

## Origins? Has Science Really Buried God?

I read with a great deal of interest Cathy Cementina's article "Origins" in the March issue of Neighbors. What I found fascinating was that there was a lot we could agree on. At times I wondered if she had read my book "Let Us Reason Together" as I wrote also about Edwin Hubble's discovery of the expanding universe, the discovery of cosmic background radiation (CBR) at Bell Laboratories, red shifts, etc., showing the universe had a beginning. So we have agreement on the beginning of the universe, it is not eternal. Ms Cementina however finishes up her article with a huge leap of faith I am not willing to logically take. Let's examine some of her statements to see how well they hold up.

She stated the stars "exploded in a way that disbursed the heavier elements through space..." that allowed for life on earth and "we all came from stardust." So I guess according to her this was an amazing bit of luck. But what I am really interested in is her last paragraph and her contention that the answer to the universe "isn't God". Now how do you know that? Well she attempts to play a quick shell game by saying "Stephen Hawking and Victor Stenger have proposed a plausible explanation for what proceeded the Big Bang. And it isn't God." She slips in another clever statement that their explanation "can in time be supported with new data." Another words it CAN'T be supported right now! She concludes with "As long as there is a plausible empirical explanation for what proceeded the Big bang there is no need to invoke a supernatural one." Game over? Not so fast Cathy.

First, neither Stephen Hawking or Victor Stenger have provided any empirical evidence for what proceeded the Big Bang. Nor can they provide us any scientific evidence against God. Cementina's claims are without merit, based on wishful reasoning, and a questionable interpretation of science. What she doesn't tell you is that Hawking's and Stenger's hypotheses have brought them into conflict with friend and foe alike. The US National Academy of Sciences has gone on record with the following statement.

"Science is a way of knowing about the natural world. It is LIMITED to explaining the natural world through natural causes. Science can say

nothing about the supernatural. Whether God exists or not is a question which science is neutral.”

Stenger in particular seems to have trouble with logical thinking. In his book he states “Where did the laws of nature come from? They came from nothing!” Try that on for size with anything else and see how it works. Stenger seems confused about just what this “nothing” is (which is a bit fascinating in itself). Remember the Big Bang contained space and time within itself. So the laws of nature, contrary to what Stenger tries to say, could not have come out from the “void out of which the universe arose” but only from the existing universe. This “void zero” by definition lies beyond the reach of science and is what the Bible calls “eternity”. In reality Stenger unwittingly corners himself into the logical conclusion that the laws of science had a non-physical, theological origin!

Stenger is also guilty of the most illogical statement I have ever read by an atheist (and I have read a lot of them). He states “In short , the natural state of affairs is something (by which he means the universe) rather than nothing. An empty universe requires supernatural intervention-not a full one. Only by the constant action of an agent outside the universe, such as God, could a state of nothingness be maintained. The fact that we have something is just what we would expect if there is no God.”

I realize that atheists have growing desperate with the growing evidence for the design in the universe and life, and the logical conclusion that it points to an intelligent, but this is like a plumber being shown Niagara Falls and after studying it a few minutes he claims he can fix it!

With that kind of logic we can maintain that Mt. Rushmore proves that there are no human beings since the mountain should have just stayed a mountain with no apparent shape otherwise.

In reviewing Stenger's book “God the failed hypothesis”, Dr. Andrews at the University of London several glaring logical fallacies and included “if you're looking for a failed hypothesis his explanation of the origin of natural law can hardly be bettered!”

As for the Hawking he drifted back and forth on his position regarding God in his lifetime. In his first major book “A Brief history of Time” in the final chapter he used the word “God” eight different times in four pages. Although he doesn't fully commit on the question of God's existence, he clearly implies the possibility. Where Ms Cementina apparently decides rest her faith is in a Hawkins last book ”The Grand Design” where he invents a multi-universe theory and later states “because there is a law like gravity the

universe can and will create itself out of nothing.” Like Stenger he wants desperately to pretend the laws are already there. Now where did he get that from? How does he know? Physical laws initiate action and events, they merely describe the physical universe! Is there any evidence at all for Hawking's theory?

