes Bernard Ramm, The Christian View of Science and Scripture, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955, p. 42.]

“True science always lines up with God’s Word when properly understood.”

[Jay Seegert, Faith is not a 4-Letter word, presented Feb 26, 2013 to the Creation Science Society of Milwaukee (CSSM) annual business meeting, at Milwaukee Lutheran High School. Quotes from the meeting advertisement on the CSSM website. Mr. Seegert is the former President of the CSSM.]

http://genesismatters.org/site/cpage.asp?cpage_id=140038041&sec_id=140000812

7. WELS Archive Search

A search of WELS data bases yielded well over 1,000 articles/essays/books/statements addressing science issues (some as the main theme, some as a side comment). Those WELS articles were examined for “True Science” statements similar to those listed in chapter 2, and for statements making an opposing claim.

Selected quotes from WELS articles with “True Science” statements are listed in chapter 8. Selected quotes from WELS articles with opposing claims are listed in chapter 10. Some quotes from these same articles are also listed in other chapters to support claims made in that chapter. The articles are tabulated and discussed chapter 11.

Data bases searched both manually and with search words included wels.net, wlsessays.net, LOGOS WLQ 1950-1989, and the LOGOS People’s Bible. The websites of our synodical schools and of our 23 area Lutheran high schools were also searched. Search words included combinations of science, scie, law, true, fossil, and evolution. Google.com was also used. Article titles were reviewed in paper copies of the WLQ from 1990-2012. My personal library was also searched, including over 50 back issues of “Lutheran Parent,” “Partners in Christian Education,” “Lutheran Leader,” and “Parish Leadership.”

This was an extensive, but not an exhaustive, search of these collections. While some articles in these data bases have probably been missed, it is assumed that articles on both sides were equally likely to be overlooked. Judgement calls were also needed as to what constitutes clear support/opposition, and what does not. The data bases were searched in January, February, and March, 2013. The Forward In Christ (FIC) on-line database had articles from November 1978 through 2012. The three FIC articles from the 1960s which support “True Science” are from a 1967 NPH book that published 14 FIC (NWL) articles on evolution. I was otherwise unable to search FIC articles prior to November 1978, so FIC articles on both sides of the issue prior to that date are not included in this report.

Articles published by the Lutheran Science Institute (LSI) in its LSI Journal (www.LutheranScience.org) are not included in this study, because this study was intended to show the LSI Board how the “True Science” apologetic is supported and opposed in the rest of the WELS. The online LSI Journal archive includes articles from 2000 -2013. As of March, 2013, six of these LSI articles include a statement supporting “True Science” and several others include statements opposing “True Science.”

8. “True Science” –Inside the WELS

On October 1, 1978, David Golisch sent a letter to Martin Sponholz criticizing Sponholz’s Oct 27 & 28, 1977 presentation to the WELS Wisconsin State Teachers Conference, “Teaching Creation and Science.” Golisch’s seven page letter was on Huron Valley Lutheran High School stationary and Golisch signed as “science teacher – H.V.L.H.S.” and as “president – Lutheran Science Institute.”

Golisch defines the “True Science” apologetic and actually says that faith can be strengthened through “True Science.”

Golisch writes (point 44, the parenthesis in this quote is in the original): “There is no confrontation between creation and true science. (True science is defined as that which does not disagree or negate Scripture.) However, there is a big confrontation with this pseudo-science of evolution. The battle is lost with the new believer if he doesn’t learn of the True Science but instead is left with the conflict of pseudo-science and the Bible.”

Golisch writes (point 41): “Are you saying that a person with a new faith who still believes in evolution should not read Gen 1 & 2 about creation lest it damage his faith because he hasn’t heard about creation? The creation materials have just the opposite effect. When a person with a new faith learns of the contradiction that creation is of evolution, his faith is shaken, but when he learns that science has erred about evolution and that true science agrees with God’s Word about creation, his faith is strengthened.”

Golisch is apparently responding to the following words in Sponholz’s presentation: “If these become our ideas for science, I’m afraid we are building our own brand of pseudoscience and dangerously tying it to doctrine as the Roman Church did with geocentrism. Galileo Galilei faced the inquisition and science moved to the Reformation countries. What might we be doing to a new faith or to a person seeking comfort in Christ, but not familiar with all the Creation Science materials we have learned to accept without proof?”

Here are quotes from my 9th grade religion textbook (written by my teacher) at Wisconsin Lutheran High School (1970-71). My wife had this same textbook the next year taught by a different teacher. In those two years alone, about 700 WLHS students were taught:

“The First Law of Thermodynamics ...God first created mass and energy and then put this law into effect.”

“The Law of Biogenesis ...God first created living things with their capacity to reproduce and then put this law into effect.”

“The Second Law of Thermodynamics ...God first brought creation in all its parts to a fully “wound-up” state, so to speak, and then put this law into effect.”

Dr. John Grebe of ICR is quoted as saying, “I want to assert that no one can point to a single fact of science, history, or archeology that conflicts with a literal reading of the Bible.”

“Conflicts between religion and science develop when scientists interpret their findings from a non-biblical point of view and when theologians are not faithful to the revealed truth with which they work.”

“There is no real evidence for the evolution concept.”

(Darrel Kautz, God's Creating Activity, Vol. 1 of The Contemporary Bible-Study Guides For Schools, Bible Classes and Families, 1969, self-published, pages 11, 13, 15, 19.)

"In the first two chapters of Genesis we have the genesis of the history of God's reign of saving grace among men. These chapters were not written, to be sure, to satisfy our curiosity about scientific matters, yet they nowhere conflict with true science."

Yet this same paper also talks about the possibility of conflict between science and the Bible: "Our confidence in the Scriptures is, of course, not in the least dependent on the so-called 'assured results' of scientific investigation. We are certain that if there does appear to be a conflict between science and the Scriptures, it is science that is in error, not the Word of God. 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away,' our Savior tells us. It is well for us to be aware, however, of how uncertain and changeable the 'assured results' of science are, and of the unproved and improvable assumptions on which these results are based."

(Wilbert R. Gawrisch, THE BIBLICAL ACCOUNT OF CREATION AND MODERN THEOLOGY, WLQ Vol. 59, July 1962, online pages 13, 19)

<http://www.wlsessays.net/node/588>

---What in the World Is Going On? --Identifying Hollow and Deceptive Worldviews

(David C. Thompson, NPH, 2010, page 35)

"But Darwinism is not about scientific evidence. The evidence was not there when Darwin began his investigation, and almost a century and a half later it is still not there. ...Naturalists thought they found their best friend in Darwinian evolution. But it is no more than a pretend friend, the kind a child makes us for comfort and companionship. In the words of Nobel Prize winner Ernst Chain: 'To postulate that the development and survival of the fittest is entirely a consequence of chance mutations [Darwinism] seems to me a hypothesis based on no evidence and irreconcilable with the facts.'"

"It behooves us to examine it [evolution] in the light of God's Word and also in the light of true science."

"From a scientific standpoint, then, evolution must be regarded as a myth."

"When anyone believes something contrary to the Word, he is unquestionably wrong. Consequently, when evolutionists promote their theory, they are lying, no question about that. It therefore should not surprise us particularly to learn that evolution is also in conflict with some of science's major laws. It especially violates two major scientific principles, called the First and the Second Law of Thermodynamics."

[Harold E. Warnke, Catechetical Resources – The First Article; on-line pages 89, 91, 99; old printed textbook pages 119, 122-123, 133]

[The WLS Essay File has no information on this article other than the author's name. In my library is an old typewritten ring binder copy with heavy blue covers (also with no details other than the author's name). I assume this article is an unpublished school textbook, updated in 1978 or 1979. Rev. Warnke served as principal and teacher at Fox Valley Lutheran High School for 20 years. Warnke quotes a June 1978 newspaper in his article. Warnke was in heaven by fall 1980, according to an FIC review of his 1980 NPH book "Abortion." That book is based on his classroom lectures according to the book cover, which also mentions Warnke resides in Florida.]

<http://www.wlsessays.net/node/783>

"Forward In Christ" was previously titled, "The Northwestern Lutheran." The Northwestern Lutheran ran a series of 14 articles on evolution over eight months in 1965 and 1966. NPH published those articles in book form in 1967. Three of those 14 articles, and the book introduction, include "True Science" statements such as those listed below. These 14 articles are not in the FIC on-line archives, since they predate the 1978 start of the archives.

“But they (the authors) will go on the offensive to show that at one point after another the theories of the evolutionists break down before the hard, observed facts of true science.”

[Werner H. Franzmann, editor NPH, Introduction, Truth Unchanging –Is Evolutionism The Answer?, NPH 1967, page 5.]

“The origin of the universe is one of the most interesting and yet most difficult questions for any student of modern science. ...For the Christian, the final answer must not only agree with the facts of true science; it must also harmonize with the statements made in the Bible.”

[Ulrik J. Larsen, The Origin of the Universe, Truth Unchanging –Is Evolutionism The Answer?, NPH 1967, page 5. Previously published in The Northwestern Lutheran, 1965-1966. Larsen taught chemistry at Wisconsin Lutheran High School.]

“When the Christian separates the facts of true science from the false theories of modern evolutionary teaching he sees that there is no conflict and he has no difficulty in accepting, through faith, the Scriptural account of man’s creation.”

[Robert W. Adickes, Man versus Animal --part one –Man Distinct From The Animal, in Is Evolutionism The Answer?, NPH 1967, page 64. Previously published in The Northwestern Lutheran, 1965-1966. Adickes taught at Lakeside Lutheran High School.]

“We will recognize that no genuine scientific facts will contradict the Word of God as we have it in the Scriptures.”

[Armin Schuetze, The Dangers of Evolutionism and How to Meet Them, Truth Unchanging –Is Evolutionism The Answer?, NPH 1967, page 79. Previously published in The Northwestern Lutheran, 1965-1966. Prof Schuetze was at WLS at the time (later to be president).]

The following FIC article has statements both supporting and opposing “True Science.” It was the only article to both clearly support and clearly oppose. Quist credits evolution with having evidence, but “no more scientific proof than creation.” This opposes the “True Science” claim that there is no evidence for evolution. Quist claims evolution can be disproved, but goes on to say that scientists believe in evolution anyway.

---Questioning Evolution

(Allen Quist, Forward In Christ, Feb 2010)

"But many do question the assumptions of evolution and oppose the blind faith so many have in a process that has no more scientific proof than creation. So is there a man who disproved evolution? Could that be true? Yes, it is true. His name is Dr. John Sanford of Cornell University."

"Science, however, is supposed to be the pursuit of truth. Why do so many scientists believe in evolution in spite of the genetic evidence? They do so because they cannot think outside the box of materialistic evolution. They do so because Darwinian evolution is a religion, not genuine science. St. Paul accurately describes the world of evolutionary thought: 'They exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshipped and served created things rather than the Creator—who is forever praised. Amen' (Romans 1:25)."

<http://www.wels.net/news-events/forward-in-christ/february-2010/questioning-evolution>

“We maintain, on the other hand, that our faith in the Bible as the Word of God cannot be in opposition to properly conducted scientific investigation.” [page 30]

“Let me cite at this point just one quotation from Dr. A. E. WilderSmith, ...in which he proves the scientific impossibility of the theory of evolution. [page 33]

[LUDWIG WIESINGER, IS THE BIBLE THE WORD OF GOD?, Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Vol. 69, no. 1, Jan 1972. A lecture delivered at the conference of church council members of the Free Ev. Lutheran Synod in South Africa in Wittenberg, Natal, June 6, 1970.] Also available on-line at:

<http://www.wlsessays.net/node/993>

“This book will be helpful in pointing out the weaknesses, rather the utter impossibility, of the theory of evolution as an explanation for existing phenomena.”

[H. Vogel, Book review of “Darwin Retried,” Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Vol. 69, no. 4, Oct 1972, , page 298.]

“Here is a book that will give any evolutionist abundant evidence of the scientific impossibility of his theories.”

[H. Vogel, Book Review of The Universe, Plan or Accident?, Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Vol. 69, no. 3, July 1972 page 219.]

“This little book by the editor and coauthor of Darwin, Evolution, and Creation and Rock Strata and the Bible Record is highly recommended to anyone who is troubled by the apparent conflict between the Biblical creation account and the theory of evolution.”

[H. Vogel, Book review of Creation, Evolution, and God’s Word, Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Vol. 69, no. 4, October 1972, page 298.]

“Prof Eugene Kirst of Watertown told the teachers that they should instruct their pupils in the parochial schools to recognize the ‘traps’ set by ‘the fiction of science’ which they will encounter ‘in higher institutions of learning and throughout their lives.’ True science does not attempt to explain phenomena of man’s environment ‘which he does not and cannot expect to understand.’”

“Hits ‘False Science:’ He cited evolutionary theory as the tendency of ‘false science’ to arrive at a conclusion without sufficient data.”

[Prof. Eugene Kirst, WELS Teachers conference at Garden Homes Evan Church and School, Milwaukee WI, Nov 1955, attendance :417. From the article “Lutherans Warned of Evolution Trap,” in the Nov 4 1955 Milwaukee Sentinel, Part 1, page 7. Kirst taught at Northwestern Preparatory School and College from 1954 until 1991.]

<http://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1368&dat=19551104&id=521QAAAAIBAJ&sjid=QBAEAAAAIBAJ&pg=7480,5728850>

“My eighth-grade brain came up with a solution. I was pretty sure that each of the days of creation was really a billion years. I wondered why no one had thought of this before. Today I know that the human brain will naturally harmonize two conflicting ideas unless one of them is specifically pointed out as not having any proof. I struggled years with this concept until attending a bible class addressing the subject and then thoroughly understood God’s Word.”

