

Self-Creation is Impossible:- Degeneration of Genuine Physical Sciences

Written by K B Napier

Thursday, 07 October 2010 15:06

Professor Stephen Hawking, a theoretical physicist of brilliance, said in 2010 that the universe created itself, from nothing – God was not needed. The absurdity of this statement has been widely recognised, yet has been grasped by evolutionists (evolution itself being another absurdity) as another example of Hawking's brilliance. But, it is not. It is an example of a man stepping outside his area of expertise into the area of spiritual realities (or not).

Hawking also specialises in Cosmology, but many mistake this for Cosmogony. Cosmology looks at the universe as a system, whereas Cosmogony looks at the *origin* of the universe – something no man and no science can ever come to conclusions about! Cosmology has a very limited authority, because most of the universe is too far away to 'test'; even so, at least it uses the scientific method, though most of its conclusions are speculation. But, Cosmogony is outside the remit of any science.

Cosmogony

Scientists claim that Cosmogony is a scientific discipline, but this is sleight-of-hand, for there is no way that men can discover what the origin of the universe is by science! It is just not possible. I say that not as a Christian trying to defend his theology and beliefs, but as a rational man with a thinking mind. I say it because before everything there was nothing. Not just 'nothing' in the everyday sense, but absolute nothing, primary nothing. This 'nothing' is literally nothing, whereas secondary nothing, or 'everyday' nothing, contains elements of matter, even in outer space.

The starkness of this is astounding and incomprehensible, even to physics. Here you have absolute nothing where there is no material existence. Next, in less than the blink of an eye, there is everything! Absolute nothing – everything! No man can explain how that happened. No man can explain everything from nothing.

If there is a wooden chair, this presupposes the existence of wood, which presupposes the existence of trees. So, if one wants to make a wooden chair, he would have to buy wood, and the wood supplier must buy rough-hewn wood from trees cut down for the purpose and generally shaped. But, if there were no trees to begin with, no man could store rough-hewn wood, and sell it on to wood suppliers, who would then sell on finished wood to the man making chairs.

Intellectual Guesswork

Self-Creation is Impossible:- Degeneration of Genuine Physical Sciences

Written by K B Napier

Thursday, 07 October 2010 15:06

Logical? Of course it is! Now apply the same logic to the universe. Scientists can trace materials back to their *secondary* origin. For example, though light is not dependent on the sun, but was made before the sun, in normal, everyday terms, science can trace ordinary light and heat back to the sun. That is as far as it goes, for they cannot trace it back any farther, because, in scientific terms there cannot be light without the sun! Once they have exhausted verifiable facts, they are stuck in the area of speculation. And that is what Cosmogony really is – intellectual guesswork. It is no more than that!

Of course, scientists will accuse Christians (and those who are ‘Creationists’) of guesswork, but go on to use guesswork themselves. The only people who can give a good account of how things came into being are Christians, because we have the account straight from God. That unbelieving scientists do not accept the explanation is irrelevant, because they are basing *their* assumptions on guesswork, with or without a ‘god’.

When they tamper with a subject that has no physical traces or data, scientists are in the realm of philosophy, not physical science. And, to put it in the vernacular – anything goes. Once we start out on a road of philosophy, we are working with ideas that have no physical form and no possibility of being verified as real, let alone provable. In reality, then, anybody can jump into the argument, from trash collectors to mighty professors.

Another way of putting it, is that Cosmogony works with ‘how reality came to be’. In itself this removes it from theology, for theology states that reality has *always* existed. God has always existed, therefore, so has reality itself. You might say “Wait a minute. You just said there was absolute nothing, where there was nothing. So where was God?” No, I have not been caught out.

God has always been, but in a spiritual dimension apart from the physical materiality known to mankind (in this article this is defined as ‘matter’ in all its forms, including energy). God made the universe for men, not for Himself. And, when He made the universe, only then did He make spiritual beings known as angels. These also live in the spiritual ‘world’, which literally has no end and no known connection to materiality known to mankind. However, angels are not eternal, but created, and have a beginning but no end.