Listen to what Roger Penrose, the leading British mathematician and a friend of a Hawking, who worked with him studying black holes, says regarding Hawking's theory:

“it enjoys no observational support whatsoever. What is referred to as M-theory isn't even a theory, indeed it it's hardly science. It is a collection of ideas, hopes, and aspirations ... I think the book is misleading. It gives the impression that this new theory is going to explain everything. ITS NOTHING OF THE SORT.”

Another friend of Hawking, astronomer Martin Rees says “I know Hawking well enough to know that he has studied very little philosophy, and even less theology, so I don't think we should attach any merit with his views on God.”

Physicist Paul Davies states that the ideas, of the likes of Stenger and Hawking, that the universe could be entirely the consequence of logical and mathematics necessity, “ I think that this is demonstrably wrong. There's not a shred of evidence that the universe is logically necessary.” As professor John Lennox of Oxford stated in his book “God And Stephen Hawking-Whose Design is it Anyway? “Nonsense is nonsense even when it is spoken by world-famous scientists... Immense prestige and authority do not compensate for faulty logic.”

Even the prestigious journal “Scientific America” headed their review of Hawking's book “Cosmic Clowning: Hawking's 'new theory' is the same old CRAP.” It went on to state that “ M-theory” stems not from the theory merits, but from lack of alternatives, and the stubborn refusal of enthusiasts to abandon their faith... if we believe him the joke is on us.”

I could go on with this, but space is limited, any interested reader can get my book “Let Us Reason Together-Christianity vs Atheism: Which has the Evidence of Science, Logic & History?”, for further study.

The above shows that Ms Cementina's statements that Stenger and Hawking have plausible explanations for what preceded the Big Bang is false. The bigger question may be why do atheists desperately cling onto any wild unsupported theory as long as it's not God? Richard Dawkins, author of “The God Delusion” has even been willing to suggest that aliens may have seeded Earth! If E.T. could have done it, why not God?

Has science buried God? Why not admit as British astrophysicist Fred Hoyle reluctantly did “A common sense interpretation of the facts suggests that a super intellect has monkeyed with the physics. As well as with chemistry and biology, and there are no blind forces worth speaking about in nature. The numbers one calculates from the facts seem so overwhelming as to put this conclusion almost beyond question.”

Or as agnostic Dr. David Berlinski concludes:

“Has anyone provided proof of God's non-existence? Not even close, has quantum cosmology explain the emergence of the universe and why it is here? Not even close. Have our scientists explain why the universe seems to be fine-tuned for the existence of life? Not even close . Are physicists and biologists willing to believe in anything as long as it is not a religious thought? Close enough. Has rationalism and moral thought provided us with an understanding of what is good, and what is right and what is moral close enough? Not close enough. Has secularism in the terrible 20th century been a force for good? Not even close to being close! Is there a narrow and oppressive orthodoxy in the sciences? Close enough. Is anything in the sciences or their philosophy justify the claim that religious belief is irrational? Not even in the ballpark! Is scientific atheism a frivolous exercise in intellectual contempt? Dead on!”

Does science seem to point to God? While since Ms Cementina used the discovery of the cosmic background radiation at Bells Labs in her article, lets ask the scientist there, Dr. Arno Penzias, who won a Nobel peace prize for this discovery. He says “Astronomy leads us to a unique event, the universe was first created out of nothing, and delicately balanced to provide exactly the condition required to support life. In the absence of an absurdly improbable accident, the observations of modern science seem to suggest an underlying, one might say, supernatural plan.” He further concludes “the best data we have are exactly what I would have predicted had I had nothing to go by the five books of Moses, the Psalms, and the Bible as a whole.”

God is still the best answer with the most explanatory power for the reality we see all around us, from the Big Bang, to the human mind, to the smallest cell. I'll take that over everything coming from “nothing” any day!