[Stan Bauer, From the Development Office, in Principal’s notes newsletter, Volume 33 Issue 7, Evergreen Lutheran High School, April 2011. Mr. Bauer is the school’s development director.]

http://test.elhs.org/home/140001978/140001978/docs/principal-ap0ss%20notes%20for%20april%202011.pdf?sec_id=140001978

“Macro Evolution is NOT scientific: a. True science must be TESTABLE, REPEATABLE, and OBSERVABLE; b. Textbooks teach evolution as scientific fact”

“Truth: I enjoy science...evolution is bad science...therefore I reject evolution.”

“The ‘theory of evolution’ suggests there is observational evidence. There is NONE!”

[David Bartelt, 5_Reasons_to_Reject_Evolution.docx, Kettle Moraine Lutheran High School]

<http://www.kmlhs.org/component/content/article/22-faculty-pages/282-mr-david-bartelt>

WELS on-line Q&A Evolution: #24 of 38

Q: “Is the theory of evolution a bad theory? ...”

A: “...Christians teach creation as a fact because the Bible teaches it. True science will not contradict what the Bible teaches. We can combat the theory of evolution by proclaiming what the Bible teaches and by encouraging unbiased scientific investigation and honest presentation of scientific facts. Honest science will not treat an unproven theory as a fact.”

[imported to WELS.net January 1, 2004.]

http://arkiv.lbk.cc/faq/site.pl@1518cutopic_topicid73cuiitem_itemid3127.htm

also on the Way Back Machine as #30 of 46 [captured Sep 28, 2009]:

http://web.archive.org/web/20090928142048/http://www.wels.net/cgi-bin/site.pl?1518&cuTopic_topicID=73&cuiitem_itemID=3119

The following articles include a short comment about evolution not being scientific. Such thinking is a part of “True Science.” Evolution is science. Evolution is based upon an a priori belief in naturalism and materialism, which eliminates a creator god. Evolutionists then use science to develop the best stories they can about origins without a creator god.

“The theory of evolution: unbiblical, unscientific.”

[M. Kaesmeyer, Lesson 2 –God and Creation PowerPoint, slide 45, 2003]

<https://connect.wels.net/AOM/ps/youth/confirmation/curriculum/Documents/Curriculum%20Ideas-M%20Kaesmeyer/Confirmation%20Lesson%202.pdf>

“the pseudo-scientific dogma of evolution”

[SIEGBERT W. BECKER, EVOLUTION AND GENESIS, Vol. 75, no. 2, April 1978, Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, page 84. Revised from that presented to the Northern Wisconsin District as a Convention Essay, August, 1966] Both versions are on-line at:

<http://www.wlsessays.net/node/106>

<http://www.wlsessays.net/node/107>

“It is a vain thing to try to reconcile the modern “science falsely so-called,” named “Evolution,” with the Bible teachings in any respect, or to fit it into one’s theological system, and yet remain a true Bible teacher.”

“But this [evolution] is ignorance, science falsely so called, false doctrine, deceit,”

[GEO. O. LILLEGARD, PROGRESSIVE REVELATION, Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Vol. 48, no. 1, January 1951, page 49, 56-57, page 6 on-line] Also available on-line at: <http://www.wlsessays.net/node/1400>

“Evolutionistic theory” is “science falsely so called.”

[Walter E. Wegner, THE LEAVEN OF THE SADDUCEES, Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly Vol. 49, no. 4, October 1952: page 234. Delivered at the Convention of the Western Wisconsin District at St. Paul’s Lutheran Church, Menomonie, Wisconsin, June 12–15, 1950.] Also online at:

<http://www.wlssays.net/node/808>

“Why should we accept any theory [evolution] advanced by so-called scientists (even though unproved) as ‘scientific truth’?”

“In what way does taking the word of some so-called scientist instead of the revealed word of God as truth differ from the question which Satan asked Eve: “Yea, hath God said ...?”

[V., Lutheran Writer Opposed To Literal View of Genesis, Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Vol. 60, no. 2, April 1963, page 155-156.]

“The statements of so-called scientists concerning eternal laws of the universe are so much charlatany.”

[AUGUST PIEPER, THE TRUE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE CHURCH, Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Vol. 62, no. 3, July 1965, page 191. Prof. August Pieper read this essay at the fifteenth biennial convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States at New Ulm, Minnesota, in August 1919. The translation from the German is by Prof. Heinrich J. Vogel] Also on-line at:

<http://www.wlssays.net/node/1923>

“No other so-called science on earth is so thoroughly based on a totally unproved assumption; continues to flourish in the face of so many unanswered questions; has so many devotees who do not even understand the theory but insist on calling it a proven fact; and has so many who worship at its materialistic altar, while calling it a science.”

[Hilbert R. Siegler, Evolution or Degeneration—Which?, NPH, 1972, page 88.]

“Given a choice, it is more reasonable to accept the account of the Creator himself, when he tells us in his revealed Word no less than seventy-five times not only that, but also how he created the heavens and the earth, than to accept a theory proposed by a would-be scientist which is based only on some observed structural similarities among plants and animals and jumping to the conclusion that therefore one must have evolved from the other. Similar theories once accepted by science have been discarded as obsolete, such as the Ptolemaic system, the theory of spontaneous generation, and the idea that an atom is the smallest particle of matter that exists. Teaching the theory of evolution as though it were a fact is gross deception, quite apart from a denial of divine truth.”

[H. Vogel, Creationism in Schools Ruled Unconstitutional, Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Vol. 79, no. 2, Spring 1982, page 156.]

“Evaluate: Some parts of the Bible just can’t be true. They contradict science. [teacher’s answer] *The Bible and true science never contradict each other; they cannot, for God created the laws of science too. When a contradiction does seem to occur, it simply means man’s understanding is flawed. We would stress, however, that the Bible is not a science textbook; it is the book that shows us how we are saved.*”

[Christ Light, Course 5 teacher’s guide Reading the Bible: The Focus, lesson 1? Reading the Bible as God’s Inspired Word, NPH 2000, page 4.]

<http://online.nph.net/SampleFiles/Print/746091E.PDF>

While it may be correct to say that evolution is philosophical and religious in nature, it is certain that evolution is scientific. The following “True Science” quote says evolution is not scientific.

“The modern world, for the most part, simply assumes that evolution offers a plausible explanation for the origin of the universe. In reality, the theory of evolution is not scientific; it is *philosophical* and *religious* in nature.” [page 8]

“Why can the theory of evolution not be called science?” [page 9]

True or False “Public schools that teach evolution are really teaching a religious philosophy.” [page 11]

[Jon D Buchholz, Basic Bible Certainty –A Study in the Truths of the Christian Faith, NPH, 2010.]

9. “True Science” –Debated in the WELS

The place of science in defending the faith was discussed in the WELS for decades. This “considerable discussion and debate in our circles” and this “ongoing concern about the use and abuse of science in defense of the faith” is reflected in the following articles from 1977 through 1999 (quotes from Brug, see next paragraph). I could not find any similar quotes about this debate after 1999. Underlines in this section are NOT in the original.

Seminary professor John Brug mentions this WELS discussion while reviewing a book:

“Although there is solid agreement on the biblical doctrine of creation in our midst, there has been and continues to be considerable discussion and debate in our circles about the validity of certain specific arguments proposed by creation-science, such as the application of the second law of thermodynamics to the issue of biological evolution. There is also an ongoing concern about the use and abuse of science in defense of the faith. Kautz’s book should be read as a basic presentation of the creation-science position.”

[JOHN F. BRUG; Wis Luth Quarterly, Vol. 86, No. 3, Summer 1989, pages 234–235]

A Bethany professor discusses the 1978 “debate” between Golisch (science teacher at Huron Valley Lutheran High School) and Sponholz (science teacher at Luther High School).

“Golisch’s frustration with Sponholz’s paper arose not from a different interpretation of Scripture, but from a different interpretation of science. More exactly, it arose from a different definition of the word ‘science.’ Sponholz defined the laws of science as ‘intellectual models of artistry. The laws of science are men’s laws. They are not God’s ordinances.’ He therefore warned his fellow Lutheran teachers not to use creation science as a form of creationist apologetics among evolutionists or as proofs for creation among their high school students. Golisch and others were following creation science gurus Henry Morris and Duane Gish, who defined ‘science’ as an endeavor that, if not corrupted by evolutionist practitioners, will discover truths that corroborate revealed truth. Sponholz, by contrast, drew his understanding of science from Thomas Kuhn. Kuhn had argued in his Structure of Scientific Revolutions that scientific laws do not necessarily bear on truth, but merely constitute a research paradigm that, like so many before it, may soon become obsolete when scientists agree upon new laws. Consequently, Sponholz claimed that the Second Law of Thermodynamics, which creation scientists employed to refute the possibility of progressive evolution, is nothing more than an imaginative invention of sinful humans and has no place alongside the infallible Word of God.”

(Ryan C. MacPherson, Ph.D., On the Antiquity of the Earth: Episodes from the History of Science That Have Shaped People’s Perceptions of the Earth’s Age; Presented to the Tenth Annual Theological Symposium, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 22 Sept. 1999, with minor corrections and revisions, 2005.)

<http://www.ryanmacpherson.com/presentation-list/14-conference-papers/36-on-the-antiquity-of-the-earth.html>

“Within our own circles there exists a Lutheran Science Institute which boasts of ‘communicating true science’. Several of our synodical schools in their course descriptions boast also of this ability to distinguish between theories and the true laws of science.”

“These, then, are the reasons for my skepticism with, and my opposition to, the creation-science movement. I see it as a dangerous unnecessary movement misguiding our youth. If there is controversy on this, then so be it. We should not be afraid of controversy or shy away from it at all costs. Controversy forces us to think and to examine our teachings again in the light of Scripture.”

“Problems With Creation-Science: The first problem I see is that it is dangerous to faith. I know that in saying this I will arouse the wrath of many who, with the best intentions, support the creation-science movement. ... But, you say, we are careful to avoid just that sort of abuse in our Lutheran creation-science teachings. I trust that you are. But whenever you lead people away from Scripture to man’s ideas, whenever you reduce faith to logical and reasonable postulates, you are operating in alien dangerous territory. Try as you might, I don’t believe you can totally eliminate

the type of thinking evidenced by that pastor. It's too easy to put the two together (science and faith) and to come up with what our old Lutheran theologians called a monstrosity, a mixtum compositum of theology and philosophy, "like unto the biform race of the Centaurs". (Quenstedt, I, 57 as quoted by Pieper)"

[David A. Kipfmiller; Fighting The Good Fight; Presented to the pastors of the Capitol Circuit, meeting at St. Paul's Ev. Lutheran church in Marshall, WI September 21, 1982; page 3]

<http://www.wlsessays.net/node/1077>

I believe a controversy on this matter, if raised, stems from a deeper problem. It usually builds on the premise that human reason of itself might conclude absolute truth. This is how, in fact, Webster defines science which may be the hope of men, but not displayed in a scientist's work. It is wrong not to oppose the teachings of the Creation Research Society or its inroads into our synod's Lutheran Science Institute. Their teaching breathes a different spirit from Lutheran education. Thankfully strong and good encouragement has come from pastors and teachers in many states.

Enthusiasm for an historical setting for science has come from several professors at our seminary in Mequon. [A QUESTION OF CONTROVERSY?, August 21, 1978, Martin P. Sponholz, Chairman, Science Department, Luther High School, Onalaska, Wis., pages 3, 7. Discussion paper for use by the science department at Luther High]

God provides us with faith in his true and inspired Word. We do not need scientific proof. The battle is fought as it always has been, by faith alone in God's Word alone. Yet even within our own circles we seem to pursue other means. I hear of the Bible Science Newsletter influence. The Creation Research Society entered the courtroom to force scientific textbooks to consider a creation theory. In our own synod we have established a Lutheran Science Institute for "communicating true science." But what is true science? Have we become so enwrapped with the scientific age we live in that we need such a crutch?

[THE CHANGING LAWS, January 13, 1977, Martin P. Sponholz, Evening Forum-DMLC. page 2]

Among our own people, some of you sitting here, exists a Lutheran Science Institute. LSI boasts "communicating true science." Several of our synodical schools in their course descriptions boast of an ability to distinguish between theories and the true laws of science. Among the many questions we will review today are words like "true science", "correct science", and "scientific evidence". These are enthusiastic boasts which no one, I repeat, absolutely no one, in the scientific community would dare make. Idols of the Market-Place are far too real and all mankind knows it. We do have strong agreement with seventeen points. ...With all this strong agreement [between LSI and Sponholz], I am going to assume the points of difference can be bridged. If this were the full embodiment of the creation science movement, I also could embrace it.

[IDOLS OF THE MARKET-PLACE, October 25, 1978, Martin P. Sponholz, pages 22, 26]

10. “True Science” –Opposed in the WELS

More than a few of these authors use the term “True Science” to describe the position they oppose.

Articles by Sponholz

From 1977 – 1999, Martin Sponholz gave presentations at teacher conferences, pastoral conferences, WLS, DMLC/MLC, and elsewhere strongly opposing “True Science.” A central theme of these presentations was that there really is a conflict between science and the Bible.

