

# The *Scientific* Impossibility of a Universe Creating Itself

Atheist<sup>1</sup> Peter Adkins' Futile Denial of the "Necessity" of God

In his public debate with Dr. William Lane Craig on the question, "Does God Exist?,"<sup>2</sup> atheist, Dr. Peter Adkins<sup>3</sup> conceded that he cannot actually "prove" the **non**-existence of a god (of any kind). Rather he declared the thrust of his argumentation to be that any conception of "**god**" is **utterly unnecessary** to account for the brute existence of the cosmos, let alone its present state.<sup>4</sup> Yet by so doing, Adkins, as a self-acclaimed champion of "science" also, roundly exposes his *own* position to refutation by means of the same intellectual grounds he claims to champion in his relentless disparagement of "religion."<sup>5</sup>

*Empirical* evidence, which by definition pertains to *actual* (**non-theoretical**) factors that, for that reason, are perceptible, measurable, testable, and ubiquitously<sup>6</sup>-repeatable, compellingly-indicates that the physical universe came into existence from out of a "*zero...volume beginning*." Physicist Paul Davies writes, "*If we extrapolate [backwards with respect to the expanding cosmos] we reach a point when all distances in the universe have **shrunk to zero**... For this reason cosmologists think of the initial singularity as the beginning of the universe.*" Furthermore he writes, "*On this view the big bang (BB) represents the creation event...not only of all matter and energy in the universe, but also of space-time itself.*"<sup>7</sup> Indeed, this view is embraced by renowned physicists,<sup>8</sup> some of whom are **not even sympathetic** to theism.<sup>9</sup>

This very body of facts, in and of itself, renders the notion of a materialistically-caused (atheistic) beginning of the universe to be **utterly impossible**. The grounds for this prohibition are framed solely by *scientific* demands as opposed to religious dogma. For example, *scientific* events by definition entail (1) *physical* entities that interact in processes with other objects by (2) forces that propel (or impel) them within (3) spatial regions over a (4) duration of time. Yet all four of these factors were **non-existent** prior to the zero-volume beginning that marks the creation of the universe.<sup>10</sup> In light of this utter **absence** of matter and energy and space and time at that beginning moment, there was absolutely no conceivable aspect of reality to draw on through which any *scientific* event could possibly have occurred.<sup>11</sup>

Although the thrust of this paper highlights impossibilities of a *materialist* account of the beginning of existence, I nevertheless also make a **positive** case elsewhere for God's creation **through** the BB.<sup>12</sup>

## Likewise Adkin's Assertion Cannot be Reconciled with *Rationality*

It is clearly the case that numerous advanced-degreed scientists **oppose** the point of this paper. In rebuttal, I highlight the vital distinction between merely appealing to ones' own "intellectual" status (ego) on the basis of academic degrees acquired, as opposed to *doing* actual science by heeding the only arguments that qualify as *scientifically*-sound; i.e. *empirical* evidence (par. 2, above). One common ploy for seeking to evade the above implications of the BB is to appeal to the *multiverse* theory. Neverthe-

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.patheos.com/blogs/unbelievable/2020/11/when-atheism-becomes-unfalsifiable-peter-atkins-and-the-problem-of-evidence/>

<sup>2</sup> William Lane Craig vs. Peter Atkins: "Does God Exist?" U. Manchester, 09-2011 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ssq-S5M8wsY&t=5643s>).

<sup>3</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peter\\_Atkins](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peter_Atkins)

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ssq-S5M8wsY&t=696s> (27:13f).

<sup>5</sup> See my paper, "Scientism is Not Science," at my website, [www.christianityontheoffense.com/articles](http://www.christianityontheoffense.com/articles)

<sup>6</sup> Every *scientific* investigation which follows the same data will arrive at the same conclusion.

<sup>7</sup> Stephen C. Meyer. *Return of the God Hypothesis*. (Harper One, 2021), p. 116. Also S.C. Meyer video, <https://evolutionnews.org/2023/07/joe-rogan-stephen-meyer-did-images-from-mwebb-space-telescope-refute-the-big-bang/> (7:14f).

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>9</sup> Theism stands for belief in a personal God who both created the universe and oversees human affairs.

<sup>10</sup> *Op.cit.* (7).

<sup>11</sup> Hence, I hold that the BB creation was (and is) the most expansive miracle in all of existence.

