

Why an Entrenched Dismissiveness of a Big Bang Creation is Anti-Scientific

“And consequently [an orator] will be able to get his way before a popular audience not by instructing but by convincing?” — Socrates¹

It’s an obvious question. If, as many Christians claim, it is really the case that scientific data indicates God created the universe, then why is it that many lauded scientists today deny that assertion? By the end of Stephen Hawking’s life for example, he denied a singular beginning of the cosmos from out of nothing and so dismissed the God of the Bible as an Agent that accounts for its existence.² Hawking ultimately died as an atheist³ thereby giving an impression to multitudes of non-specialists that is highly consequential to the question of the existence of God. And Hawking is not alone. Numerous advanced-degreed cosmologists and physicists are reviving the previously-held view that the cosmos has existed forever so that the challenge posed by a universe-with-a-beginning can be cast to the wayside.

Prior to the 20th Century the Bible and its supporters stood alone their assertion that the cosmos had a beginning out of nothing (Genesis 1:1). With the discovery of the Big Bang (BB) however, that all changed. The main rival scientific cosmogonies,⁴ the “steady-state” and “oscillating cosmos” models were discarded due to discovery of the BB on the basis of the mounting body of empirical evidence solely in its favor.⁵ With this dawning realization that the cosmos has come into existence from out of absolutely nothing, atheism lost a key aspect of its intellectual status. Albert Einstein and Sir Arthur Eddington are two former atheists who conceded that atheism was given a death blow by the BB.⁶

Nevertheless, within the “scientific” community the tables have been turning back toward previous cosmologies that support (allegedly) an eternal, self-existing cosmos. It is vital to notice however that this shift is due **not** to a change in direction of the weight of the *empirical* evidence away from a beginning, but rather of a shift in the weight being placed onto *philosophical* (non-scientific) commitments that are impotent to impacting actual evidence. Traditionally scientists have understood their mission to be investigating phenomenal (empirical) evidence by following where it leads. Today however, there is an inclination among scientists to decide in advance of the research to refuse to follow whatever evidence that leads in an undesired direction. Logic dictates that if nothing existed prior to the universe, then the cause for its existence would of necessity demand a creator who transcends⁶ our cosmos. Even though Einstein and Eddington and, more recently Antony Flew, renounced their atheism for reasons of the reality of the Big Bang and its implications, many cosmologists today fail to take that very step based on a prior refusal to entertain the possibility that a creator of the heavens and the earth exists. The fundamental question then that this paper poses about this reversal in thinking *scientifically* about the cosmos is whether these allegations are based truly on scientific data, or merely speculation.

1. It is Stephen Hawking who has flirted most glaringly with the boundary between empirical facts which are testable and, on the other hand, abstract (non-testable) speculations. His first transgression entailed his use of “**imaginary time.**” In his book, *A Brief History of Time*, with

¹ E.V. Rieu, ed. Socrates. *Plato’s Gorgias*. (Penguin, 1960), p. 37.

² Stephen Hawking and Leonoid Mlodinov. *The Grand Design*. (Bantam, 2012), p. 129.

³ https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2018/03/14/im-not-afraid-what-stephen-hawking-said-about-god-his-atheism-and-his-own-death/?utm_term=.4471c66a3952

⁴ A “cosmogony” is a scientific theory of the causal origin of the cosmos (commonly known as the universe).

⁵ See both my paper, “Was the Big Bang the Big Beginning?” pp. 4-5, which can be accessed, together with all of my documents, at my website: www.christianityontheoffense.com, ** and Fred Heeren. *Show Me God*, 2nd revised ed. (Day Star, 2004), ch. 5.

⁶ Hugh Ross. *The Creator and the Cosmos*. (RTB, 2018), pp. 80-82. ** William Lane Craig. *Reasonable Faith*, 3rd ed. (Crossway, 2008), pp. 128. ⁶ To “transcend” is to exist outside of material creation.

respect to Quantum Mechanics he posited that *time* came into play after *space* already existed, hence there was no absolute beginning of the universe. Yet one major problem (among others) with that suggestion was that his equations required a conception of time which was imaginary (divorced from reality), that is to say, he invented it out of whole cloth⁷

2. More recently Hawking (and Mlodinov) build their thesis on an imaginary “**nothing.**” For example they stated in The Grand Design, “*Because there is a law like gravity, the universe can and will create itself out of nothing.*”⁸ Since they were utterly dismissive of philosophy on their first page (p. 5), it is no wonder that confusion in matters of logic runs through their entire book. The problems pervading their work include firstly an incoherent use of the very term “nothing.”⁹ Secondly, *gravity* (a measurable scientific force that exists only in *actual* fields) is obviously something and not nothing. To suggest that nothing can create something is to commit the logical fallacy of *begging the question* by assuming the prior existence of something (which in their case doesn’t exist) in order to “account for” it arising from absolutely nothing!
3. Later on they betray their non-scientific commitment to “*the concept of scientific determinism, which implies...that there are no miracles.*”⁹ What they have effectively done is ruled out the possibility of a Creator on the authority of their scientific degrees in spite of the reality that no data that scientists investigate can possibly answer that question, even in principle.¹⁰
4. Atheist theoretical physicist Dr. Sean Carroll in a public debate with theologian William Lane Craig belittled Christianity for being irrelevant to the *scientific* reality that undergirds cosmology. Yet when challenged by Dr. Craig, Carroll too failed to produce a single specific example that could overthrow Craig’s harmonization of the BB with the declaration of Genesis 1:1.¹¹
5. Astrophysicist Lawrence Krauss argues that since “*a universe manifesting a flat geometry [indicates that] the total Newtonian gravitational energy of each cosmic object is zero [because] the positive energy of motion is exactly cancelled out by the net energy of gravitational attraction. Therefore the net energy of the universe is zero.*” Although Christian astrophysicist Hugh Ross concedes that the cosmos is very nearly flat, he nevertheless declares Krauss’s proposal to be invalid on the grounds that the cosmos is much *more* than gravity. It also consists of physical entities. For example, a 16 lb. ball is **not** gravity, but a very heavy object that hurts if dropped on one’s toes!¹² The entirety of its existence consequently requires an omnipotent Creator.
6. There are increasing numbers of scientists who appeal to a **multiverse**¹³ (in contrast to **universe**) as a means to discredit the declaration of Genesis 1:1 that God created everything in a unified creation. Yet that theory can only ever rest on **non-scientific-conjectures** for the reason that it