The universe is merely another form of reality. It had a definite beginning, will last a few

Self-Creation is Impossible:- Degeneration of Genuine Physical Sciences

Written by K B Napier

Thursday, 07 October 2010 15:06

millennia, and will then be destroyed. The materiality known to man will disappear and be replaced by another kind of materiality known to God and spirituality. The closest we can come in concept is the world when it was immediately made, but not after Adam and Eve sinned. Yet, it will also be different, for it will follow the pattern of the risen Christ, Whose body looked similar but was very different in kind.

When created matter is burned to nothing at the end of time, we do not know if everything will then revert back to absolute nothing, but we do know that God will create a new heaven and earth, *probably* from absolute nothing. I insist it will be from absolute nothing for a very good reason: God cannot have sin in His presence, so He cannot create new matter from tainted material (existing matter). It has to come from absolute nothing, that is, the 'mind of God'. So:

Absolute Nothing ? Creation (Universe) ? Absolute Nothing ? Creation

We can see that the universe (and time) 'appears' in the middle of two phases of absolute nothing! Then along comes another creation and universe, though of a very different kind, typified by the risen body of Christ. In both cases what was made emanated from the mind of God, not from extant physical matter.

Time

Time, too, is only a temporary concept and structure. It was made just for mankind's life on the material earth. It began when God created the unformed world and will end when God destroys the universe before making another one. After that time will not exist, because, if you like it was 'tacked on' to eternity for our use. In our spiritual home there is no time for there is no beginning and no end to God's abode and existence.

For time to have any meaning it has to use points of reference. The unfolding of these is called 'history', which records the milestones of human existence in a material world. In the spiritual world everything that has ever been, is, or will be, has already happened in the mind of God. For Him it is all 'now'. Thus, time is irrelevant to God and will be to our new existence in heavenly places.

Time, then, did not exist until God created. Science works within time frames and cannot function outside that framework, because without time their assumptions would be meaningless.

Self-Creation is Impossible:- Degeneration of Genuine Physical Sciences

Written by K B Napier

Thursday, 07 October 2010 15:06

This is because their assumptions use time-related equations, which must cease function when applied to eternity (pre-creation). This is another reason why Cosmogony cannot have relevance and cannot work.

Two Restraints on Science

Science - and therefore theorists like Stephen Hawking - can certainly speculate about the origins of the universe, but they cannot ever say it is scientific (in physical science terms) to do so. There are two reasons why it is impossible: Firstly, science can never give us the answer to 'why' the universe came into being. At least not the secular science that has formulated itself over the past few hundred years. Secondly, no-one was at the scene of the creation (whether we refer to it in physical terms alone, or if we use the name of God). Therefore, science cannot verify its own findings, which are bound to be speculative.

Cosmology, though severely restricted by the sheer size of the universe and the inability to prove anything about things so far away (and therefore not within 'testable' distance), is at least *based*

on known science. Again, once it moves away from known data, the 'science' becomes 'philosophy' and is 'fair game' for anyone with a mind, scientist or not.

For example, science might discover the *possibility* of water on a distant planet (or, what they *think*

might be water). This is no problem. But, when they then say 'therefore the planet once had life', they are making philosophical speculation, even though the existence of water anywhere does not necessarily mean life exists, has existed, or will exist. This is because there must be much more than water for life to exist, even on earth. The reason scientists propose the possibility of life because of water is simple: they are evolutionists who believe life began in a swamp! That, too, is just speculation, without a shred of evidence in support, let alone genuine proof.

But, gullible scientists accept it as 'fact', from the non-specialist David Attenborough to senior specialist personnel. Not one of these 'experts' has bothered to test the hypothesis of evolution; they just accept it to be true, because so many others say it is true. Not very scientific and certainly not indicative of the scientific process. All their assumptions are based not on scientific proof, but on a concept that has never been proved to *exist*, let alone proved to work. Yet, they dare to impose Cosmogony on us!

Even the more scientific Cosmology is severely limited by its own scientific process! Anything

Self-Creation is Impossible:- Degeneration of Genuine Physical Sciences

Written by K B Napier

Thursday, 07 October 2010 15:06

that cannot be proved must remain an hypothesis*, no matter how interesting or feasible as an argument. (* An hypothesis is only the foundation of a theory, but the foundation may not be solid or able to bear a theory). Those scientists, then, who work on things beyond the possibility of testing and distance are speculative, no matter how feasible their thoughts. It is true that they can make hypothetical concepts that seem reasonable and genuine, but unless they can actually handle the data, everything they say remains hypothesis and should not be regarded as proven fact.