Before becoming a WELS teacher, Sponholz was Chief Meteorologist on a team of eight at Plateau Station in Antarctica, and represented the U.S. on the Japanese Antarctic Research Expedition. He is credited with discovering “inversion winds.” Martin received the Antarctica Service Medal for courage, devotion and sacrifice from President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1967. Sponholz Peak in Antarctica is named in his honor.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Martin_Sponholz accessed April 15, 2013

THE CHANGING LAWS, January 13, 1977, Martin P. Sponholz, Chairman, Science Department, Luther High School, Evening Forum-DMLC.

“I have heard that there is no conflict between science and religion. I have heard the laws of science are proved. ...To hide behind the semantics of true science which was little or nothing to do with the subject we commonly refer to as science today is to play into the hands of the devil. We would debate scientific laws rather than confess Jesus Christ. In the real front of Christian warfare there is a conflict between science and religion.” [page 1]

“There are no laws of science which cannot be replaced by other laws. The laws of science are not God’s ordinances of nature. The laws of science are only laws of men.” [page 2]

TEACHING CREATION AND SCIENCE --The Role of Faith and Reason for a Christian Student of Science, Martin P. Sponholz, Science Department, Luther High School, Onalaska, Wis., Wisconsin State Teachers' Conference, Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, October 27 & 28, 1977

“It is difficult, even impossible with certainty, to equate God's ordinances for nature and man's derived laws of nature.” [page 5]

“As teachers of science we must continually remind ourselves as well as our students that science is entirely a human endeavor. Its laws are intellectual models of artistry. The laws of science are men’s laws. They are not God's ordinances.” [pages 8, 9]

A QUESTION OF CONTROVERSY?, August 21, 1978, Martin P. Sponholz, Chairman, Science Department, Luther High School, Onalaska, Wis. [discussion paper for use by the science department at Luther High]

“Is the statement, ‘They must recognize the human origin of scientific theories and laws and understand that scientific knowledge is tentative and subject to change,’ a controversial statement?” [page 1]

“It is wrong not to oppose the teachings of the Creation Research Society or its inroads into our synod's Lutheran Science Institute. Their teaching breathes a different spirit from Lutheran education. Thankfully strong and good encouragement has come from pastors and teachers in many states. Enthusiasm for an historical setting for science has come from several professors at our seminary in Mequon.” [page 7]

IDOLS OF THE MARKET-PLACE, October 25, 1978, Martin P. Sponholz, Chairman, Science Department, Luther High School, Onalaska, Wisconsin. This paper was written in response to a critical letter from the then LSI president Golisch regarding Sponholz's paper, TEACHING CREATION AND SCIENCE.

"We all must recognize the human origin of scientific theories and laws and understand that scientific knowledge is tentative and subject to change." [page 22]

"As long as the Lutheran church existed, there has always been a proper lack of enthusiasm for finding harmony between theology and the scientific explanations of men." [page 24]

"My condemnation is not against apologetics; it is against bad apologetics. You see, I am convinced evolution is so bad that all Christians readily recognize it as that. But the wolf in sheep's clothing, the Calvinist drawing a soul away from faith to reason, is to be warned against." [page 32-33]

"I speak against using creationist materials without first teaching faith alone. I speak against using creationist materials without first teaching the uncertainty with any and all scientific methods. A faith leaning on science will collapse when the crutches are removed. [pages 34-35]

SOME TRUTHS OF SCIENCE by Martin Sponholz, Presented at Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary, Mequon, Wisconsin on March 7, 1979

"I intended to title this paper "True Science!" Instead, "Some Truths of Science" will be more palatable until some definitions become clear."

"We foster the wrong idea of science being an approach to truth when few scientists would dare be so bold. A scientist becomes a Nobel laureate by developing new and different laws, never by confirming old established laws. Science must be taught as the imaginative artistry it is. Like the poet who chooses words for a poem, the scientist chooses formulas and natural impressions to develop his laws."

"I find great trouble in the mixture of the clear doctrines of Scripture with the science laws of men."

"The hope that science can be used to refute science and find truth is a futile dream."

THE FLUID ICE "Out of whose womb came the ice?" By Martin P. Sponholz, For The Lutheran Science Institute, At Wisconsin Lutheran College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 21 March 1981

"Many seem to think science is an approach to truth: the laws of science not only have been proved, but were created by God, and therefore we know true science is harmonious with the prophets. The trouble is I believe none of this last sentence is true." [page 2]

"And I repeat, it is possible to have your own well reasoned and tested research lead you to evolution in a most convincing fashion. We cannot be so boastful in the reasoning abilities of our minds even with the Bible in our hands. What saves us is the faith God's Word instills in our hearts." [page 4]

"The real problem is with all science. It's not just science we don't like that has sweeping historical changes and flip-flops of explanations. They all do. Seek out any general history of science reference. It's not just the evolutionary sciences that follow circles of reasoning. They all do." [page 6]

TWO TOWERS -- The Relationship between Science and the Bible, For Minnesota District Pastoral Conference, St. John's Ev. Lutheran Church, Minneapolis, Minnesota, April 20, 1982

"There is no relationship between science and the Bible." [page 2]

"If a harmony between science and the Bible were sought, if true science were expected to emerge from this study, then I will fail you. To have such expectations for science, I believe, is not to understand science or at least to expect from science things it cannot do." [page 3]

JOB AND A MAN OF SCIENCE FACING EVOLUTION—THINGS TOO WONDERFUL FOR ME, Martin P. Sponholz Professor, Math-Science Division, Dr. Martin Luther College, New Ulm, Minnesota. Presented for discussion at Wisconsin Lutheran Student Center, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 11 October 1983, and at Wisconsin Lutheran Chapel, and Student Center, Madison, Wisconsin, 12 October 1983. The title of both of their programs was Facing Evolution.

“The notion that science can approach truth with certainty is however, in fact, what permits the festering sores of doubt to grow deep into the believer's faith.” [page 4]

“It is wrong to play a game of semantics and merely redefine science to bypass the real problems of conflict. Laws of science, as accepted by the world's scientists, do conflict with God's revelation of the environment He created for us to live in. To call a conflicting law an unproven theory is again not wanting to help the man with this conflict.” [page 10]

“The scientists of the world are dedicated to their studies and know their profession. They know they do not have a free ticket to truth. They ask with Pilate, What is truth? They know they do not have it even with material things. Their laws are collectively accepted, not proven with certainty. To send a student into a scientific occupation with a definition different from the professional's is to send an infantryman out with a broom handle. If a Christian is to become a scientist, he must work with the tools of the trade, paradigms, reason, interpreted observations, as well as the theories and laws of the world.” [page 10]

SCIENCE AND THE TRUTH OF NATURE, Professor Martin P. Sponholz, August 1, 1984

Centennial Essays: Eleven Essays to Mark the Centennial of Dr. Martin Luther College, Edited by Richard E. Buss.

“Science is an ever changing body of knowledge based on man's attempt to explain the natural world in which God has placed him. A most important aspect of science thus defined is to recognize that it is not a synonym for nature, nor is it a certain true explanation of nature. Old explanations, although no longer accepted by the practitioners identified as scientists, adequately described nature for a time. The history of science shows the ever-changing characteristic of science. It is the science textbooks at every level of education that are the first to be outdated.” [page 3]

“And that is why I must keep insisting science is different than nature.” [page 19]

“Science can never reach a perfect understanding of nature. Science on this side of heaven cannot escape its human connection, whether pursued by believer or pagan. Historically science changes continually. Science may appear to increase the scope of human understanding between the major changes of scientific thought. It is in these changes of revolution that the old is cast out and the new interpretations of observation, law, and theory are rebuilt from a different base of understanding. These sciences leave us in a quagmire of pessimism. We cannot know true science.” [page 21]

TEACHING AND UNTEACHING EVOLUTION: The Fossils Say Nothing, Prof. Martin P. Sponholz, Math-Science Division, Martin Luther College. This paper was originally presented to a Teacher's Conference October 24, 1985. It is updated and presented as a handout with additional readings added for a Workshop on Instructional Methods in Lutheran High Schools, July 5-10, 1999. MLC, New Ulm, Minnesota.

“Teachers, hold fast to your high calling ‘teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you.’ That calling is not to save this world from its false science by finding a true science. Look what must be added to find a hopeful harmony between our Bible and science.” [page 1]

“Our children must see that science is an ever changing body of knowledge based on attempts by men and women to explain the natural world our Lord has created and maintains. Our children must see the human side of science and its changeable character, not the phony image of unchanging laws as displayed in a textbook, but yet are altered with each new edition. Scientific laws as written by men and women are not synonymous with God's work of nature. With such a proper introduction to the study of science, I believe the best way for a Christian teacher to deal with evolution is to teach it right out front, plainly, to the youngest child that can understand the difference between man's word and God's Word.” [page 2]

THE SAVING WATERS --Implications of the Noachic Flood from a Biblical and Scientific Standpoint
Prof. Martin P. Sponholz, DMLC, New Ulm, Minnesota, Minnesota State Teachers' Conference,
Trinity Lutheran School, Belle Plain, Minnesota, Oct. 16, 1986

"I must conclude that very little in modern science agrees with the biblical account of the flood. This conclusion does not sit well with one who might insist that there is a 'true science' or that the 'laws of science are true, but evolution is just a theory.' [page 1]

"A doubting believer is not the same as a doubting unbeliever. A doubting believer rarely demands infallible proofs. He knows he does not live in an intellectual vacuum. The Bible describes a real world to him, and he wants a touch more of a scientific explanation. When you show him some such scientific evidence, but properly qualify it with the limits of science, always returning to the Word as the final authority, then there is room for the Holy Spirit to show our weak brother his Lord and Savior." [page 21]

WET-BULB TEMPERATURES -- The Intrusion of Science upon Nature, Prof. Martin P. Sponholz, Dr. Martin Luther College, New Ulm, Minnesota, Presented for a luncheon forum at Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary, Mequon, Wisconsin. 19 December, 1990

"If scientific explanations were sought for the understanding of the miracle of the Lord's Supper, we all readily would see the ugly head of Calvinism. When similar arguments are used to explain the miracles of creation or the miraculous preservation of a world for Noah and his family, we are expected to be obligated to pursue such efforts in a Lutheran Science Institute and embrace the Creation Research Society. There is a wrong spirit here!" [pages 2-3]

"Science is not nature. Science has never been a synonym to nature. Science is an ever changing body of knowledge based on human attempts to explain the natural world." [page 3]

"There is no true science! [page 10]

DIFFERENT!, Professor Martin P. Sponholz, The Science Curriculum Workshop, Martin Luther College, New Ulm MN, July 22, 1995

"Nature and science are different. This difference is simply that, since the Fall of mankind, nature and science cannot be the same until we take up residence in our new heaven and new earth."

"Science, on the other hand, is an ever changing body of knowledge based on scientists' attempts to explain the natural world. Some of these scientists might be Christian but many are not." [page 1]

A STUDY OF SCIENCE OVER AGAINST FAITH, Prof. Martin P. Sponholz, South Atlantic District Pastor Teacher Conference at King of Kings, Maitland Florida, [an outline for discussion] 29-30 January 1998

"We will examine science set in history revealing changing laws, changing definitions and changing interpretations of what is observed in nature. The certainty given in God's Word of His creation and maintenance of that creation is contrasted against the uncertainty of human understanding of nature." [page 1]

"Science as an invented human activity. ...We should not be surprised to find science opposed to modern religion. ... History of science shows that changing the laws is a result of failure." [page 2]

"Trying to find harmony with modern science as it has often been practiced cannot be achieved." [page 7]

CREATIONISM IS DIFFERENT FROM CREATION, by Prof. Martin P. Sponholz, May 3, 1999, Chicago Pastoral Conference, Abiding Peace Lutheran Church, Elgin, Illinois

"Lutheran Science Institute: desire to be an 'official' organ of Synod, info service, censorship, divisions over many theories." [page 3]

SEPARATE FROM HIS WORD –A Christian Commentary on the History of Science, MARTIN P. SPONHOLZ, DMLC Printshop, Doctor Martin Luther College New Ulm, 1989, updated 1998]

The MLC website has this book available for download so that teachers in the field can use it:

<http://mlc-wels.edu/divisions/math-science/prof.-martin-sponholz>

“This history of science reflects the historical portion of a ninth grade course, Scientific Thought, developed at Luther High School, designed to be different from traditional ninth grade courses in science, designed to show students how human beings develop theories and laws of science, and designed to show how these theories and laws change in the endless struggle to explain the natural world.” [page 4]

“Max Planck (1858-1947), when he attended an undergraduate college to study physics, was told that he had chosen a subject that was complete. All the laws were believed to be correctly known and the task of the new scholar in physics would be only to measure with greater and greater precision the constants that bound the universe together. Conservative church bodies that believed God created and maintained all of nature, and also believed the laws of science, could teach that God created the laws of science. Logically it followed for these church bodies that when people of science had found the laws, they had found true science. Teaching in this manner only solidified the certainty of man's pride. Teaching the existence of a true science repeats the blunders of Thomas Aquinas locking the true doctrines of God to the scientific laws of men. We know too well from history the errors which that mistake caused in the church for many centuries. Historically it is true that by 1873 the certainty of the laws of physics was believed by every scientist. But if the teaching of science is restricted only to what scientists have explained and believe to be correct, then the scientists' own artistry is not seen; how they developed these laws quite separate from God's Word is not seen. Instead, an admiration for the scientist occurs and a love for humanly derived laws is proclaimed. The view of nature and the adoration for the Creator is lost to the laws of science.” [page 222]

“In fact, the vast majority of science textbooks are written with a hostile view of history. These textbooks generally claim the science of today is correct and true while the genius of the past, which also was once accepted as true, is ignored or ridiculed. The Christian teacher must teach the views of science commonly accepted by the practitioners of science of his age, but in the bright light of God's true Word. If some of the humanly formulated laws of science ignore our God who rules over all of nature, or even reject Him, the Christian teacher must teach that also without trying to fight science with more science. Our Lord alone knows His ordinances for nature which He has created and now maintains. The Christian teacher must also teach the historical development of science in order that the child might see correctly what happens to laws of science developed by the reason of people, many of whom have rejected God's ways.” [page 253]

Articles by Others

This Lutheran Science Institute (LSI) Board member and LSI author, who now resides in heaven, made a clear separation between the laws of nature and the laws of science.

