

## Answering my Opponents in Regard to Atheist Dr. Peter Atkins

### Background

In a debate between Christian philosopher of science, Dr. William Lane Craig, and atheist professor of Chemistry, Dr. Peter Atkins, the latter stated (8:37) that he didn't have to prove the non-existence of God, but merely demonstrate that appealing to any possible god is unnecessary to account for the existence of the universe (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hVCVt-dvVOc>). So I took up his challenge by writing my paper, "The Scientific Impossibility of Our Universe Creating Itself" which can be accessed at my website: [www.christianityontheoffense.com/articles](http://www.christianityontheoffense.com/articles)). Then I announced it in the comment section of the debate by three weeks ago stating, "*The scientifically-substantiated fact of the Big Bang singlehandedly demolishes Peter Atkins' claim of a universe coming into existence by naturalistic causes. Absolute physical nothingness prior to the "zero-volume" cosmic beginning lacks any possible means to produce anything.*" Even more recently I repeat, I posted, "*See my rebuttal of Dr. Atkins' premise by searching: 'article, 'The Scientific Impossibility of Our Universe Creating Itself.'*" Just a few days ago I began receiving multiple challenges to my position from several opponents now listed; my **opponents** in **red**, and **myself** in **blue**. By the way, you may wish to return to this conversation at a later time since it is possible that other like-minded skeptics may join the conversation.

#### **DocReasonable**

**Who said there was nothing before the Big Bang?? And proposing supernatural magic as the origin of everything because you don't understand science is puerile**

#### **@garyjensen3004**

**What's up Doc? That authoritative scientists speak of a "zero volume beginning at the BB indicates the non-existence of anything at all prior to it. How do you know on scientific grounds that there was something before it? You're just guessing. Secondly, it is you, the 'reasonable Doc,' who bear the burden of scientifically accounting for physicality deriving from nothing at all. BTW, I am "just" (as you imply) a pastor.**

#### **@Garrison169**

**Why not say the universe (or possibly the multiverse) has always existed and save a step?**

#### **garyjensen3004**

**Because no empirical evidence exists that indicates that there is any such thing as a multiverse, a view that rests instead solely on speculation**

#### **@Garrison169**

**Every discovery in science began with speculation. It would explain why this universe is so well adapted to life. Interestingly, there are a few parameters that would make our universe better for life. Maybe they exist. Your god of the gaps may shrink into nonexistence if the multiverse is discovered. I can see why you want to deny the possibility of it. It wouldn't be the first time that religion impeded science.**

#### **Gary Jensen**

**I am surprised that you are charging me with the "god-of-the-gaps" ploy. Since it is at this point in time true that no known or even conceivable naturalistic alternative of a causal agent has been presented, it is your position which is in principle committing the parallel fallacy of the "place-holder of the gaps." "Maybe"-placeholders don't qualify as evidence**

@Garrison169

What caused the BB is not yet known, but that does not mean that your god did it. The god of the gaps will get smaller as science progresses.

Gary Jensen

My article, "The Scientific Impossibility of Our Universe Creating Itself," in the first two paragraphs answers why science has no means to bring a universe into existence.

Correction, should say first page.

@DocReasonable

The universe has always existed. Looks like you've wasted a lot of time on hot air.

@DocReasonable

How do we explain the beginning of the universe? A better question would be WHICH beginning? In 2016, a team of mathematicians from Canada and Egypt have used a staggering set of equations to work out what preceded the universe. They didn't find any gods. They concluded, via quantum mechanics, that the universe basically goes through four different phases. More importantly they discovered what came before this universe was -- another universe or more accurately another 'cosmological phase'. The universe is expanding, and the expansion is speeding up, but the team finds that certain modification motivated by quantum mechanics will ultimately halt the expansion and pull the whole lot back to a near infinite point – at which stage the universe will start expanding again, as per the Big Bang.

@garyjensen3004

The problem with your claim is that the "staggering set of equations" you appeal to excludes empirical facts and data that can be tested. So that venture does not qualify as scientific.

@DocReasonable

So, what are the 'empirical facts and data' that support your religious screed? Were you able to ascertain the molecules that made up the magical fairy dust Yahweh used to create an entire universe?

@garyjensen3004

So since it can't create itself, what then is your alternative?

@DocReasonable

Please present those two paragraphs here (which I mentioned at top of this page). And Like I've told you several times, the universe/reality are eternal.

@DocReasonable

I did suggest that you read the article in the Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics. Non-singular and Cyclic Universe from the Modified GUP.

Gary Jensen

I will read it, though I have every reason to doubt it for the very reasons I already stated. Indeed, I have just visited that article. The problem is that even if the universe did collapse back on itself, the result would be so unstable that no conceivable smooth rebound would be impossible. Chaos, not cosmos, would result.

[@DocReasonable](#)

If a god did create the universe, it's not the simple-minded genocidal tyrant of the bible. I hope you're aware of that much, at least.

[@garyjensen3004](#)

I won't address your simple-minded offensive personal attacks, but instead suggest that you have failed to offer a sufficient causal agent capable of creating an entire cosmos.

[@DocReasonable](#)

[@garyjensen3004](#) I don't want to read your creationist screed, thanks anyway

Gary Jensen

When you employ the term, "universe/reality" I assume you are conflating the words by equating them. My view is that the universe is instead not eternal as demonstrated by the "zero-volume" conditions prior to the Big Bang beginning of the cosmos from out of nothing. I hold further that the God of the Bible (Genesis 1:1) is the only conceivable "sufficient cause" available that can account for the existence of the finite universe (with respect to both duration and extent). Neither "magical fairy dust" (as you framed it) nor even quantum physics.

[@garyjensen3004](#)

I sincerely appreciate your questions. However, I notice that you have yet to offer an alternative, naturalistic, cause of the universe that stands up to rational (or should I say "Reasonable") scrutiny, Doc?

Gary Jensen, NALC Lutheran Pastor, retired © August 27, 2024

Gjensen549@gmail.com \*\* Christianityontheoffense.com \*\* offensivechristianity.blogspot.com

M.Div. Degree, Luther/Northwestern Theological Seminary \*\* M.A. Degree w. Honors in *Science and Religion*, BIOLA University