



October 2013

The Origin of Man

Dear Friend of Radio Liberty,

“The Cosmos is all that is or ever will be.” Carl Sagan

“God is an ever-receding pocket of scientific ignorance that’s getting smaller and smaller as time moves on.” Astrophysicist Neil deGrasse Tyson

“There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy.” Hamlet, Act One, scene 5

“What was around before the universe? It must have been something.’... I get asked that all the time,” observed celebrity astrophysicist Neil deGrasse Tyson in a December 2012 panel discussion at the Connecticut Forum. **“So they’ve got to stick in God where we’re not there yet. And I just say, ‘Well, we’ve got top people working on that. It’s a current frontier. We’re not there yet.’”** (1)

Neither Dr. Tyson, nor others similarly inclined, can explain how those “top people” could discover what existed before the observable universe, and how that discovery would be validated. He simply urges us to exercise faith – **“the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen”** (2) – in academic claims buttressed by abstract mathematics, and not susceptible to empirical confirmation. After all, none of the **“top people”** to whom he alludes would be able to travel through space-time back to the formation of the universe and record what happened for our benefit.

Dr. Tyson is one of the most accomplished scientists in his field, and a singularly engaging public personality. This is why he was selected to host the revival of Carl Sagan's "Cosmos" program. (3) If Sagan's original PBS series offers the template for Dr. Tyson's show, viewers can expect an exceptionally well-produced (4) and consistently fascinating program that will immerse us in the wonders of the universe even as it quietly but insistently evangelizes on behalf of Sagan's view that "the Cosmos" – an impersonal, un-created space-time continuum – "is all there is or ever will be."

Modern physics increasingly resembles medieval theology – a field in which highly credentialed elitists, many of them courtiers of powerful political bodies, furiously debate entirely un-provable assertions in the service of a dominant worldview.

The worldview of the so-called Dark Ages was often focused more on the "divine right" of kings than on the teachings found in the Sermon on the Mount.

Since the modern age erupted in terror and bloodshed in 1789, the dominant worldview has been one in which we live in an impersonal universe devoid of purpose or eternal moral laws. The objective of this variety of science – often called "scientism" in the works of C.S. Lewis (5) and those whom he influenced – is not to discover how the universe operates, but rather to abolish belief in a Creator.

"If we are to be honest," admits Peter Atkins, a former Professor of Chemistry at Oxford, **"then we have to accept that science will be able to claim complete success only if it achieves what many might think impossible: accounting for the emergence of everything from absolutely nothing."** (6) In the service of that ambition, some exceptionally intelligent people have made fools of themselves (7) – to the point of repudiating some of their legitimate scholarly achievements in the interest of their ideology. One prominent example is Dr. Steven Hawking, who effectively re-wrote the laws of mathematics through the invention of a concept called **"imaginary numbers."** Dr. Stephen Hawking is incontestably one of the most intelligent people of our era. His signal achievement was the development of mathematical theorems dealing with the "Big Bang Singularity." **The "problem,"** according to Dr. Hawking, is that **"So long as the universe had a beginning, we could suppose it had a creator."** (8)

This *is* a problem, given that from the perspective of modern physics, the event called the "Big Bang" is simply unavoidable – yet acknowledgment of a primordial creative agency

of any kind *is precisely what the custodians of the modern worldview are striving to avoid.*

Dr. David Berlinski, an elite mathematician and senior fellow at the Discovery Institute, has briefly described the predicament confronted by Dr. Hawking and others who pursue the “final success” described by Dr. Atkins:

“Within general relativity, time has an unvarying direction. If a man is going down toward the Big Bang, it is one thing *before* another, and if he is coming up from the Big Bang, one thing *after* another. This is a feature of the real number system itself. It cannot be changed. Within quantum cosmology [a recently minted concept], however, time has been altered. Very much like a physician who proposes to cure his patient’s infection by infecting him with another affliction, Hawking suggested that in going down toward the Big Bang, one mathematical regime (that of the real numbers) would somehow give way to another (that of the imaginary numbers).”

“It was the use of the word *imaginary* in this context that gave his ideas their air of pontifical mystification,” continues Berlinski. **“How can numbers be imaginary? They cannot be.... [I]n Hawking’s scheme, at the point in which the regime of the real numbers gives way, the complex regime takes over. As the physicist descends toward the place formerly known as the Big Bang Singularity, time smoothly executes a transformation all on its own.... There is now a moment corresponding to the magician’s withdrawal of a handkerchief from his sleeve: The Big Bang Singularity has disappeared! It is just gone.”**

The most obvious and important of the myriad questions left begging by that approach is this: If the Big Bang didn’t happen, why does anything exist? How can the universe be an uncaused effect – of nothing? Furthermore, if the current model of cosmology rejects the concept that there was a “before” prior to the existence of the universe, how could Dr. Tyson’s “top people” ever answer the question, “What was before the universe”?