“God, indeed, brought order into our world and into our universe by establishing the many laws of the natural world. We rarely discover them; we approximate them. Even our erroneous approximations often give great benefit to our daily lives.”

[Cleone H. Weigand, Creation –God Made All Things, people's Bible Teachings, NPH 2000. page 121.]

Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Professor R. Gurgel warns of the danger in creation science in this book, which has a cover matching that of the WELS official doctrinal statement booklet, for which this is a Q&A.

--- This We Believe –Questions and Answers

“Creation science is an attempt to approach the facts and data with the assumption that the world came into existence by God's creative power. Creation science can be useful when speaking with an unbeliever to demonstrate that belief in creation does not spring from the ravings of irrational minds. At the same time, some of the

conclusions and analysis of creation science may be as flawed as those of evolution. In addition, Christians may begin to base their faith on human research instead of God's revelation."
[Richard L. Gurgel, NPH 2006, page 62.]

Prof. Toppe, who had just retired as president of Northwestern College, makes a point similar to mine, that we cannot prove evolution false to the satisfaction of most evolutionists.

---Reason Won't Settle The Issue (Carleton Toppe, Forward In Christ, Sep 1987)

"If 'creation scientists' expect equal time for both the teaching of evolutionism and the teaching of special creation to win the argument against evolutionism by showing that evolutionism lacks the facts it needs to support it, they must reckon with reactions like George Will's. Even highly rational people sacrifice their reason to a fear that their intelligence and their scholarship are at risk if they admit that evolutionism lacks essential facts to support it, and if they admit that evolutionism is really only a belief and a hope and a dream. Reason and logic do not always do their homework--not when intellectual pride is at stake, not when it means that unbelieving man might have to admit that--maybe--there was a Creator God."

<http://www.wels.net/news-events/forward-in-christ/september-1987/reason-wont-settle-issue>

Dr. Gerlach teaches in the school of education at Arizona State University. He calls evolution science and implies it is good science, says all scientific knowledge is tentative, and implies that creation science seems to be a contradiction in terms.

---Reflections On Creation Science (Vernon Gerlach, Forward In Christ, Nov 1987)

"Evolution, as an answer to the question of the origin of the universe, is science because the answer is both discovered and tentative. But don't the creation scientists have a right to equal time? Not if we agree with this precept, which is held by every respectable scientific body: Good science is whatever a majority of scientists say it is at any given time."

"Furthermore, all scientific knowledge is tentative. It is never more than the most reasonable answer discovered to date. Every scientific finding, all discovered knowledge, is subject to correction or disproof."

"If the assumption that science deals only with discovered and tentative knowledge is valid, then creation science seems to be a contradiction in terms."

"God could use error (such as creation science) to lead someone to truth (revelation), but such a possibility hardly constitutes an endorsement of science as a means of discovering the truth."

<http://www.wels.net/news-events/forward-in-christ/november-1987/reflections-creation-science>

G. Baumler, editor of FIC and WELS Director of Communications, points out the conflict between science and the Christian faith.

---At Least Get The Definition Right

(Gary P. Baumler, Forward In Christ, Nov 1999)

"So, let the Goulds of the world call us foolish and tout their 'facts.' But let them not say there is no conflict between their position as scientists and ours as Christians. That is ignorance."

<http://www.wels.net/news-events/forward-in-christ/november-1999/least-get-definition-right>

---Facing The Unbeliever

(Charles Sonnenburg, Forward In Christ, May 2002)

"Scientifically, evolution as the beginning of life is a rational theory whose only failing is that it happens to be completely wrong."

<http://www.wels.net/news-events/forward-in-christ/may-2002/facing-unbeliever>

A teacher at Minnesota Valley Lutheran High School essentially says that mankind's flawed science is not "God's Science" or "True Science."

--- Where Experiments End

[Paul L. Willems, *The Lutheran Educator*, Vol. 46 No. 4, MAY 2005, pages 102-104.]

"We must not attach God's name to our favorite scientific theories. We do not know God's science. If science is only the attempts of humans to understand God's creation there can be no true science. To attach God's name to any science dishonors God's name."

<http://www.mlc-wels.edu/home/academics/luthed/>

A. Eggert, Ph.D., a professor emeritus of the University of Wisconsin–Madison, speaks against creation science.

---Creation vs. Science – The Underlying Principles (WLS Essay File)

[Arthur A. Eggert, Ph.D.; Presented to the Southeast Pastor-Teacher Conference of the Michigan District Huron Valley Lutheran High School, Westland, Michigan; February 21-22, 2011]

"In an effort to combat what they feel is an attack by science on the Christian faith, some have tried to use science to fight back. Is this possible? Can the methods of science, for example, be used to substantiate the Biblical account of creation? Unfortunately, this effort runs into both scientific and theological difficulties as we shall soon see.

...Difficulty 7: Compromising the church's mission. As the church we cannot allow ourselves to compromise our mission of preaching the Gospel. Moses warned the Israelites against putting a stumbling block in front of the blind.

... Such stumbling blocks can be placed when one tries to challenge the validity of science instead of pointing out its limitations."

"Science is a field of shifting human models held by our Humanistic opponents, where we can only waste our time and our credibility."

"It is appealing to want to force scientists to "get their facts straight," but the very word "fact" has no consistent scientific definition. Scientists rather speak of "observations," "evidence," "models," "assumptions," "domains," "precision," "metrics of measurement," and a whole plethora of terms that they have developed to more accurately define the entities with which they work."

"Some try to attack evolutionary models with counterexamples. But counterexamples, while being a deadly effective technique in mathematics, are much less so in science and are often easily overcome by tweaking the model being attacked or by improving the method of measurement. In fact, scientists are continuously challenging each other's models – this tactic is the heart of classical science. If religious critics find anything significant, it actually helps scientists to strengthen their models. Most of the time, however, attacks made on models by those outside a particular scientific field appear to those in the field as foolish as a Jehovah Witness' attempt at interpreting Scripture appears to a genuine Bible scholar."

<http://www.wlssays.net/node/2240>

P. Boehlke, then a professor at MLC (later at WLC), instructs our WELS teachers to not teach "True Science." Scientific laws are human inventions.

-- Science: Philosophy & Objectives Based on Scripture

(Prof. Paul R. Boehlke, School Visitors Workshop, DMLC, Aug 1-3 1978)

"The Christian's view of the nature of science will imply a great deal about how he will treat the subject in the classroom. We have all been exposed to an image of the scientist as a collector of bare and objective facts. Is the scientist not able to reject all prejudice and bias by his method? Is there not at least a true science which is evidence of this?" [underline in original.]

"Laws are not any less the product of imaginative thought than are theories."

"Science is a human activity that does not assure truth."

"We should realize that evolution is internally logical in view of the presuppositions built into the current scientific paradigm. It is man's best effort at a natural explanation of how we have come to be here."

General Objectives in Teaching Science: ...3) To stress that the laws of science are not identical to God's laws. ...8) To avoid teaching science (true science) as dogma."

<http://www.wlsessays.net/files/BoehlkeScience.pdf>

---The Church and Science Through the Ages: Seven Key Questions From the History of Science.

(Ryan Cameron MacPherson, in Here We Stand –A Confessional Christian Study of Worldviews, Curtis A. Jahn Editor, NPH 2010, pages 208-209; an earlier version was presented at The Christian, Society, and Science symposium for Lutheran educators at MLC, April 25, 2003)

"Once a person concedes that theology and science must be harmoniously integrated, then one already has agreed to adjust one to fit the other. Adjusting science to fit with Scripture will not work well, since both Christians and non-Christians agree that science is supposed to be based on data gathered from observation and experiment, rather than from passages quoted out of the Bible. ...If one does not want to be stuck in the position of having to revise one's interpretation of Scripture in light of science, then one would be wise not to try and integrate science and Scripture in the first place. Conservative Lutherans, in fact, have generally adopted that strategy."

---A Lutheran View Of Science

(Ronald A. Buelow and Ryan C. MacPherson, Forward In Christ, Jan 2004)

"Human science is limited also by original sin, which clouds the thinking of all scientists, Christian or not."

"...in all cases the conclusions reached by human science are always subject to revision."

"Lutherans also recognize that human science, in its attempts to discover God's workings in nature, sometimes misidentifies God's designs. Lutherans teach human science as human science, and divine science [theology] as divine science, recognizing that the limits of human science often prevent the two from matching up perfectly."

<http://www.wels.net/news-events/forward-in-christ/january-2004/lutheran-view-science?page=0,0>

---Creation and Science

(Vernon Gerlach, Forward In Christ, Jan 1985)

"The problem with a science of creation: But can't creationism or creation science serve a useful purpose? Don't the heavens declare the glory of God? Doesn't the firmament show his handiwork? Isn't there an apologetic role that creation science can play, helping to bring the unbeliever to faith? If we are talking about the realm of secular fact, both the Christian and the unbeliever are capable of discovering it and interpreting it. One does not have to be a Christian to come to the conviction, on the basis of sound data, that Jesus Christ lived in Palestine about 2000 years ago. One does have to be a Christian to come to the conviction that Jesus Christ is Lord."

"Creation is a diamond. When the Spirit creates in me the faith that enables me to believe the First Article, he is flooding that diamond with sunshine. I cannot possibly see greater beauty in that diamond; I cannot enjoy that diamond more, by turning on it the flashlight of science, neither creation science nor any other kind. And if, without faith, I search for that diamond aided only by the flashlight, I run the risk--no, I am assured--that I will mistake glass baubles for that diamond. Once I make that mistake, I will soon cease to know the difference. And then I will cease to care."

<http://www.wels.net/news-events/forward-in-christ/january-1985/creation-and-science>

--- Only natural causes; God above natural causes

(Paul R. Boehlke, Forward In Christ, April 2009)

"Science is not the only way to know. That is a narrow view of life that by assumption rules out God, Scripture, the natural law in us, and what nature truly declares to us."

"Some objectors dwell on unsolved problems to attack Darwinism. For example, a biochemist, Michael Behe, has said that 'irreducible complexity' in the cascading chemical reactions of blood clotting points to a supernatural designer

and falsifies Darwin. The reply from opponents, however, is that in time we will see how natural causes could have accomplished this. To this we must again say, 'What are you assuming? You are begging the question.' More than looking for more gaps in evolutionary conclusions, we need to look at the assumptions that guide this thinking."
<http://www.wels.net/news-events/forward-in-christ/april-2009/only-natural-causes-god-above-natural-causes>

--- A world without God; a world with God
(Paul R. Boehlke, Forward In Christ, March 2009)

"Science is not separate from its times. Furthermore, the events in an individual scientist's life, as seen in the first part of this magazine series, also affect scientific claims. Science is a human activity subject to everything that is human. There is bias. There are limits. There is human error. What happened with Darwin was that biology took a philosophical turn. Physics had already taken this turn."

<http://www.wels.net/news-events/forward-in-christ/march-2009/world-without-god-world-god>

--- Science--Through God's Eyes
(Paul R. Boehlke, Forward In Christ, Feb 1999)

"How can science be so far from Scripture? We need to recognize and to teach that science is a human activity."
" Even facts are selected to fit the theories. According to historian Thomas Kuhn, scientists share a way of looking at nature, a series of concepts and procedures that structure how they work and what solutions they will accept. They are hardly objective."

" However, some think that we can also select and sift science for what is true. Then everything would fit together. Would not theology and science both benefit?"

" Of course, nature and the Bible agree, and nature's wonderful complexity directs us to seek the Creator (Romans 1:20). But it ends there."

<http://www.wels.net/news-events/forward-in-christ/february-1999/science-through-gods-eyes>

--- A Model or Reality?

[Paul L. Willems, The Lutheran Educator, Vol. 44 No. 2, Dec 2003, pages 58-61.]

"Science is not truth. The old models still work although science has abandoned them. ... Do astronauts work out their equations with Einstein's new gravitational model or do they assume Newton's model is good enough?"

"We delude ourselves if we think the models of today are so clever they mimic reality. Are we teaching our students that we have now achieved a complete understanding of God's creation? Do we think we teach reality? Do we claim to teach true science? Can we comprehend the mind of God? Perhaps we, like Job of old, should say, "Surely I spoke of things I did not understand, things too wonderful for me to know" (Job 42:3). I believe we should be as honest as we can as teachers and acknowledge much of what is called science is based on human imagination and is a model. Just because scientific theories are successful does not mean they are real."

<http://www.mlc-wels.edu/home/academics/luthed/>

---In The Beginning

(Arthur A. Eggert, Forward In Christ, Aug 2010)

"SCIENTIFIC PROBLEMS WHEN EXPLAINING THE ORIGINS OF LIFE. ...First, the most basic assumption of science says, in effect, "There is no God nor are there other supernatural beings. ...Second, science is limited by sample size.

...Third, just because a model is viable, does not mean it is correct."

