

## Dark Energy, Dark Matter. Unscientific!

Written by K B Napier

Tuesday, 31 January 2017 10:22

---

This is one of the latest evolutionary ideas from the fold of cosmology. And, like evolution itself, it is a non-starter, as unscientific as they come! Before we look at 'dark energy' and 'dark matter', let me say something quickly about 'cosmology'.

### Big Guesswork

You cannot get bigger guesswork than Cosmology. There is nothing wrong with educated guesses... except when they are marketed as 'science' or 'facts' or 'laws of science'! Cosmological guesses depend on the foundational beliefs of the cosmologist, and there are two main divisions – biblical and evolutionist.

The latter is fixed on evolution, the hypothetical\* fiction that masquerades as true science... and bad hypotheses lead to bad research and bad conclusions. (\*Note: Though I charitably refer to evolution as 'hypothesis' I *really* mean it is a very bad guess, not even to the standard of hypothesis).

The biblical view, on the other hand, is the only logical and scientific view. I say this because wherever science touches on scripture, scripture is found to be accurate, whereas there is no proof whatever for evolution (roughly, one 'kind' changing into another). I also hold to creation because it is God's word, which is absolute.

There is no way at all to prove the legitimacy of cosmological claims, because they cannot be tested scientifically. Prof. Lieu, Chair of Astrophysics, University of Alabama, says this about it:

*"Cosmology is not even astrophysics: all the principal assumptions in this field are unverified (or unverifiable) in the laboratory..."* (17<sup>th</sup> May, 2007. Arxiv.org).

He says that this is a fact, because

*"the Universe offers no control experiment..."*

## Dark Energy, Dark Matter. Unscientific!

Written by K B Napier

Tuesday, 31 January 2017 10:22

---

Cosmology, for all its claimed scientific background is no more than one of the 'philosophies of men' that can lead people down the path of heresy (as it has done in the lives of Theistic Evolutionists). We are warned not to be tempted by what amounts to 'vain deceit', of man's own imagination, not of God. (Colossians 2:8).

Lieu has a delightful way of putting it: he says that cosmologists have become "*comfortable with inventing unknowns to explain the unknown.*"

(As above). Cosmology cannot truly explain what it thinks is 'out there', because there is no way to check it out. Nor will there ever be such a way. In other words, it is unscientific. So, now we have given this warning about the 'science' of Cosmology, let us look at supposed Dark Energy (DE) and Dark Matter (DM), both the brainchild of Cosmology.

### Dark Energy & Dark Matter

We are told that atoms only make up about 4% of the entire universe. The rest is made up of DE (74%) and DM (22%). This begs the question, which screams out of such a claim: ***How do they know?***

Water is made up of hydrogen and oxygen, and we can prove it by checking it in a laboratory. It has been checked in a variety of laboratory studies and no matter what the study, the amounts percent are always the same. Time and again. It has been proved.

*But, in the case of DE and DM we have three major problems:*

1.

No man or instrument can possibly test the universe.

2.

DE and DM have not been proved to exist anyway!

3.

Both are based on the 'Big Bang' myth... also unscientific.

## Dark Energy, Dark Matter. Unscientific!

Written by K B Napier

Tuesday, 31 January 2017 10:22

---

DE and DM, though supposedly filling the universe, cannot be seen or experienced! This is rather like believing in the 'invisible friend' of one of our children, something invented to give comfort!

Scientists have tried for forty years to find DM in their laboratories, without success. But, even if they found DM it would only prove that it existed in their test tubes. There is no way they can prove it exists anywhere else in the universe, because it is impossible to check. They were looking for something they nicknamed an 'axion'. It has turned out to be just an 'invisible friend', costing millions in funding and resulting in nothing. To my mind, the fantasies in a StarTrek programme are more convincing!

DE is supposed to be some kind of anti-gravity force that propels the Universe apart at ever-increasing speed. The problem is that there is no real proof this is happening, or, if it is, that DE is responsible. Yet, both are presented as fixed scientific 'facts'! We may as well claim that Greek gods are throwing the planets and stars around, because *they* would be invisible, too. Indeed, we could say anything we wished; without proof it makes no difference. Cosmologists who work on this mythical stuff admit that DE is 'mysterious'. What they mean is, it cannot be found or tested!