Cosmogony: Wild-Child of Science

If they cannot prove their speculations then they are simple hypotheses, not full theories, and certainly not 'laws' of science. If this is true of Cosmology, then what of Cosmogony? To put it bluntly, Cosmogony is to Cosmology what Astrology is to Astronomy.

There is a huge inconsistency in the Cosmogonous arguments of physical scientists, for their minds have a naturalistic mindset. The two are not conducive. Yet, as if to give themselves credibility, they use models based on known equations to describe something they can never prove – how the universe began! It does not matter how far back science goes in its investigation, it can never, ever 'prove' how the universe began, or why.

One reason or this is that if they could reach that point, they would be faced with absolute nothing. Then what? Then they would be stopped dead in their tracks by something they know nothing about and which, in scientific terms, is impossible. Creation was somehow 'inserted' into spiritual existence, almost like washing hanging on a temporary line that has been put up and will be taken down again. Yet, because the material existence we are familiar with is not spiritual, it *cannot* exist in the spiritual realm, even as a washing line!

It is a conundrum we cannot solve: first there was God only. Even in that phrase, the word 'first' (implying time) has no meaning, for God is in eternity, not in time. Anyway, 'first' there was God in eternity, which is spiritual. Then came the material universe. Where was it put, if not 'in' the spiritual world? This cannot be solved, for the material world is not the spiritual world, nor is it part of it. Yet, there will be a different form of 'materiality' after the end of time, but its form will be spiritual! Of course, using the word 'materiality' in a spiritual context is inadequate, but we are human and need to use human words. God is separate from His creation... simple to say but impossible to examine or talk about.

Eventually, any investigation into origins (the so-called 'conservation law') MUST end with

Self-Creation is Impossible:- Degeneration of Genuine Physical Sciences

Written by K B Napier

Thursday, 07 October 2010 15:06

absolute nothing, because A produces B produces C and so on. Matter produces matter, because this is how God designed the universe (except for A, which was *not* made from matter).

No physical science can ever produce matter (including energy) out of absolute nothing, not just because they are not God, but because, in scientific terms, absolute nothing is impossible. It is impossible because there cannot ever be a state of absolute nothing, where even secondary nothing cannot exist! Science cannot investigate what does not exist. Nor can it reproduce absolute nothing, because one cannot work backwards from existence to non-existence.

In spiritual terms God lives in what we might call 'absolute nothing'. Yet, we do not know what absolute nothing is, except in human terms. Rather, God lives in a sphere we cannot examine, contemplate, or theorize about, because, to us, it does not exist! We might even argue that God does *not* live in absolute nothing at all, because He created out of absolute nothing and therefore He could *not* have lived in this sphere, because He is totally separate from His creation.

Gravity Falls Down?

Stephen Hawking and others claim that the universe could create itself from nothing, because "theories such as gravity prove it can happen"? But, does it? I have a suspicion that Hawking is talking about secondary nothing rather than absolute nothing, because if he was referring to absolute nothing, then he has made a fool of himself, for nothing cannot produce *anything*, let alone nothing. If the tree did not exist, how is it possible for someone to make a wooden chair? It is simply impossible. Also, gravity requires created material for it to exist and for it to have any kind of formulation and sense. Gravity, then, is relative to existence and matter, whether that matter is 'solid' material or energy.

A variety of sub-atomic ideas are used to try and make cosmology a reality when it comes to origins. But, it does not matter how small or technical you get – you still cannot prove what caused the universe to come into being! Many try this route, but no-one can break the barrier between philosophy and 'physical science' (even though philosophy is, in strict terms, also a science).

Stephen Hawking bases his Hartle-Hawking theory on calculations from the path integral (Feynman). However good it all seems on paper, blackboard or white board in mathematical terms, the theory is only speculation, not proven science. It is quantum and so cannot be

Self-Creation is Impossible:- Degeneration of Genuine Physical Sciences

Written by K B Napier

Thursday, 07 October 2010 15:06

verified by actuality. Quantum theory (quantum mechanics) is... theoretical and not proven. It is 'true' that certain quantum ideas have reasonable solutions, but it does not prove they are true.