"Models devised by creationists are subject to the same three underlying problems mentioned previously that evolutionists face. It is foolish to jump off the solid rock of biblical revelation to do battle in the quagmire of scientific uncertainty."

<http://www.wels.net/news-events/forward-in-christ/august-2010/in-beginning>

---Fighting The Good Fight (WLS Essay File)

[David A. Kipfmiller; Presented to the pastors of the Capitol Circuit, meeting at St. Paul's Ev. Lutheran Church in Marshall, WI September 21, 1982]

"Historically, it is from this same camp of the Reformed that the creation-science movement received its impetus and greatest support. Lutherans have been 'Johnny-come-latelys.' But what the Lutherans lacked in priority, they seem to have made up in enthusiasm. Within our own circles there exists a Lutheran Science Institute which boasts of 'communicating true science.' Several of our synodical schools in their course descriptions boast also of this ability to distinguish between theories and the true laws of science."

"The other definition comes from David Golisch, science teacher at Huron Valley Lutheran High School. He says that 'true science is defined as that which does not disagree or negate Scripture'. This is better but it, too, is inadequate and misleading. It is possible, for example, for a scientific law to fit this definition and still be incorrect. Even if it does not conflict with Scripture it may still be wrong. (Remember Ptolemy and his geocentric view point!) We are being unfair to our students if we teach them that the Bible confirms a scientific theory because it does not disprove it! That is poor logic and even worse theology."

"The laws of science are man's laws, not God's!"

"These, then, are the reasons for my skepticism with, and my opposition to, the creation-science movement. I see it as a dangerous unnecessary movement misguiding our youth."

"Finally, let me say that I do not consider it an error to combat evolution, defend the Bible, or confirm creation. These are things to which I am also committed. The error, however, is in looking to science and in appealing to reason to achieve these things."

<http://www.wlssays.net/node/1077>

---Dinosaurs God's Creatures -Parts I & 2

[Paul R. Boehlke; The Lutheran Educator; VOLUMES 31 & 32, NUMBERS 3 & 4, FEBRUARY & May 1991]

"Science changes; new ideas replace the old. Science does not generate truth, but rather, useful explanations. Our students need to know about how science works. Dinosaur science is typical science which shows how mankind creates explanations and picks and organizes facts to fit the current scheme."

"Perhaps the dinosaurs on the ark lived only a while after the Flood, never reaching numbers large enough to make many more fossils. We cannot know. Perhaps the dinosaurs were even extinct before the Flood. If mankind was so evil, the environment probably suffered. The easiest way to kill an organism is to change its environment. We cannot tell from the Bible, and any scheme that we might dream up to fit the geological record to the Scriptural record could be proven false in the long run. That would do more harm than good if people foolishly had attempted to support their faith with it. All science changes, even science done by well-meaning Christians."

"By the study of these things, our students can learn that dinosaur science is very typical science. In fact, we are teaching our students little science if we do not let them see hints of its inner workings. Science is always a creative and selective use of evidence to build a reasonable, natural explanation. There are many assumptions. There are many inferences. There are cases of searching until you find what you need to fit and support your favorite ideas. Science is a human construction."

"Science is puzzle-solving with most of the pieces missing and many parts out of place. There is no promise of truth."

"Our students should not come to ridicule the scientist but to sense the limitations of science and of all our knowledge. Science and other disciplines can be very, very wrong. A good scientist knows this."

<http://www.mlc-wels.edu/home/academics/luthed/>

"Science and theology have different sources of knowledge, different assumptions, different methods, and different standards of proof. In one the Spirit works; in the other we are on our own. No wonder that St. Paul, who was highly educated, concluded that in spiritual matters, he "resolved to know nothing ... except Jesus Christ and him

crucified....so that your faith might not rest on men's wisdom, but on God's power" (1Co 2: 2-4). We must remind ourselves that many Creationists are of a different spirit. Lutherans and Calvinists have had this difference before over the nature of the elements in communion. We believe in Creation by faith and by Scripture. Do we not confess in Luther's Third Article that by our own "reason and strength" we would never come to God and faith? Do we not sing "All my knowledge, sense and sight lie in deepest darkness shrouded"? Let us apply this in science: My science cannot not make me believe in God. My science cannot bring me to God. The Spirit does not work through test tubes and microscopes. Scientific creationism is well-meaning, but misguided and dangerous.

[Paul Boehlke, Preface, in *Discovering God's Creation –A Guidebook to Hands-on Science*, Edited by Paul Boehlke, Roger Klockziem, John Paulsen; The Printshop Martin Luther College New Ulm, Minnesota, 1997, page xiv. pdf page 15] <http://mlc-wels.edu/divisions/math-science/discovering-gods-creation>

"Science should be presented from an explicit scriptural viewpoint: seeing science as a creative human activity, seeing science historically as a changing body of knowledge, recognizing that the laws of science are not the laws of nature, ..."

"All science should be seen as tentative."

[Paul Boehlke, Teaching Science In the Lutheran School, in *Discovering God's Creation –A Guidebook to Hands-on Science*, Edited by Paul Boehlke, Roger Klockziem, John Paulsen; The Printshop Martin Luther College New Ulm, Minnesota, 1997, page xix. pdf page 20]

<http://mlc-wels.edu/divisions/math-science/discovering-gods-creation>

"Scientists are not objective and may jump to conclusions. They are greatly influenced by assumptions and the science that has already been accepted. All people tend to see what they expect to see. Science is a human activity and is subject to human error and limitation. When science concludes that we have evolved by natural processes from chemical to mankind and were not created, it is wrong. This is a limitation of science; it can discover only natural causes. Nevertheless, in many other areas of science God blesses us greatly through discoveries that often lead to greater appreciation of the Creation and also to technologies that enhance our lives."

[Dawn J. Ferch, *Summary: Scientific Methods*, in *Discovering God's Creation –A Guidebook to Hands-on Science*, Edited by Paul Boehlke, Roger Klockziem, John Paulsen; The Printshop Martin Luther College New Ulm, Minnesota, 1997, pdf page 45]

<http://mlc-wels.edu/divisions/math-science/discovering-gods-creation>

"God created all the "laws of nature" and continues to sustain his creation. Mankind has just scratched the surface in attempting to figure out all the wonders God has done! We must realize that what we call "the laws of science" are likely not the same as "the laws of nature." Our science changes."

[Kevin J. Loersch, The Sticking Jar, in *Discovering God's Creation –A Guidebook to Hands-on Science*, Edited by Paul Boehlke, Roger Klockziem, John Paulsen; The Printshop Martin Luther College New Ulm, Minnesota, 1997, pdf page 61]

<http://mlc-wels.edu/divisions/math-science/discovering-gods-creation>

"During Galileo's life, scientific thought and Christian dogma were inseparable in the Roman Catholic faith. Galileo showed that science is not an absolute. Since science is made from the mind of man, it, unlike the Word of God, can and does change."

[Paul Tess, Let's Have a Swinging Time with Pendulums, in *Discovering God's Creation –A Guidebook to Hands-on Science*, Edited by Paul Boehlke, Roger Klockziem, John Paulsen; The Printshop Martin Luther College New Ulm, Minnesota, 1997, pdf page 91]

<http://mlc-wels.edu/divisions/math-science/discovering-gods-creation>

“Theories and laws of science are made by man. God did not fit his creation into a set of pre-existing conditions. The conditions came into being during the act of creation. Therefore laws and theories of science are mankind’s attempt to interpret the conditions and order in the physical environment.”

[Stephan Rodmyre, Density and Buoyancy, in *Discovering God’s Creation –A Guidebook to Hands-on Science*, Edited by Paul Boehlke, Roger Klockziem, John Paulsen; The Printshop Martin Luther College New Ulm, Minnesota, 1997, pdf page 100] <http://mlc-wels.edu/divisions/math-science/discovering-gods-creation>

“The Bible is rightly silent on this matter and many other interesting scientific questions, so we are not distracted or further puzzled. Recall Galileo’s apt comment that the Scriptures show us how to go to Heaven, not how the heavens go. We must join Job and admit in humility that there are “things too wonderful” for us to completely understand (Job 42: 1-3). We can look forward to asking God about such matters when we get to heaven. Presently, we do not know everything that God does and if we have an opinion on some of these things, we must keep it separate from Scripture. We must clearly show students what is Scriptural and what is human opinion—and not confound the two. Faith must not rest on our science, personalities, or a system of reasoning because science can change, people can be wrong, and any reasonable arguments can finally be out-reasoned by counter-arguments (cf. 1Co 2:1-4; 3:10-15). Still another important understanding is that the fossil record does not compel us to believe in macroevolution. All scientists know that any organization of the fossils that have been found (in itself a very biased activity) shows gaps between the various organisms; there is a lack of gradual progress from one organism to another predicted by Darwinism. Our students also need to know that evolutionists do deal with this problem. Some scientists (neo-darwinists or ultra-darwinists) reply that clearly more fossils need to be found and then the gaps will be filled. However, Niles Eldredge and Steven Jay Gould maintain that evolution can sometimes move at a relatively faster rate. This would cause a much smaller chance of finding those transition fossils because the organism was not around as long as others. This is called the punctuated equilibrium theory. Evolutionism is basically assumed to be true while argument focuses on the particular mechanism (Wheeler). The fossil record really says nothing until inferences are made, and they can be wrong.” [Thomas Koepsell, Fabricating Fossils, in *Discovering God’s Creation –A Guidebook to Hands-on Science*, Edited by Paul Boehlke, Roger Klockziem, John Paulsen; The Printshop Martin Luther College New Ulm, Minnesota, 1997. pdf page 303]

<http://mlc-wels.edu/divisions/math-science/discovering-gods-creation>

“We must keep nature and science separate. Since science is man’s interpretation of nature, science changes, and it is not the place for the church to consider a man’s scientific opinion to be absolute truth. Only God’s Word remains the same. History shows that science changes.”

[Stephan Rodmyre, Mass and Inertia: Thanks to Galileo, in *Discovering God’s Creation –A Guidebook to Hands-on Science*, Edited by Paul Boehlke, Roger Klockziem, John Paulsen; The Printshop Martin Luther College New Ulm, Minnesota, 1997, pdf page 96] <http://mlc-wels.edu/divisions/math-science/discovering-gods-creation>

“Science is based on careful observation of nature. Scientists are very creative in inventing explanations to explain how things work. The theory of how glues work may not be true but it is the best idea presently available and is very useful. Science changes when the theory cannot explain something that it should be able to include. Science is a human activity. God blesses us through it, but science does not produce absolute truth.”

[Stephen Merten, Making Casein Glue, in *Discovering God’s Creation –A Guidebook to Hands-on Science*, Edited by Paul Boehlke, Roger Klockziem, John Paulsen; The Printshop Martin Luther College New Ulm, Minnesota, 1997. pdf page 328] <http://mlc-wels.edu/divisions/math-science/discovering-gods-creation>

“Since fossil formation requires rapid burial and water, some Christians have felt that many of the fossils were formed by the Flood waters. The large number of fossils, the condition and position of many fossils—caught in the act of swallowing prey, and various positions suggests a sudden, violent situation. While this is interesting, we cannot be sure of this and such an inference should not be used in an attempt to ‘prove’ or support the Bible (an unnecessary and dangerous task). The person who has rejected Scripture will have different reasonable answers for what is discovered in the fossil record.”

[Thomas Koepsell, Excavating Skeletal Remains: Chickensaurus, in Discovering God’s Creation –A Guidebook to Hands-on Science, Edited by Paul Boehlke, Roger Klockziem, John Paulsen; The Printshop Martin Luther College New Ulm, Minnesota, 1997. pdf page 306]

<http://mlc-wels.edu/divisions/math-science/discovering-gods-creation>

In the following article, it is “science” that is made into a “god,” not the “theory of evolution.” Science is also referred to as “natural reason.”

“Natural reticence or fear of rejection and ridicule can inhibit me when I am a lone voice calling sinners to repentance. I may shrink from telling the heathen that it is blindness to bow down to wood and stone. I am intimidated by a world that prides itself in man’s accomplishments and has made science its god. I know that natural reason considers the things God has prepared for them that love him foolishness. St. Paul also knew that, but witness he did, even on Mars hill. You too will witness to a world that’s on the way to hell. You will witness, empowered by the Spirit who fortifies fearful hearts and loosens hesitant tongues.”

[ARMIN W. SCHUETZE, GRADUATION ADDRESS: THE LORD’S ABIDING PRESENCE IN YOUR MINISTRY, Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Vol. 82, no. 3, Summer 1985, page 166.]

“The natural sciences (physics, chemistry, biology) clearly fulfill one of the purposes of a liberal arts education: ...Since science is one of the great gods of our age, we must become familiar with its methods, and evaluate its reliability and its limitation. The informed student must know its great strengths and achievements; he must also know the weaknesses that are inherent in scientific inquiry, ‘the kinds of questions that science neither asks nor answers’ (‘Integrity in the College Curriculum,’ p 19). A study of the natural sciences should teach both respect and skepticism.”

[CARLETON TOPPE, THE PLACE OF LIBERAL ARTS IN THE NORTHWESTERN COLLEGE CURRICULUM, Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Vol. 83, no. 1, Winter 1986, pages 53-54.] Also on-line at:

<http://www.wlsessays.net/node/1552>

Previously in this paper, we saw WELS “True Science” quotes calling Darwin and other evolutionary scientists, “so-called scientists” and “would-be scientists.” The quote below calls Darwin a scientist, just as the greater scientific community does.