Lieu makes a valid point:

*"...astronomical observations can never by themselves be used to prove 'beyond reasonable doubt' a physical theory. This is because we live in only one Universe – the indispensable 'control experiment' is not available."* (As above).

When cosmologists try to give scientific credence to their claims about DE and DM, Lieu says scathingly:

*"Hence the promise of using the Universe as a laboratory from which new incorruptible physical laws may be established without the support of laboratory experiments, is preposterous..."* (As above).

## **Non-Science to Explain Non-Science**

(Some of the following is quoted from Creation Quarterly, July-September, 2015).

Lieu says there are five evidences where cosmologists use 'unknowns' (i.e. unproved) to explain 'unknowns'. He is quite annoyed that cosmologists pretend to be astrophysicists ('they are not really doing astrophysics'), who claim that the Big Bang caused it all. In the five evidences, the words in italics are not known to real physics (even though they are used in popular science TV programmes as 'laws'):

1.

The redshift of light from galaxies, explained by *expansion of space*.

2.

The Cosmic Microwave Background radiation, explained as the *afterglow of the Big Bang*.

3.

The perceived motion of stars and gases in the disks of spiral galaxies, explained by *Dark Matter*.

4.

Distant supernovae being dimmer than they should be, hence an accelerating universe, explained by *Dark Energy*.

5.

Flatness (space has Euclidean geometry - uncurved) and isotropy (uniformity in all directions), explained by faster-than-light *inflation*.

(Note: This list is also found in 'Evolutions' Achilles' Heels', Creation Book Publishers, 2015).

## Dark Energy, Dark Matter. Unscientific!

Written by K B Napier

Tuesday, 31 January 2017 10:22

---

Prof. Dr John Hartnett says that none of the above would “pass muster” in his laboratory as genuine science, though it passes itself off as ‘precision cosmology’.

As if to highlight the tediously unscientific nature of cosmology, cosmologist Max Tegmark said:

*“... 30 years ago, cosmology was largely viewed as somewhere out there between philosophy and metaphysics. You could speculate over a bunch of beers about what happened, and then you could go home, because there wasn’t a whole lot else to do.” [But now they are closing in on a] consistent picture of how the universe evolved from the earliest moment to the present.”* (Tegmark, M. Precision Cosmology (lecture), MIT World, 7<sup>th</sup>

June, 2008).

Frankly, cosmology is STILL an esoteric subject mooted in a beer hall or pub, rambling unknowns patched together by people who love evolution, using scientific-sounding phrases to ‘explain’ what they cannot. They have built a whole ‘ology’ to ‘explain’ unknowns in terms of unknowability! This is not proof of cosmology becoming more scientific, but proof of a beer-laden chat pretending to be science.

Seeing as DE and DM supposedly make up 96% of all matter in the Universe, how can cosmologists claim to know almost everything about the universe, when they cannot even begin to describe DE and DM, which they themselves have invented and have not proved to exist? They can do it because people are gullible, even scientists. They believe the marketing ploy, that the Big Bang occurred, *ex nihilo* (even though *ex nihilo* from a scientific stance is impossible) Everything they believe after that is predicated on that single false belief, which is itself unverified (and unverifiable) by science.

For more on this subject, read ‘Evolutions’ Achilles’ Heels’, Creation Book Publishers. ISBN 978-1-921643-32-8.

Do not be ready to swallow everything scientists try to foist on you. Drink the antidote before you drink their ideas. The antidote is simple – a reasonable understanding of what science is and how it ought to operate, and a single demand: “Prove it!!” Seeing as Dark Energy and Dark Matter supposedly make up 96% of all space, I should think this is more than reasonable!!

## Dark Energy, Dark Matter. Unscientific!

Written by K B Napier

Tuesday, 31 January 2017 10:22

---

© June 2015

---oOo---

{loadposition btm\_address}