

Why the Declaration of Genesis 1:1 has NOT been *Scientifically Overthrown*

It is 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 his life for example, Stephen Hawking denied a singular beginning of the cosmos from out of nothing and so dismissed the God of the Bible as the Agent for accounting for its existence.¹ Hawking ultimately died as an atheist² 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,³ 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.⁴ 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.⁵

Nevertheless, within the “scientific” community the tables have been turning back toward other cosmologies that support (allegedly) an eternal, self-existing cosmos. It is vital to notice however that this shift is not due 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 ought not to impact the 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 the evidence if it 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 step because of their prior refusal to entertain the possibility that God exists as the Creator of the heavens and the earth (Genesis 1:1). The fundamental question then that this paper poses about this shift in scientific thinking on the cosmos is whether these allegations are truly based on scientific data, or just speculation.

1. It is Stephen Hawking who has flirted most blatantly 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 Stephen Hawking and Leonoid Mlodinov. *The Grand Design*. (Bantam, 2012), p. 129.

² 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

³ A “cosmogony” is a scientific theory of the causal origin of the cosmos (commonly known as the universe).

⁴ 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.

⁵ 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 cloth⁶

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.*”⁷ 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.” 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” its having arisen 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.⁸
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 over-throw Craig’s harmonization of the BB with the declaration of Genesis 1:1.⁹
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!¹⁰ The entirety of its existence consequently requires an omnipotent Creator.
6. There is an increasing number of scientists who are appealing to a **multiverse**¹¹ (in contrast to the **universe**) as a means for discrediting the declaration of Genesis 1:1 that God created everything in a unified creation. Yet that theory can only ever rest on **non-scientific conjecture**

⁶ Hugh Ross. Op.cit. (5), pp. 132. By “whole cloth” is meant a fabrication that cannot be drawn from anywhere in nature.

⁷ Op.cit. (1), pp. 34, 180.

⁸ “Scientism IS NOT Science,” Op.cit. (4).

⁹ See my paper, “Sean Carroll’s Sleight-of-Hand Evasion of a Creator.” Op.cit. (4).

¹⁰ Op.cit. (5), p. 144.

¹¹ 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.

for the reason that it is conceptually impossible to investigate any cosmos except our own which, on *scientific* grounds points to a singular beginning that is consistent with Gen. 1:1.¹⁴

Notice that in all of the above cases the arguments being advanced were grounded **not** on scientific facts, but on ignoring them and instead reaching into conjectures that evade scientific scrutiny. Despite being paraded by scientists, the “scientific” case *against* the Big Bang is not scientific!

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