“scientists like Charles Darwin”

[WILBERT R. GAWRISCH, ESCHATOLOGICAL PROPHECIES AND CURRENT MISINTERPRETATIONS, Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Vol. 85, no. 2, Spring 1988, page 111.]

“from the Scriptures –the only reliable source for the truth.”

“But the test for truth is not whether or not it sounds reasonable, but whether or not God has revealed it.”

“The existence of the ark on Mount Ararat cannot be proven. To skeptics, nothing will prove the account of Genesis.”

[John A. Braun, Noah Obedient Builder, NPH 2004, pages v, 18, 35.]

“As Dr. Paul Boehlke of Dr. Martin Luther College has written, if we place our trust in a particular proof of Scriptural truth, such as Noah’s Ark, or the Shroud, or human footprints among dinosaur tracks, we will be devastated when the evidence evaporates. Using reason to assist the claims of the Word of God is clearly a Reformed approach to the Scriptures, one which threatens the gospel itself, even though the motives seem worthwhile.”

[Gregory L. Jackson, Liberalism: Its Cause and Cure, NPH 1991, pages 60-61.]

“Mathematics is man’s attempt to describe the order that God has placed in the universe.”

[Ronald A. Buelow, The Devine Proportion, 8 minutes into this PowerPoint presentation, part of WLC course MAT118 Mathematics for Life, presented to: Michigan Conference of Pastors and Teachers for the Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod (2010), faculty of Winnebago Lutheran Academy, Fond du Lac, Wisconsin (2000), Student Convocation, Wisconsin Lutheran College, Milwaukee, WI, (1986), WELS Wisconsin State Teachers Conference, Milwaukee, WI, (1984), Northwestern College Student – Faculty Discussion Group, Watertown, WI, (1983), created as a teaching unit and a presentation (1978)]

<http://faculty.wlc.edu/buelow/Home/HomePage.html>

Buelow presents quotes from several famous scientists, but then ends with his own definition of mathematics. “This is my quote. I believe that ‘mathematics is man’s attempt at describing the order that God has put into the universe.’”

[Ronald A. Buelow, Thinking God’s thoughts after him, 48.5 minutes into this PowerPoint presentation, part of WLC course MAT118 Mathematics for Life, presented to: Michigan Conference of Pastors and Teachers for the Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod (2010), Milwaukee Metro Lutheran Teachers Conference, Milwaukee, WI (2007), Discipleship Workshop, Beautiful Savior Lutheran Church, Carlsbad, CA (September, 2003), WELS Tech 2001 (now EduTech), Appleton, Wisconsin (2001), faculty of Winnebago Lutheran Academy, Fond du Lac, Wisconsin (2000), created (1996).]

<http://faculty.wlc.edu/buelow/Home/HomePage.html>

Buelow shows a quote from Einstein, “How can it be that mathematics, being after all a product of human thought independent of experience, is so admirably adapted to the objects of reality?” Buelow then remarks (in the audio) “I think math is ...we are really mimicking the order that has been handed to us by the Almighty.”

A later slide states, “Mathematics is man’s attempt at describing the order that God has put into the universe.”

[Ronald A. Buelow, Stop and Consider God’s Wonders, 14 minutes and 16.3 minutes into this PowerPoint presentation, recorded at WLC, created 2003.]

<http://faculty.wlc.edu/buelow/Home/HomePage.html>

Following are several quotes from WELS high school science syllabi showing that science is not taught as truth, and that evolution is taught as science, not as false science.

“Explain how science is based on assumptions about the natural world and themes that describe the natural world.”

“Show how conflicting assumptions about science themes lead to different opinions and decisions about evolution.”

“Using the science themes, describe theories of the origins and evolution of the universe and solar system, including the earth system as a part of the solar system, and relate these theories and their implications to geologic time on earth.”

“Using science themes, understand that the origin of the universe is not completely understood, but that there are current ideas in science that attempt to explain its origin.”

“Construct arguments that show how conflicting models and explanations of events can start with similar evidence.”

“Understand the theory of evolution, natural selection, and biological classification.”

[David Kren, Earth Science Nation Syllabus 2011-2012.doc, Wisconsin Lutheran High School (WELS)]

<http://www.wlhs.org/page/kren.html>

accessed Feb 27, 2013

“COURSE OUTCOMES: 1. Demonstrate an understanding of God’s plan for science in our lives by differentiating between relative science truths and God’s absolute truth. (Ch. 1, Bible)”

“Enabling Outcomes: the student will ...explain the difference between God’s Word and relative scientific truth.”

Marcie KREN, PHYSICAL SCIENCE SYLLABUS 2011-2012.pdf, Wisconsin Lutheran High School (WELS)]

<http://www.wlhs.org/page/mkren.html>

accessed Feb 27, 2013

“Other dangerous philosophies sneak in such as attempting to find the "true" science that lines up perfectly with Scriptures. Since even the science of Christians is a human endeavor, it is a mistake to think that a true science exists in a sinful world.”

“Finally it is a mistake to think that if we find some science that lines up perfectly with Scriptures, we will strengthen the weak in faith through this finding or "supplement" their faith.”

“One has to be a little careful not to get carried away with his fun "rips" on evolutionary science since these can imply that no one who believes in evolution does good science. A creation scientist's science is equally fallible.”

[Greg Schibbelhut, Earth Science course webpage, Luther High School (WELS), 2013]

<http://www.lutherhigh.org/academics/course-webpages/earth-science>

accessed Feb 26, 2013

“Geology, Astronomy, Chemistry, and Physics are surveyed in their most basic forms. This course gives a broad overview of science while investigating the processes of science as a human activity.”

[Prof. Greg Diersen, Physical Science 9 Syllabus, Great Plains Lutheran High School, 2013.]

<http://www.gplhs.org/home/180002059/180002059/Physical%20Science%209.pdf>

accessed Feb 28, 2013

“Science is an attempt by mankind to grasp the concepts of God's creation.”

[Riley W. Westphal, Chemistry Course Description, Winnebago Lutheran Academy, 2013]

<http://www.wlavikings.org/inner.iml/academics/science>

accessed March 2, 2013

The following quote does NOT say “there is no evidence for evolution,” but instead says:

“Unit VI : The Evolution Model vs. The Creation Model: We must understand the need for clarification of models. We must get our facts straight. Evolutionists are “stuck” because they have no god, therefore they must believe in evolution. ...Fossil record supports creation. Young earth evidence a disaster to evolutionists. There are some strong evidences that point to a created universe.”

“Unit VII: ...The world’s scheme of classification points to a created earth.”

“Understand the theory of evolution, natural selection, and biological classification.”

“Using concepts of evolution and heredity, account for changes in species and the diversity of species, include the influence of these changes on science, e.g. breeding of plants or animals.”

“Explain how science is based on assumptions about the natural world and themes that describe the natural world.”

“Show how conflicting assumptions about science themes lead to different opinions and decisions about evolution.”

“Unit VI: The Evolution Model vs. The Creation Model. ...Construct arguments that show how conflicting models and explanations of events can start with similar evidence.”

[Roger Festerling, Biology Syllabus 2011-2012, Wisconsin Lutheran High School, 2012]

<http://www.wlhs.org/facultypagefiles/Festerling%20R%20%202011-2012%20Biology%20%20Syllabus.pdf>

accessed March 2, 2013

“COURSE OUTCOMES: The student will: ...Examine the creation / evolution / intelligent design controversy and present arguments in favor of creation that are based on both science and Scripture.”

“Show how conflicting assumptions about science themes lead to different opinions and decisions about evolution, health, population, longevity, education, and use of resources, and show how these opinions and decisions have diverse effects on an individual, a community, and a country, both now and in the future.”

“Give examples that show how partial systems, models, and explanations are used to give quick and reasonable solutions that are accurate enough for basic needs.”

“Construct arguments that show how conflicting models and explanations of events can start with similar evidence.”

[Thomas J. Schulz, Biology Syllabus 2011 – 2012, Wisconsin Lutheran High School, 2012]

<http://www.wlhs.org/facultypagefiles/schulz%20biology%20syllabus%2011-12.pdf>

accessed March 2, 2013

“As we examine what we see around us we will also explore how scientists may try to explain things through the “eyes” of chance, which is evolution.”

“Explain the Darwinian viewpoint of the origin of life. Critique this viewpoint by identifying flaws in the theory and beliefs in direct contradiction with Scripture.”

“Explain how evolutionists use fossils and the geologic time column to map out a history of evolution of life. Again identify flaws in this line of thinking.”

“For each of the evolutionary patterns below, we will look for weaknesses in the ideas and how to explain the concepts using the truths of scripture and good scientific research.”

“Debate whether a Phylogenetic tree really shows the relationships and evolutionary history scientists claim it does.

ii. Explain why Phylogenetic trees are hypotheses at best.”

“Use scripture passages to directly contradict the evolutionary ideas. Highlight in what specific ways God’s word tells us enough to know the evolutionists are wrong.”

“Show how conflicting assumptions about science themes lead to different opinions and decisions about evolution.”

[David A. Kren, Advanced Placement Biology Syllabus 2011-2012.doc, Wisconsin Lutheran High School, 2012]

<http://www.wlhs.org/page/kren.html>

accessed March 2, 2013

“We will learn the difference between science and God’s created world.”

“Explain how science is based on assumptions about the natural world and themes that describe the natural world.”

“Using concepts of evolution and heredity, account for changes in species and the diversity of species, include the influence of these changes on science, e.g. breeding of plants or animals.”

“Show how conflicting assumptions about science themes lead to different opinions and decisions about evolution, health, population, longevity, education, and use of resources, and show how these opinions and decisions have diverse effects on an individual, a community, and a country, both now and in the future.”

“Give examples that show how partial systems, models, and explanations are used to give quick and reasonable solutions that are accurate enough for basic needs.”

“Explain how science is based on assumptions about the natural world and themes that describe the natural world.”

[Roger Festerling, Life Science Syllabus 2011 – 2012, Wisconsin Lutheran High School, 2012]

<http://www.wlhs.org/facultypagefiles/Festerling%20R%20Life%20Science%20Syllabus%20%202011-2012.pdf>

accessed March 2, 2013

“Analysis of observations in science and how they are limited to the physical world and our senses (extended senses).”

“Show how conflicting assumptions about science themes lead to different opinions and decisions about evolution.”

“Give examples that show how partial systems, models, and explanations are used to give quick and reasonable solutions that are accurate enough for basic needs.”

“Using the science themes, describe theories of the origins and evolution of the universe and solar system, including the earth system as a part of the solar system, and relate these theories and their implications to geologic time on earth.”

“Construct arguments that show how conflicting models and explanations of events can start with similar evidence.”

[Al Greschner, Basic Physics syllabus, Wisconsin Lutheran High School, 2012]

<http://www.wlhs.org/facultypagefiles/agreschner%20basis%20%20physics%20syl%202011.pdf>

accessed March 2, 2013

“What is science? ...man’s assessment and organization about what he knows.”

“Theories and Laws are always being tested. Whenever new information is observed that doesn't fit the present explanation the theory changes. We're always looking for a better explanation.”

“Models can represent physical evidence. Representation of an object or event you're observing usually used if the object or event is difficult or maybe even impossible to see or observe because of limits of technology, size, or complexity.” [Al Greschner, WISCO Science PowerPoint: Science Introduction. What Is Science?, Wisconsin Lutheran High School, 2012] <http://www.greschner.wiscoscience.com/worksheets/physics/intro/science%20intro.pdf>

accessed March 2, 2013

“Analysis of observations in science and how they are limited to the physical world and our senses (extended senses).”

“Show how conflicting assumptions about science themes lead to different opinions and decisions about evolution.”

“Explain how science is based on assumptions about the natural world and themes that describe the natural world.”

“Using the science themes, describe theories of the origins and evolution of the universe and solar system, including the earth system as a part of the solar system, and relate these theories and their implications to geologic time on earth.”

[Al Greschner, Physics syllabus, Wisconsin Lutheran High School, 2012]

<http://www.wlhs.org/facultypagefiles/agreschnerphysics%20syl%202011.pdf>

accessed March 2, 2013

“Hebrews 11 states “Now faith is being sure of what we hope for and certain of what we do not see. By faith we understand that the universe was formed at God’s command, so that what is seen was not made out of what was visible.” Understanding that it is through faith that we know the truth, students will be reminded daily of the words

in 1Peter 3:15, “be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give a reason for the hope that you have.” 1Pet 3:15.”

“The theory of Evolution: a. Describe the basic tenets of the evolutionary theory along with identifying which specific parts of scripture the theory is trying to combat. b. Identify and discuss the major scientific problems and flawed assumptions of the theory. c. Describe the ethical and moral issues at stake because of how “successful” the devil has been in developing this theory.”

“Explain how science is always in a process of change, where the truths of scripture are never changing.”

[David A. Kren, Biology Family Syllabus 2011-2012.doc, Wisconsin Lutheran High School, 2012]

<http://www.wlhs.org/page/kren.html>

accessed March 2, 2013

“Give examples that show how partial systems, models, and explanations are used to give quick and reasonable solutions that are accurate enough for basic needs.”

“Explain how science is based on assumptions about the natural world and themes that describe the natural world.”

“Show how conflicting assumptions about science themes lead to different opinions and decisions about evolution.”

“Construct arguments that show how conflicting models and explanations of events can start with similar evidence.”

[Mike Sebald, Chemistry Syllabi, Wisconsin Lutheran High School, 2012]

<http://www.wlhs.org/facultypagefiles/Chemistry%20Syllabus%202011-12.pdf>

accessed March 2, 2013

“Creation and Evolution. How do we know what happened? Creation [is] God’s eyewitness testimony. Evolution [is] Human deductions and observations.”