“No less than the doctrines of religious belief, the doctrines of quantum cosmology are what they seem: biased, partial, inconclusive, and largely in the service of passionate but unexamined conviction,” concludes Dr. Berlinski. (10) It is, to be brutally frank, a species of fundamentalism. A small but growing number of eminently qualified – and professionally brave – scientists are willing to admit that this is the case.

Twenty years ago, Dr. David Lindley, formerly a research fellow with the Theoretical Astrophysics Group at the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, published “The End of Physics,” an astringent critique of the search for a “unified field theory” – that is, a theory “that can explain everything,” in the words of theoretical physicist Michio Kaku.

Lindley’s lament is that theoretical physics has destroyed its value as a science by taking refuge in recondite mathematical theories about the origin and structure of the universe (or, in string theory, the “multi-verse”) that are impossible to validate through experimentation. He begins with a question that has occurred to many well-informed and intelligent people who are not elite mathematicians: Why do we assume that the universe is understood through mathematical equations?

“The puzzle becomes a tautology,” Lindley writes. **“Mathematics is the language of science because we reserve the name ‘science’ for anything that mathematics can handle.”** (11)

“The image of the theoretician that emerges from ‘The End of Physics’ is of a surprisingly unsophisticated individual who must anthropomorphize nature to understand it,” summarizes one review of the book. **“I like symmetry and beauty; ergo, nature likes symmetry and beauty. It reminds one of the Parisian animal trainer who teaches his bear to respond to voice commands and concludes that bears speak French.”** (12)

More to the point, that perspective brings to mind the biblical rebuke directed at those who worship the creation, rather than the Creator. (13)

The campaign to devise a “theory of everything” begins with the enthronement of “nothing” as the source of everything. The most impassionate advocates of the new physics are immensely intelligent and well-educated people who immerse themselves in elaborate mathematical abstractions, while treating people of faith with pity or contempt because of our passionate belief in the Unseen. Ironically, the same *bien-pensants* ardently defend a new model of physics that depends entirely on the unproven existence of “dark matter,” “dark energy,” and higher dimensions to which we have no access.

“No one has ever isolated a particle of dark matter, but that hasn’t shaken physicists’ resolve to confirm its existence,” explains Popular Science magazine. **“What dark matter is, nobody knows. But physicists can tell you exactly what it is**

not: ordinary atoms of the variety that make up you, me, and everything else in the visible universe.” (14)

“All the start, planets and galaxies that can be seen today make up just 4 percent of the universe,” points out science commentator Clara Moskowitz. **“The other 96 percent is made of stuff astronomers can’t see, detect or even comprehend. These mysterious substances are called dark energy and dark matter. Astronomers infer their existence based on their gravitation influence on what little bits of the universe can be seen, but dark matter and energy themselves continue to elude all detection.” (15)**

Some theoretical scientists have suggested that we and everything we know – our planet, Solar System, and galaxy – share a multi-dimensional realm with “dark matter” analogues whose existence we cannot perceive. (16) This conclusion is fortified by elaborate theoretical models dealing with phenomena we haven’t observed — and that may be impossible to observe.

Nearly a mile beneath the surface of Lead, South Dakota, in the abandoned Homestake gold mine, physicists are carrying out a project called the Large Underground Xenon experiment (LUX). The researchers are attempting to observe the impact of a fugitive particle of hypothesized dark matter in a xenon receptacle shielded by 70,000 gallons of purified water. (17)

“Knowing more about dark matter will give us ideas about the future of our planet, galaxy, and universe,” insists Nicole Larsen, a fifth-year grad student at Yale, with the fervor of a seminarian. **“This search has implications for how the universe got to be the way it is and for what’s going to happen to us in the future as well.”**

Another sect of the church of quantum cosmology has grown impatient. Rather than awaiting confirmation of the existence of dark matter, the DarkLight project at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology seeks to synthesize dark matter by observing the decay of streaming electrons emitted by a particle accelerator. (18)

The problem with dark matter research, of course, is that although **“We’re pretty sure that it exists (whatever it is) ... we’re not at all sure what we’re looking for,”** points out science reporter Robin Burks. The **“missing mass”** necessary to make the universe fit into the equations **“is believed to be dark matter, but we have no proof of that.” (19)**

All of this assumes, of course, that the mathematical models demanding the existence of dark matter and dark energy are reliable – and that those who are trying to confirm that theory aren't involved in a pursuit as fruitless as Kepler's attempt to force the known planetary bodies into circular orbits, when observation dictated that their motion was elliptical. At least Kepler – who was both a monumentally accomplished scientist and a devout Christian (20) – was honest enough to make his theory conform to the data, rather than continue his effort to do the reverse.