I remember in school working on a mathematical equation, writing down my thinking process and coming up with the correct answer. But, the math teacher refused to mark it as correct, because my thinking did not follow normal mathematical procedure. At the time I was rather annoyed, because I had the right answer. But, his point was that though I came up with the right answer on that occasion, because my process was not according to math protocol, I would eventually come up with the *wrong* answer on another occasion.

Some might argue that I had simply found another way to come up with the answer and it would have worked every time. But, there was no way to prove that. This is what quantum thinking is like... right answers might occur most of the time, but because they cannot be tested against proofs they may, conversely, be utterly wrong and the right answers to that juncture are just flukes. In other words, we must treat quantum thinking as speculative... and some of it as philosophy.

Principles Made by God, Not Science

Because God created everything, 'everything' does not necessarily conform to scientific principles devised by mankind! Yes, God created 'laws of nature' so that mankind could fairly predict weather, growing seasons, and so on. Because of this predictability, scientists can fairly predict what things do and why, in the mechanical sense. Even then, they are not always right.

When things we see do not conform to these usual principles, it upsets scientists, who then try to find other ways to describe what is happening. So, along came quantum mechanics, which works on an atomic and sub-atomic level. To put it in a very poor way, what appears to work on a large scale does not work so neatly on the atomic scale, where tiny bits and pieces naughtily do things not expected of them. Yet, this rarely affects the larger scale, where things operate as usual... normally.

It is like saying that, on the bigger scale, $A = B$, but, when we look underneath this workable solution, A deviates to X, then to D, and only then reaches B. For me this is irrelevant, because if the greater picture works, what is the point of finding minor fluctuations? None, apart from satisfying man's curiosity! It certainly does not answer the 'problem' (to unbelievers) of HOW or WHY. So, back to square one.

Self-Creation is Impossible:- Degeneration of Genuine Physical Sciences

Written by K B Napier

Thursday, 07 October 2010 15:06

(A similar 'problem' arises in fractal measures of length, where the length of, say, a piece of wood, is one metre using a normal tape measure. But, when subjected to fractal measuring techniques the length appears to be almost indefinite and very much longer.... which it is. Though true, it makes no difference to the man who wants a one-metre length of wood to fit a one-metre width of space... which it does. The fact that in fractal terms it is maybe several miles long makes no difference to the practical requirement. Therefore, it is not a problem in most cases because the fractal length is subsumed by the 'everyday' length).

Excellent Approximations

Classical physics has been called "an excellent approximation". That is, we have many mathematical equations to 'explain' this or that activity in nature, and they 'work' because mostly they just do. Sometimes, these predictable things are not so predictable, and so quantumers want to find out why. The trouble is, they must use speculation to explain what is almost impossible to see and experience. Nothing wrong with that, until scientists try to fool the public into thinking their 'quantuming' activities are equal to proof.

This is why the idea given out publicly by Hawking (as just one example), that God did not create, is not acceptable. It is unacceptable because he has not explained that his ideas are Cosmogonous (speculative) rather than Cosmological (based on actual science but still highly speculative). If he had given the difference to the public, then they could see it for what it is: guess-work and not proven science; philosophy and not physical science.

We can say that whilst quantum scientists can identify unpredictability in the world that underlie the known theories of science, and even its accepted 'laws', this should not worry the general public, for the general laws everyone is aware of are sufficient for ordinary purposes.

Peas in a Box

To put it another way, unpredictability discovered by quantum means is like peas in a box. They might roll around like crazy – but they are still confined to the box. So long as the peas do not burst forth and roll around everywhere, there is no problem. The box remains the same, as does its position in the environment. What is happening inside the box... different distances travelled by each pea, different times taken to move, etc... is irrelevant to everyday usage, though it might be interesting to thinkers. That is, it is 'only academic' (unless, of course, it has tangible benefits to mankind).