“Creation Science: The attempt to demonstrate by scientific observations and principles that creation is true. This practice tries to make creation acceptable to unbelievers – it forgets that we only accept creation by faith.”

“TRUE: The “Big Bang” Theory can’t be true, because it disagrees with the Bible.”

“TRUE: You can’t prove creation – it takes faith to believe in it.”

[Geoffrey A. Kieta, Confirmation Curriculum: Built on a Rock – Lesson 15 the creation PowerPoint and Review Sheet – teacher edition, 2002]

<https://connect.wels.net/AOM/ps/youth/confirmation/curriculum/Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx>

accessed March 2, 2013.

“Creation Science: The attempt to demonstrate by scientific observations and principles that creation is true. ”

[Geoffrey A. Kieta, Going On To Maturity PowerPoint and Review Sheet, 2003]

<https://connect.wels.net/AOM/ps/youth/confirmation/curriculum/Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx>

accessed March 2, 2013.

“The purpose of science therefore is to build models that describe the laws of nature.”

[WELS What About Jesus website, Has Science Proven Evolution?, 2013]

<http://whataboutjesus.com/evolution/has-science-proven-evolution>

WELS on-line Q&A Evolution: #1 of 38

“Neither creation nor evolution can be proved in a strict sense, since we can't go into a lab and reproduce them. We believe creation by faith in God's Word, not because it can be proved in a laboratory.”

“All we can demonstrate is that the evidence for evolution cannot demonstrate the case for evolution from one kind of life to another. The evidence can be explained by creation as well as evolution. The two groups are starting with different presuppositions.” [2005.]

http://arkiv.lbk.cc/fag/site.pl@1518cutopic_topicid73cuitem_itemid3127.htm

WELS on-line Q&A Evolution: #2 of 38

“We may point out the inadequacy of the evidence that is alleged to support evolution of man from an ape-like ancestor, but we do not try to prove creation on the basis of the inadequacy of evolution as a theory. We believe creation by faith in the Word of God. The only way we can witness the origin of life is in a secondary way if we have an eyewitness to testify to what happened. We have only one witness--God's account in the Bible. We either believe that account because we are convinced by the power of God's Word or believe the unprovable theories of human origins which are based on interpretations of the extant evidence which discount the possibility of a role for God on the basis of presuppositions. The role of God in origins is not demonstrable by scientific experiment. It rests on the testimony of Scripture and also in a weaker way in the testimony that remains in every person in the natural knowledge of God.” [2005]

http://arkiv.lbk.cc/fag/site.pl@1518cutopic_topicid73cuitem_itemid3127.htm

WELS on-line Q&A Evolution: #3 of 38

“The DNA tests add nothing to the discussion because they simply show the similarity we can see with our eyes. They can't show why the similarity. Diverging from a common starting point is a reasonable explanation. But there is nothing illogical about the possibility of two different starting points with two similar designs due to the same designer. The atheistic evolutionist chooses one interpretation because his presuppositions (not the evidence) cannot allow the possibility of a designer. The Christian chooses the other explanation because his presuppositions come from what Scripture says.” [2005.]

http://arkiv.lbk.cc/fag/site.pl@1518cutopic_topicid73cuitem_itemid3127.htm

WELS on-line Q&A Evolution: #4 of 38

“We are not attached to any scientific theory, whether of Ptolemy, Galileo, Kepler, Newton, or Einstein. None of them are laws in a strict sense. Theories come and go. They are only humans' attempts to explain what they observe in creation in such a way that they can predict future outcomes.” [2005.]

http://arkiv.lbk.cc/fag/site.pl@1518cutopic_topicid73cuitem_itemid3127.htm

WELS on-line Q&A Evolution: #5 of 38

“Our primary goal is not to reconcile Scripture with science or vice versa. Our goal is to use Scripture to reach souls with the Good News. Yet there is a place for apologetics, or the defense of the faith. The Christian Church can indeed defend the biblical record and can give examples where a biblical worldview is compatible with the observable scientific data.” [2005.]

http://arkiv.lbk.cc/fag/site.pl@1518cutopic_topicid73cuitem_itemid3127.htm

WELS on-line Q&A Evolution: #6 of 38

“Remember, a believer's acceptance of the creation account is a matter of faith, a faith worked by the Holy Spirit through the Gospel. Hebrews 11:3 declares ‘By faith we understand that the universe was formed at God's command, so that what is seen was not made out of what was visible.’ Sometimes believers try to “argue” someone into accepting creation, or we try to ‘explain scientifically’ the validity of the creation account. God's Word is powerful. All God asks us to do is to state the truths of Scripture.” [2005.]

http://arkiv.lbk.cc/faq/site.pl@1518cutopic_topicid73cuitem_itemid3127.htm

WELS Q&A Evolution: #19 of 38

“Q: Can the theory of evolution really be "disproved" or when creationists and other Christians try to disprove it are they merely entering a fruitless debate centering around reason rather than Scripture?”

“A: Evolution can't be disproved by reproduction of creation in a lab, but it can be shown to be unsound and this may lead some of its adherents to examine the claims of the Bible.”

[imported to WELS.net January 1, 2004.]

http://arkiv.lbk.cc/faq/site.pl@1518cutopic_topicid73cuitem_itemid3127.htm

WELS on-line Q&A Evolution: #31 of 38

Q: “Upon reading the questions regarding evolution, dinosaurs, ...”

A: “We do not base our acceptance of what the Bible says on any specific theories of creation science. Like other theories of science these may or may not be correct. Lutheran writers have often discussed these theories, but the church does not endorse any specific theory.”

[imported to WELS.net January 1, 2004.]

http://arkiv.lbk.cc/faq/site.pl@1518cutopic_topicid73cuitem_itemid3127.htm

WELS on-line Q&A Creation: #6 of 59

Q: “What is the danger of trying to prove creation with science?”

A: “...1. Trying to ‘prove creation’ with science (or with any other means) is a waste of time. Creation is beyond the scope of science and investigation and there was only one eyewitness (God). 2. Trying to prove creation by science can give the false impression that what we believe on the basis of divine testimony in Scripture is somehow dependent on what the discipline of science has to say. 3. Trying to prove creation by science will invariably result in frustration not only because it will ultimately end in failure but because whatever provisional or limited findings result will please very few people. It will satisfy neither those who trust science more than they trust revealed truth nor those who trust revealed truth more than findings that have apparent but limited scientific evidence to support them. On the positive side, there is a perceived apologetic value in presenting information to show that a faith that is based on revelation is as reasonable if not more reasonable than a faith that rests on limited scientific observations and deductions. This kind of argument, in itself, will not change hearts but can allow a Christian to maintain dialog with a skeptic long enough to share law and gospel and allow the Holy Spirit to change the heart.” [2005]

http://arkiv.lbk.cc/faq/site.pl@1519cuqa_qaid1cutopic_topicid72.htm

WELS on-line Q&A Creation: #38 of 59

“We do not base our acceptance of what the Bible says on any specific theories of creation science. Like other theories of science these may or may not be correct. Lutheran writers have often discussed these theories, but the church does not endorse any specific theory.”

[imported to WELS.net January 1, 2004.]

http://arkiv.lbk.cc/faq/site.pl@1519cuqa_qaid1cutopic_topicid72.htm

The following articles were published by “CHARIS, The Institute of Wisconsin Lutheran College” in their journal, “CHARIS: A Journal of Lutheran Scholarship, Thought, and Opinion.”

“While nature declares the glory of God, modern science usually does not. One may wish that this were not true, but it is a descriptive judgment of modern science.”

“Hence, this reviewer would predict that science will not change its course as dramatically as Woodward and the ID people wish. It can hold on to evolutionary natural causes even if it has to modify Darwinism. There are already scientists that question gradualism in evolution for other reasons.”

“Science is a step away from nature and involves human interpretation.”

[Paul R. Boehlke, book review of *Doubts about Darwin: A History of Intelligent Design.*, CHARIS, Winter 2003-04, Volume 3, Number 2]

http://www.charis.wlc.edu/publications/charis_winter04/

http://www.charis.wlc.edu/publications/charis_winter04/reviews.pdf

“A scientist is trained not to believe anything until evidence is provided, and that evidence needs to be compelling. Many scientists do not see the evidence for God that nature evinces, or at least they do not see it as compelling evidence. The argument that random chance, the Big Bang, and evolution could have caused all the variety in nature and all the order in the natural laws of the universe seems equally compelling to them.”

[Dr. David D. Gebhard, *An Overview of Intelligent Design*, CHARIS, Lent 2006, Volume 5, Number 1]

<http://www.charis.wlc.edu/publications/charis5-1/>

<http://www.charis.wlc.edu/publications/charis5-1/Gebhard.pdf>

“This is the case in the never-ending debate over evolution and creation. ...Both sides throw around ‘scientific evidence’ and accuse the opposition of bias and ignorance. While these techniques may allow each side to feel better about its stance, the arguments do not provide an answer to the question of how the universe was formed. Examining scientific evidence does not decisively clear the issue. Although the application of science is important, Christians need to remember that creation is more a matter of faith than science, and this faith cannot be proven by scientific arguments.”

“The first objection raised by numerous creationists is the notion that evolution is no more than a theory, a mere speculation. ...No one would doubt Newton’s theory of gravitation simply on the grounds that it is only a theory. In practice, scientists treat theories as if they are proven true.”

“Based on the previous discussion of different interpretations of data and the difficulties involved in falsifying this scientific theory, the likelihood of discovering proof which effectively handicaps the theory of evolution is not great.”

[Jessica Laird, *The Original Debate*, CHARIS, Winter 2003-04, Volume 3, Number 2]

http://www.charis.wlc.edu/publications/charis_winter04/

http://www.charis.wlc.edu/publications/charis_winter04/laird.pdf

“In the area of science we not only warn against the philosophy of reductionism and materialism, but we also especially need to guard against Reformed answers to evolution that elevate reason human and try to develop a true science. [*footnote*: “Isch, John. “Remember These Things: The Church’s Responsibility to Teach.” *Proceedings: Thirty-Ninth Biennial Convention of the Minnesota District, Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod*, June 21-23, 1994, published in the district *Proceedings*, 116. *Dr. Isch generally warns against Reformed educational materials that are not Scriptural.*”]

[Dr. Paul R. Boehlke, *Reflections on a New Science Building*, CHARIS, Summer 2004, Volume 3, Number 3]

http://www.charis.wlc.edu/publications/charis_summer04/

http://www.charis.wlc.edu/publications/charis_summer04/boehlke.pdf

11. “True Science” –Rejected in the WELS

The “True Science” apologetic was considered, then rejected, in the WELS

This section utilizes several methods to examine the collected quotes. Each approach concludes that the “True Science” apologetic has been rejected in the WELS.

Tables 1a and 1b tabulate articles listed in chapters 8 and 10.

Table 1a

Articles Supporting / Opposing “True Science” [FIC, WLQ, Luth. Educ., Conf. Papers, Books, etc.]

	1950s	1960s	1970s	1980s	1990s	2000s	2010s	Total
Supporting Articles	3	8	8	1	-	3	5	28
Opposing Articles	-	-	6	14	18	26	20	84
<i>Opposing Articles by Sponholz</i>	-	-	5	7	4	-	-	16
<i>Opposing Articles by Others</i>	-	-	1	7	14	26	20	68

This report uncovered significant WELS support for “True Science” in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, when 19 articles included “True Science” statements. Since then, only 9 articles included such statements. Statements opposed to “True Science” went from 6 to 78. Table 1b shows this progression. Support for “True Science” greatly diminished while opposition greatly increased.

Table 1b

Articles Supporting / Opposing “True Science” [FIC, WLQ, Luth. Educ., Conf. Papers, Books, etc.]

	1950 - 1979	1980 – 2013
Supporting Articles	19	9
Opposing Articles	6	78

This shows the “True Science” apologetic was considered and then overwhelmingly rejected in the WELS.

Table 2 tabulates articles listed in chapter 8. These are the same supporting articles tabulated in Table 1.

TABLE 2 - Details of Articles Supporting True Science

Author	Article Supporting "True Science"	Year	Inten- sity *	FIC	NPH	WLQ	Text- book	Luth Edu	WLS Wrk shop	MLC Wrk shop	Other Work shop	Pas- tor Conf	Tea- cher Conf
Wegner	THE LEAVEN OF THE SADDUCEES	1950	1			x							
Lillegard	Progressive Revelation	1951	1			x							
Kirst	Lutherans Warned of Evolution Trap	1955	4										1
Gawrisch	The Biblical Account of Creation and ...	1962	1			x							
V.	Lutheran Writer Opposed To Literal ...	1963	1			x							
Pieper	The True Reconstruction of The Church	1965	1			x							
Adickes	Man versus Animal	1967	4	x	x								
Franzmann	Introduction to Truth Unchanging ...	1967	4		x								
Larsen	The Origin of the Universe	1967	5	x	x								
Schuetze	The Dangers of Evolutionism and ...	1967	4	x	x								
Kautz	God's Creating Activity	1969	4				x						
Siegler	Evolution or Degeneration—Which?	1972	1		x								
Vogel	Review of "Darwin Retried,"	1972	1			x							
Vogel	Review of "The Universe, Plan or Acc..."	1972	1			x							
Vogel	review of "Creation, Evolution, and ..."	1972	1			x							
Wiesinger	IS THE BIBLE THE WORD OF GOD?	1972	1			x							
Becker	EVOLUTION AND GENESIS (1966 Conv.)	1978	1			x						1	
Golisch	Letter to Sponholz	1978	5										
Warnke	Catechetical Resources – First Article	1978	2				x						
Vogel	Creationism in Schools Ruled Uncon...	1982	1			x							
Christ Light	Course 5, lesson 1, teacher's guide	2000	1				x						
Kaesmeyer	Lesson 2 –God and Creation	2003	1										
Q&A	WELS on-line Q&A, Evolution: #24 of 38	2003	1										
Quist	Questioning Evolution	2010	4	x									
Thompson	What in the World is Going On? ...	2010	1		x								
Buchholz	Basic Bible Certainty	2010	2		x								
Stan Bauer	From the Development Office	2011	1										
Bartelt	5_Reasons_to_Reject_Evolution	2013	2				x						
	Number of Articles in Each Column.....	28		4	7	11	4	0	0	0	0	1	1

* Intensity: Support of True Science in this article is:
5 = the very purpose of the article.
4 = a main theme or conclusion.
3 = a secondary theme or conclusion.
2 = several sets of clear comments.
1 = a brief but clear comment.

notes: 1. District conventions are included in "pastoral conferences." 2. Textbooks include course syllabi and course website comments by the teacher. 3. Other Workshops are all presentations at WELS events (ELS, etc. not counted).