Somebody needs to explain this, politely, to Dr. Tyson.

In the December 2012 forum mentioned above, Dr. Tyson dismissed the concept of the “God of the gaps” – that is, the idea that mysteries inexplicable through scientific means can be understood through faith. That “gap,” Tyson insisted, is a “pocket of scientific ignorance that's getting smaller and smaller and smaller as time moves on.”

The reality Tyson chooses to ignore is that the “gap” continues to grow larger – and presently accounts for ninety-six percent of the universe, which is a respectable approximation of “everything.” That's a pretty big thing to miss.

In an ironic way, abstract theoretical physics, which posits the existence of multiple unseen realms (as many as eleven dimensions, according to string theory) from which our universe sprang, and that may be inhabited with beings that interact with our realm, resonates with teachings found in the scriptures so many robustly despise. If that cosmology is valid, it could possibly help us understand, for example, how Paul was caught up into the “third heaven” (21), or elucidate the teaching that “our struggle is not against flesh and blood,” but rather against “powers of this dark world and against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realms.” (22)

Modern physics insists that such a “dark world” exists. For many of the faithful, contemporary politics demonstrates that its emissaries are running rampant among us.

Notes

- 1) “Neil deGrasse Tyson and Neil Gaiman – Religion vs. Science, God of the Gaps,” found at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4IzHxftS8MI>
- 2) Hebrews 11:1 (KJV).
- 3) “Neil deGrasse Tyson on ‘Cosmos’ remake, Gov’t Shutdown,” PCMag.com, October 12, 2013.
- 4) For a brief preview, go to <http://io9.com/neil-degrasse-tyson-promises-a-whole-new-journey-in-cos-1452878190>
- 5) See, generally, “Mere Christianity,” “The Abolition of Man,” and “The Magician’s Twin,” for some of Lewis’s insights regarding “scientism.”
- 6) Quoted in “The Devil’s Delusion: Atheism and its Scientific Pretensions,” by David Berlinski (New York: Basic Books, 2009), pg. 95. Note that Dr. Berlinski, a Princeton-educated elite mathematician and senior fellow at the Discovery Institute, is not a Christian fundamentalist, but rather a self-described non-believing Jew. The point of his book is not to abet hatred toward non-believers, but to defend the proposition that religious faith and serious scientific scholarship are entirely compatible.
- 7) Romans 1:22 comes irresistibly to mind, as does Ps. 14:1.
- 8) Berlinski, pp. 70-71.
- 9) Ibid., pp. 101-102.
- 10) Ibid., pg. 104.
- 11) “Perhaps This Universe Is Only a Test,” Dick Teresi, New York Times, September 5, 1993.
- 12) Ibid.
- 13) Romans 1:25.
- 14) Popular Science, November 2013, pg. 38.
- 15) “What’s 96 percent of the Universe Made Of? Astronomers Don’t Know,” Space.com, May 12, 2011.
- 16) “The Possible Parallel Universe of Dark Matter,” Discover, July/August 2013; see <http://discovermagazine.com/2013/julyaug/21-the-possible-parallel-universe-of-dark-matter#.UnAxTxAmM2F>
- 17) “In former gold mine, scientists lie in wait for dark matter,” Phys.org, October 17, 2013.
- 18) “MIT attempts to make its own dark matter,” Dvice.com, October 28, 2013.
- 19) Ibid.
- 20) See “Can a Scientist Be a Christian? The Testimony of Johannes Kepler,” at <http://www.faithalone.org/magazine/y1989/89feb4.html>
- 21) 2 Corinthians 12:1-4.
- 22) Ephesians 6:12, NIV.

William Grigg

When I was a boy, the United States was a Christian nation, but the U.S. is not a Christian nation today. Why did America change?

The U.S. has changed because a small group of evil men (the Brotherhood of Darkness BOD) has gained control of: (1) The U.S. military, (2) Six banks that control over 90% of the financial assets of our nation, (3) Most major corporations, (4) The U.S. education system, (5) The religious seminaries, (6) The six corporations that control 90% of the major media outlets, and (7) They have purchased the support of the politicians that rule our nation.

What is their goal? I believe most members of the BOD are atheists who want to produce a better world, but some worship Lucifer, and want to destroy Christian civilization.

What is the basis of that belief? If you would like to verify the Satanic nature of the group that controls the U.S., the Trilateral Commission, access their web site: www.trilateral.org, and examine their logo.

It consists of 3 curved arrows, three 6s joined together by an upside down broken cross: **i.e. 666.**

We are involved in a spiritual battle for the souls of men and the survival of Christian civilization.

If you are in a position to help maintain Radio Liberty or advertise on my programs, call 800-544-8927.

Barbara and I appreciate your loyal support, and your faithful prayers.

Yours in Christ,

Stanley Monteith