Self-Creation is Impossible:- Degeneration of Genuine Physical Sciences

Written by K B Napier

Thursday, 07 October 2010 15:06

In the same way, Hawking and others can speculate their way all around the universe, but they cannot escape the universe created by God. They can work down to sub-atomic levels, but can never discover HOW the universe came into being. It is impossible, because of the impossibility of absolute nothing. Only God can make something out of absolute nothing! The existence of gravity does not alter this fact in any way. The most it can do is alter perception about what is already contained in the created universe, just like those peas in the box, but it cannot alter the 'box' itself – the creation by God.

Thus, quantumeers only discover the things already placed there by God. That they might not act according to the 'laws' devised by science is irrelevant, though interesting, because the universe will still 'work' as God intended. The minutae will not affect it one bit, because they are subsumed by the greater creation, as we see them in everyday life and 'everyday' laws of nature. They are peas in a box. It does not matter what the peas do inside the box if the box remains the same. Look at the work by Max Planck, or Albert Einstein, and this fact is true. The only change is in perception, not in practical actuality.

Just as moving the furniture on the Titanic did not stop it from sinking, so discovering quantum differences do not alter what God has designed, and does not bring anyone any closer to discovering how the universe was made. We are told that God made it, and that is the most logical thing to say, even though it will not be accepted by evolutionist science. The only thing they will find in quantum physics is the amazing properties of creation by an amazing God. The smaller they go the smaller they must go, because there can be no end to matter in this universe. And the more complex their studies the more complex are the things found, ad infinitum, revealing the divine intelligence behind creation, but not the divine reason.

Ask yourself this: "Is it more reasonable to say a Being created everything, or, that everything was created by itself without the necessary materials to do so?" It does not matter if you believe in God or not to answer that question. We do not live in utter chaos with everything 'evolving' continually – we live in a universe of amazing lawfulness, workability and incredible design. To deny this is to deny and defy logic and one's own eyes.

Speculation, Not Necessarily Fact

One source (srikant.org) asks why we need quantum physics? After all it says, Newtonian physics (the one we all know about) works perfectly well in the usual world of ours. I believe I have answered the question. However, the site says "Quantum theory unveils a new level of reality, the world of intrinsic uncertainty, a world of possibilities, which is totally absent in

Self-Creation is Impossible:- Degeneration of Genuine Physical Sciences

Written by K B Napier

Thursday, 07 October 2010 15:06

classical physics.”

And this is the crux of the matter. I can understand the enquiring mind. I can understand speculative thinking. But, I cannot accept it when speculation about ‘possibilities’ (which are not actualities) are put out as definite laws. Scientists might not intend doing that, but they do, because non-academics accept anything they say wholesale. Indeed, to put them out this way contradicts the reasoning behind quantum physics (which deals in unpredictability)!

It is true that a variety of useful ‘things’ have been given to us by quantum physics. But, they cannot lead us to discover the HOW and WHY of creation. This is the real point. Quantum physics may be able to give us many explanations... except for origins. So, let us finish this paper by returning to the statement that self-creation by the universe is impossible, making the ideas of people like Hawking irrelevant and a waste of time, when it comes to Cosmogony.

God Said

It is my contention that ‘God said’. His mind created everything from absolute nothing. Even secondary nothing is created! (See my article on secondary nothing for an explanation). It is also my contention that if any law of science contradicts this fact, then we must abandon the law of science, not the word of God. However, I have yet to come across a scientific law (that I understand!) that does contradict God’s word... I mean *provably* contradicts.

When I speak of a ‘scientific law’ I refer to genuine laws, which are an “excellent approximation”. I accept that within those laws is the possibility of change or even dismissal, as newer scientific findings take their place or amend them. But, even so, they work just fine! And when they work just fine they coincide with, and conform to, the fact of God’s creation.

The widespread use of evolution hypothesis does not just contradict scripture – it also contradicts the very process of science it claims to work from. This is why so many evolutionist scientists fabricate lies and deception in their research, so as to support evolution hypothesis. And it is this contradiction upon which people like Hawking precariously assemble their quantum theories. That is, speculation built upon speculation.

© October 2010

Self-Creation is Impossible:- Degeneration of Genuine Physical Sciences

Written by K B Napier

Thursday, 07 October 2010 15:06

---oOo---

{loadposition btm_address}