Table 3 tabulates articles listed in chapter 10. These are the same opposing articles tabulated in Table 1.

TABLE 3 - Details of Articles Opposing True Science

Author	Article Opposing "True Science"	Year	Inten- sity *	FIC	NPH	WLQ	Text- book	Luth Edu	WLS Wrk shop	MLC Wrk shop	Other Work shop	Pas- tor Conf	Tea- cher Conf
Sponholz	The Changing Laws	1977	5							1			
Sponholz	Teaching Creation and Science ...	1977	5										1
Boehlke	Science: Philosophy & Objectives ...	1978	5							1			
Sponholz	A Question of Controversy?	1978	5										
Sponholz	Idols of the Market-Place	1978	5										
Sponholz	Some Truths of Science	1979	5						1				
Sponholz	The Fluid Ice "Out of whose womb ...?"	1981	5								1		
Kipfmiller	Fighting The Good Fight	1982	5									1	
Sponholz	Two Towers -- The Relationship ...	1982	5									1	
Sponholz	Job ... Things Too Wonderful For Me	1983	5									2	
Sponholz	Science and the Truth of Nature	1984	5										
Gerlach	Creation and Science	1985	5	x									
Schuetze	GRADUATION ADDRESS	1985	1						1				
Sponholz	Teaching and UNTEACHING Evolution ...	1985	5								1		1
Sponholz	The Saving Waters	1986	5										1
Toppe	THE PLACE OF LIBERAL ARTS IN ...	1986	1										
Gerlach	Reflections On Creation Science	1987	5	x									
Toppe	Reason Won't Settle The Issue	1987	4	x									
Gawrisch	Eschatological Propesies and Current ...	1988	1			x							
Sponholz	Separate From His Word	1989	2				x						
Sponholz	Wet-Bulb Temperatures	1990	5						1				
Boehlke	Dinosaurs, God's Creatures	1991	4					x					
Jackson	Liberalism: Its Cause and Cure	1991	1		x								
Sponholz	Different!	1995	5				x			1			
Boehlke	Preface to Disc. God's Creation	1997	4				x						
Boehlke	Teaching Science In the Luth. School	1997	3				x						
Ferch	Summary: Scientific Methods	1997	4				x						
Koepsell	Fabricating Fossils	1997	4				x						
Koepsell	Excavating Skeletal Remains: Chicken...	1997	4				x						
Loersch	The Sticking Jar	1997	3				x						
Merten	Making Casein Glue	1997	4				x						
Rodmyre	Density and Buoyancy	1997	3				x						
Rodmyre	Mass and Inertia	1997	3				x						
Tess	Let's Have a Swinging Time w Pendulums	1997	3				x						
Sponholz	A Study of Science Over Against Faith	1998	5									1	1
Baumler	At Least Get The Definition Right	1999	4	x									
Boehlke	Science--Through God's Eyes	1999	5	x									

Table 3 continued on next page

Table 3 continued from previous page

Author	Article Opposing "True Science"	Year	Inten- sity *	FIC	NPH	WLQ	Text- book	Luth Edu	WLS Wrk shop	MLC Wrk shop	Other Work shop	Pas- tor Conf	Tea- cher Conf
Sponholz	Creationism is Different From Creation	1999	5									1	
Weigand	Creation --God Made all Things	2000	1		x								
Kieta	Built on a Rock – Lesson 15 the creation	2002	2				x						
Sonnenburg	Facing The Unbeliever	2002	1	x									
Boehlke	Review of Doubts about Darwin: A ...	2003	2										
Kieta	Going On To Maturity	2003	1										
Laird	The Original Debate	2003	5										
Buelow	Stop and Consider God's Wonders	2003	1				x						
Q&A	WELS on-line Q&A, Evolution: #19 of 38	2003	1										
Q&A	WELS on-line Q&A, Evolution: #31 of 38	2003	1										
Q&A	WELS on-line Q&A, Creation #38 of 59	2003	1										
Willems	A Model or Reality?	2003	5					x					
Boehlke	Reflections on a New Science Building	2004	1										
Braun	Noah Obedient Builder	2004	2		x								
Buelow / MacPherson	A Lutheran View Of Science	2004	3	x									
Q&A	WELS on-line Q&A, Evolution: #1 of 38	2005	1										
Q&A	WELS on-line Q&A, Evolution: #2 of 38	2005	1										
Q&A	WELS on-line Q&A, Evolution: #3 of 38	2005	1										
Q&A	WELS on-line Q&A, Evolution: #4 of 38	2005	1										
Q&A	WELS on-line Q&A, Evolution: #5 of 38	2005	1										
Q&A	WELS on-line Q&A, Evolution: #6 of 38	2005	1										
Q&A	WELS on-line Q&A, Creation #6 of 59	2005	4										
Willems	Where Experiments End	2005	5					x					
Gebhard	An Overview of Intelligent Design	2006	1										
Gurgel	This We Believe –Q&A	2006	1		x								
Boehlke	Only natural causes; God above ...	2009	1	x									
Boehlke	A world without God; a world with God	2009	5	x									

Table 3 continued on next page

Table 3 continued from previous page

Author	Article Opposing "True Science"	Year	Inten- sity *	FIC	NPH	WLQ	Text- book	Luth Edu	WLS Wrk shop	MLC Wrk shop	Other Work shop	Pas- tor Conf	Tea- cher Conf
Eggert	In The Beginning	2010	5	x									
MacPherson	The Church and Science Through ...	2010	3		x					1			
Buelow	The Devine Proportion (1978 - 2010)	2010	1				x				3	1	2
Buelow	Thinking God's thoughts after him (1996 - 2010)	2010	1				x				3	1	2
Eggert	Creation vs. Science – The Underlying ...	2011	4									1	1
D. Kren	Earth Science Nation Syllabus	2012	2				x						
D. Kren	Advanced Placement Biology Syllabus	2012	2				x						
D. Kren	Biology Family Syllabus	2012	3				x						
Festerling	Biology Syllabus	2012	2				x						
Festerling	Life Science Syllabus	2012	2				x						
Greschner	Basic Physics syllabus	2012	2				x						
Greschner	Science Introduction. What Is Science?	2012	5				x						
Greschner	Physics syllabus	2012	2				x						
M. Kren	PHYSICAL SCIENCE SYLLABUS	2012	2				x						
Schulz	Biology Syllabus	2012	1				x						
Sebald	Chemistry Syllabi	2012	1				x						
Diersen	Physical Science 9 Syllabus	2013	1				x						
Schibbelhut	Earth Science course webpage	2013	2				x						
WAJ .com	Has Science Proven Evolution?	2013	2										
Westphal	Chemistry Course Description	2013	1				x						
	Number of Articles in Each Column.....	84		10	5	1	30	3	3	4	8	9	9

* Intensity: Opposition to True Science in this article is:
 5 = the very purpose of the article.
 4 = a main theme or conclusion.
 3 = a secondary theme or conclusion.
 2 = several sets of clear comments.
 1 = a brief but clear comment.

notes: 1. Textbooks include course syllabi and course website comments by the teacher. 2. Other Workshops are all presentations at WELS events (ELS, etc. not counted).

Based on Tables 1, 2, and 3, the following becomes evident:

“True Science” has been rejected by generations of WELS leaders across the synod.

The leaders of MLC workshops, WLS workshops, and other WELS workshops

chose presenters whose message included opposition to “True Science.” Over the 62 years of this study:

- 15** workshops had presentations opposing “True Science.”
- 0** workshops had presentations supporting “True Science.”

The leaders of pastoral conferences and teacher conferences

chose presenters whose message included opposition to “True Science.” Since 1979:

- 14** conferences had presentations opposing “True Science.”
- 0** conferences had presentations supporting “True Science.”

The editorial staff at The Lutheran Educator

chose authors whose message included opposition to “True Science.” From 1990 – 2008 (entire on-line data base), the Lutheran Educator published:

- 3** articles opposing “True Science.”
- 0** articles supporting “True Science.”

The editorial staff of Forward In Christ (FIC – formerly the Northwestern Lutheran)

chose authors whose message included opposition to “True Science.” The FIC online archives go back to Nov, 1978. Since then, FIC published:

- 10** articles opposing “True Science”
- 1** article supporting “True Science” (and that article both supported and opposed).

Some may point out that these WELS leaders may have chosen a popular presenter/author, or a respected WELS science teacher or pastor. This may be the case, but it does not diminish the argument that “True Science” has been rejected in the WELS. If generations of our popular presenters, popular authors, and respected teachers and pastors opposed “True Science,” then the point stands that “True Science” has been rejected in the WELS.

**Most WELS Teachers Supported “True Science” Prior to 1982.
Since 1982 (for 30 years) Most Have Rejected “True Science.”**

Tables 4 and 5 list authors (from Tables 2 and 3) who served as teachers/professors at a WELS school near the time they wrote their article(s).

TABLE 4 - 1982 and Prior: Teachers Whose Articles Supported or Opposed “True Science.”

SUPPORT		OPPOSE	
Christian Day Sch. Wrightstown, WI	George O. Lillegard	DMLC	Paul R. Boehlke
Fox Valley Lutheran High School	Harold E. Warnke	Luther High School / DMLC	Martin P. Sponholz
Huron Valley Lutheran High School	David Golisch	Northwestern Prep / NWC	David A. Kipfmiller
Lakeside Lutheran High School	Robert W. Adickes		
Northwestern College	Eugene Kirst		
Wisconsin Luth. High School	Ulrik J. Larsen		
Wisconsin Luth. High School	Darrel Kautz		
Wisconsin Luth. Seminary	Siegbert W. Becker		
Wisconsin Luth. Seminary	Wilbert R. Gawrisch		
Wisconsin Luth. Seminary	Armin Schuetze		
Wisconsin Luth. Seminary	Heinrich J. Vogel		

TABLE 5 - AFTER 1982: Teachers Whose Articles Supported or Opposed “True Science.”

SUPPORT		OPPOSE	
Kettle Moraine Luth. High School	David Bartelt	Great Plains Lutheran High School	Greg Diersen
		Luther High School	Greg Schibbelhut
		Martin Luther College	Martin P. Sponholz
		MLC / WLC	Paul R. Boehlke
		Minn. Valley Luth. High School	Paul L. Willems
		Northwestern College	Carleton Toppe
		Winnebago Lutheran Academy	Riley W. Westphal
		Wisconsin Lutheran College	Ronald A. Buelow
		Wisconsin Lutheran College	David D. Gebhard
		Wisconsin Luth. High School	David Kren
		Wisconsin Luth. High School	Marcie Kren
		Wisconsin Luth. High School	Roger Festerling
		Wisconsin Luth. High School	Thomas J. Schulz
		Wisconsin Luth. High School	Al Greschner
		Wisconsin Luth. High School	Mike Sebald
		Wisconsin Luth. Seminary	Wilbert R. Gawrisch
		Wisconsin Luth. Seminary	Richard L. Gurgel
		Wisconsin Luth. Seminary	Armin Schuetze
		WELS teachers attending the 1995 Science Curriculum Institute at MLC	Dawn J. Ferch
			Kevin J. Loersch
			Paul Tess
			Stephan Rodmyre
			Thomas Koepsell
			Stephen Merten

The COP Speaks

The WELS Conference Of Presidents (COP) has officially rejected the "True Science" position, at least partially. In the Oct 18, 2011 edition of "Together," WELS President Mark Schroeder reported the following:

"The Conference of Presidents (COP) ... discussed how matters relating to creation and the flood are addressed in WELS publications and presentations. While scientific explanations are sometimes offered to explain or understand the biblical teachings regarding creation and the flood, the COP reaffirmed the importance of recognizing that these explanations are to be viewed as scientific theories only. The district presidents will be reminding pastors, teachers, and presenters not to present as factual anything that goes beyond what Scripture says on any issue that lies in the realm of scientific observation and theoretical explanation. The COP recognizes that there are scientific theories that do, in fact, violate statements of Scripture and must be rejected—not on the basis of science but on the basis of clear statements of Scripture. ... Our synod has entrusted the district presidents as the supervisors of doctrine and practice and has called them to serve as the pastors of their respective districts."

<http://www.wels.net/news-events/presidents-discuss-creation-other-issues>

accessed April 15, 2013.