⁷ Hugh Ross. Op.cit. (6), p. 132. By “whole cloth” is meant a fabrication that can’t be drawn from anywhere in nature.

⁸ Op.cit. (2), p. 180.⁹

⁹ John Lennox states in God and Stephen Hawking, (Lion, 2011), P. 44, states that Hawking “*has signally failed to answer the central question [which is] why is there something rather than nothing.*” Indeed, Lennox’ entire book is a devastating point-by-point-specific rebuttal of Hawking’s fallacious thesis. ** C.S. Lewis’ anticipates one of Lennox’ points concerning the *laws of nature* by stating in Miracles. (Macmillan, 1947), p. 71. “*They produce no events; they [laws] state the pattern to which every event—if only it can be induced to happen – must conform, just as the rules of arithmetic to which all transactions with money must conform – if only you can get hold of any money.*”

¹⁰ “Scientism IS NOT Science,” Op.cit. (5).

¹¹ See my paper, “Sean Carroll’s Sleight-of-Hand Evasion of a Creator.” Op.cit. (5).

¹² Op.cit. (5), p. 144.

¹³ The word “multiverse” stands for the existence of potentially millions of universes that are separate from our own. ¹⁴ Op.cit. (5), pp. 144-153.

is conceptually impossible to engage with any cosmos except our own which in fact points to a singular beginning which is consistent with Genesis 1:1. Dr. Hugh Ross lays out his summations of these very driving speculative tendencies which are occurring in scientific communities with respect to origins as follows:

*“What all these scenarios share, with one minor exception, is that they are **immune from possible experiential or observational falsification**. No physical technology existing or possible will permit astronomers to observe phenomena earlier than 10 to the minus 35 seconds after the creation event in big bang cosmology...”¹⁴*

With respect to quantum gravity theories astrophysicist Dr. Ross states, *“the foaminess of spacetime is a theoretic consequence of the energy uncertainty principle. While such individual spacetime fluctuations (foam) would be infinitely small...the **fluctuations would accumulate** (become frothier) over long path lengths. This accumulation would blur the images of the most distantly observed sources, such as quasars....**because of the lack of blurred images of distant quasars, blazers, and gamma burst objections, their speculation** [over the role of quantum mechanics in the early universe] **their speculations now are much more restrained...The lack of blurred images... demonstrates the biblical principle that the more we learn about nature the more evidence we will uncover for the supernatural handiwork of God.**”¹⁵*

*How might a minority of scientists persist in these singularity-defying theories? A less satisfactory test of these speculations is that for any one [of them] to possibly be true it **must be able to generate the features of the universe that astronomers observe**. This test is less satisfactory in that it provides **no positive evidence** for the scenario. It merely shows that the scenarios explanation for the universe is not an absolute impossibility...(boldface mine).”¹⁶*

Notice that in all of the above cases except for Hugh Ross’s, the arguments being advanced were **not** grounded on scientific data, but on omitting it by instead reaching into conjectures that even in principle evade scientific scrutiny. Despite being paraded by scientists, the “scientific” case *against* the Big Bang isn’t scientific at all!

On posture held by a significant sector of the scientific community effective commits the bait-and-switch tactic by appealing to their authority to pronounce their “scientific” judgments on the grounds of being certifiably-trained and publicly-acclaimed scientists. Yet two conditions apply:

1. Despite holding their academic degrees, scientists are experts only in their respective fields.
2. In order to earn their authority as a scientist concerning any matter they must support their viewpoint by appealing to *scientific* data and observations as opposed to mere conjecture.

¹⁴ Op.cit. (5), p. 105f.

¹⁵ Op.cit. (5), p. 103.

¹⁶Op.cit. (5), p. 106.

Former atheist, the late Antony Flew put the matter this way in regard to the question of Intelligent Design,

“Of course scientists are just as free to think as philosophers as anyone else. And of course not all scientists will agree with my interpretation of the facts they generate. But their disagreement will have to stand on their own philosophical feet. In other words, if they are engaged in philosophical analysis, neither their authority nor their expertise as scientists is of any relevance.”¹⁶

Rev. Gary Jensen, © April 5, 2020
Holy trinity Lutheran Church (NALC), Berlin, PA, USA

¹⁶ Antony Flew with Roy Abraham Varghese. [There is a God: How the World's Most Atheist Changed his Mind](#). (Harper One, 2007), p. 90f.