<sup>12</sup> See my papers, "Was the Big Bang the Big Beginning?" and "God's Prints are Everywhere." At my website: *Op.cit.* (5).

less, that tactic (due to the impossibility of our perceptual access) yields **no conceivable empirical data by which a multiverse** schema can be validated through actual *scientific* knowledge.<sup>13</sup>

A further strategy for staving off the theistic<sup>14</sup> implications highlighted in my third paragraph entail conceding that the solution has yet to be discovered even as they at the same time assure audiences that a *scientific* solution is surely "just around the corner!" Yet that ploy presents three intellectual problems. Firstly it ironically acknowledges that the "solution" to their challenge is **actually not in place**. Consequently, secondly, their "guarantee" of what amounts to an *unspecified* wish, commits the same "god-of-the-gaps" ploy that they decry whenever young-earth-creationists **fail to deliver** on the *scientifically-grounded* evidence that they allege supports their views. Thirdly, they fail to pose even a *potential* pathway as to *how* anything material can come into existence from absolute nothingness.<sup>15</sup>

Additionally, in regard to the habitual refusal of *materialists*<sup>16</sup> to so much as consider the concept of a *personal* creator as the cause of the universe, there is, I reply, no conceivable body of *scientific* evidence (p.1, par.2) to which materialists can appeal, which **prohibits** such a notion as a spiritual realm that is overseen by a personal, omniscient and omnipotent God who intentionally brought all things into existence at creation (Genesis 1:1). Only the Bible presents a rational cause for existence by offering the only sufficient cause of the cosmos; namely, that Being who, by His very essence is eternally self-existent, even as He also transcends<sup>17</sup> the entire expanse of His created order.<sup>18</sup>

Finally, readers may judge it an oxymoron that a pastor (below) should dare to goad a renowned Ph.D. chemist such as Dr. Peter Adkins over a specifically *scientific* contention. My reply is that, that criteria which is decisive in determining the winner of a *scientific* debate consists not of a roster of one's own academic degrees,<sup>19</sup> but rests on the quality, relevance, and sufficiency of the data that is brought to the table. In regard to the debate that launched this paper, I, on the other hand gave counter-evidence which refuted the contention Dr. Adler posed by my naming the initial conditions at the moment of the BB. They entirely rule out the possibility of a creation event having been *caused* by *science*. Indeed, the evidence that I here employed, coupled with the parameters that distinguish science from non-science are freely accessible to **any truth seeker**, whether or not they be a professional scientist!

Rev. Gary W. Jensen (NALC Lutheran)© August 1, 2023

I have both an M.Div. from Luther Theological Seminary in St. Paul, MN (1982) \*\* and an M.A. with Honors in *Science and Religion* from BIOLA University in La Mirada, CA (2016).

Gjensen549@gmail.com \*\* www.christianityontheoffense.com \*\* offensivechristianity.blogspot.com

---

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/does-the-multiverse-really-exist/> "All parallel universes lie outside our horizon and remain beyond our capacity to see, now or ever, no matter how technology evolves...[so that] **none of these claims...can be directly substantiated.**"

<sup>14</sup> Theism is the "belief in the existence of one God viewed as the creative source of the human race and the world who transcends yet is immanent in the world." <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary>

<sup>15</sup> By their insistence that the *so-called* god the Bible (as skeptics usually define deity) cannot possibly be eternal, then they must, in turn, concede that the concept of an eternally-stable cosmos that is in the process of ever-increasing decay, is far, far less-plausibly eternal. \*\* See also High Ross. The Creator and the Cosmos, 4th ed. (RTB, 2019), pp. 85-108. \*\* Rebuttal of Stephen Hawking and Leonard Mlodinow. The Grand Design (rebuttal) by John Lennox. God and Stephen Hawking. (Lion, 2011).

<sup>16</sup> Materialism in the philosophical sense is the conviction that the only entities that are real (or actual) are physical in makeup. There is no spiritual reality and hence no god(s). Peter Adkins is a self-identified materialist. <https://iai.tv/articles/a-universe-of-nothingness-auid-1557>

<sup>17</sup> To "transcend" is to stand entirely outside of the natural order at its Creator ("...*God created the heavens and the earth*" - Genesis 1:1).

<sup>18</sup> "*Take your pick: God or universe. Something always existed,*" Roy Abraham Varghese's essay, "The New Atheism" contained Antony Flew [the renowned former atheist] and Varghese. There is a God: How the World's Most Important Atheist Changed His Mind. (Harper One, 2007), p.165.

<sup>19</sup> This is not to deny that such degrees lack merit altogether. To the contrary, they represent courses of academic instruction at the levels named, which ought to guarantee the level of intellectual competence of the possessor in the areas that the degrees identify. Since, however, the assertion made by Adler (p.1 par.1) was a philosophical (as opposed to a *scientific*) claim, he needed to return to his own turf by advancing data of a kind that is sufficient to *scientifically* account for the existence of an entire universe in the absence of a transcendent God.