

## How Life Began: A Smorgasbord Presented By Atheists

**Category:** Creation

**Example A)**

"Because the law of gravity exists, the universe can and will create itself from nothing."

Stephen Hawking

**Example B)**

"Only in a few universes that are like ours would intelligent human beings develop and ask the question, Why is the universe the way we see it?"

Stephen Hawking

**Example C)**

"I think the universe was spontaneously created out of nothing."

Stephen hawking

**Example D)**

"Religion is poison because it asks us to give up our most precious faculty, which is that of reason and to believe things without evidence. It then asks us to respect this, which is called faith."

Christopher Hitchens

(Certainly more faith, blind faith, is required to hold Christopher's position: Note he rarely addresses this question: Just "Big Bang").

**Example E)**

“The mystery of the beginning of all things is insoluble by us; and I for one must be content to remain an agnostic.”

Charles Darwin

**Example F)**

“But science makes God unnecessary. The laws of physics can explain the universe without the need for a creator.”

Stephen Hawking

**Example G)**

“I have often felt that man is a stranger on this planet, a total stranger. I always played with the fancy maybe a contagion from outer space is the seed of man.”

Eric Hoffer

**Example H)**

“A radical theory called Panspermia suggests our ancestors are about to arrive from outer space..”

Discover 2015

**Example I)**

“My goal is simple, it is a complete understanding of the universe. Why does it exist, and why it is the way it is.” [Thus we set out to weave the intuitive idea of the multiverse into a rigorous and testable framework for cosmology.]

Thomas Hertog

## Food for Thought

***In the beginning God created the heavens and the Earth. The Earth was without form, and void; and darkness was on the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God was hovering over the face of the waters. Then God said, "Let there be light"; and there was light.***

The Bible's explanation of the beginning of all things is beautiful and quite understandable.

If you reread the quotes I've given you, you will find some of the current theories Atheists/Materialists/Empiricists/et al have recently proffered. None are beautiful, but most are understandable, even if one is permitted to charge that most are more fanciful than scientifically sound.

Truly, all of the theories put forth were inventions of necessity. The need to find an alternative to the Genesis account has sparked a cottage industry.

As you wade through this highbrow brush, please keep in mind that these morsels are straight from the kitchens of the crème de le crème of the planet's most renowned Atheist thinkers.

Most of our chefs rely on two pillars:

A) The argument from authority

I am a scientist and bright, therefore believe me no matter the topic and in spite of my tap-dancing around the fact that I'm not being scientific.

B) We are your priests and gurus

You've bought my books, you've listened to my self-congratulatory videos, or you've listened while one of my fellow "brights" amens all that I say. You are my disciples, and likely own several of my t-shirts, the ones with slogans like "Truth is a rainbow" on the back. If you haven't purchased any, you're naughty. They are available through our online store, Science and Nothing but Science.

That pretty well explains the Atheist purveyors you are poised to encounter.

Their disciples will be a part of the average folks you will discuss things with.

Should you feel the need to laugh at some of the theories offered, be kind, this is the best their best has to offer.

“Because the law of gravity exists, the universe can and will create itself from nothing.”

Stephen Hawking

You recall what I said earlier correctly. I said Hawking was the brightest of The Traveling Medicine Show troupe. This wasn't his best moment. This is a clear case of a desperate scientist being obnoxiously unscientific. Stephen wrote this for his bestseller, The Grand Design. With that title, you can probably guess the theory put forth; yep, there is no design.

Stephen concedes in his book that the scientific evidence that has rolled in, in the past 50 years, has militated against him. He also concedes that he understands, following the reveal of the new scientific evidence, how you might be more inclined than ever to conclude the universe has a Designer.

Stephen asks that his disciples not lose their faith. After all, Stephen desires that you trust him more than those pesky old facts that science used to rely on. Stephen then pulls back the magic curtain to reveal multiverse (applause please).

But, before I explain the multiverse, let's look at the renowned scientist being his unscientific best! I should add that The Grand Design opens with the proclamation that “philosophy is dead”. He goes on about science being the end all of truth and such. Stephen did overlook the fact that the statement, “philosophy is dead”, is itself a non-scientific, dare I say a philosophical statement. Oh well, as I often say, nothing is quite as pitiful as a scientist playing philosopher. It is back to,

“Because the law of gravity exists, the universe can and will create itself from nothing.”

I do wish Stephen were still alive. I'd enjoy watching the way he'd tried to wriggle out of such a statement.

Look, do you recall our talk about the laws of probability in our discussion on chance? Laws “describe”, they do not “cause”. The law of gravity simply describes what gravity does.

“...The universe can and will create itself...”

My friend, if the law of gravity exists, it is because gravity exists. What does it take for gravity to exist? It requires at a minimum a "something", so Stephen without a word of explanation has already solved the insoluble, he has wrangled something out of nothing. It would have been decent of him to at least let us see the magic trick.

It feels a bit presumptuous for Stephen to say he can read the mind of the universe, all his degrees duly noted. The universe can create itself from nothing (even if his nothing is something as I noted)? Self-creation? Something has being before it is? We did cover this in an earlier question, so I won't rehash the silliness of it here.

I hope you can smell the doo-doo Stephen dumped on you and me and millions of his adoring fans in The Grand Design. But Stephen isn't finished. Get prepared for the cosmic wonder that is multiverse.

### The Multiverse

Multiverse is Stephen's response to

"The evidence is militating against us, the systems are too complex; the human is too complex, and the universe is too finely-tuned."

To expect this from randomness is too much to ask anyone to swallow who isn't a devoted disciple already.

In 2010, The Grand Design was published. It was quickly a New York Times #1 Bestseller. I, like most others, cite Stephen Hawking as the author. In fairness, the book was written by Hawking and Leonard Mlodinow.

Any summation one chooses quickly poses a problem. If my stated goal is to be met, that of enabling ordinary people to converse with other ordinary people with a differing opinion, how am I to best do this with a theory like multiverse without defining all the unknown terminology that men like Hawking constantly employ? Where do I draw the lines as your helper? What do I explain simply and what do I pass over? The kicker is that, like all of you, I am more knowledgeable on one topic than I am on another. I am more comfortable discussing morality, purpose in life, and free will.

Coincidentally, I feel those three topics are best understood by the ordinary folks, folks like you and me. Discussions of multiverse, quantum theory, eleven-dimensional m-theory, and the unified field theory often shed little light.

Why? I suspect it's because neither party in the discussion knows the subject well, and in most cases, neither party is certain what light it might shine on the real topic, how did this universe come to be at all. In the end, it's either God or some hopeful but often "wax" theory.

Why do I call all anti-God creation theories "wax" theories? Because they are like moist clay or wax in a sculptor's hands. The theory, like wax in a potter's hands, is able to be shaped and reshaped a thousand times. Why does the theory's sculptor keep reshaping the thing he has made? Because patrons and other artists point out flaws in the ashtray the artist has made. In our case, the ashtray is the scientist's "current" theory (the "wax" theory).

The thoughts I expressed in the previous paragraph are likely the most useful comments I will make on this topic. Why? You can understand now that all the anti-God theories, and Hawking's theory of multiverse is no different, are like ashtrays that are constantly being scrapped and recast due to their flaws. Only one theory has not varied, nor will it ever vary: It is the Genesis, chapter one, account I began my comments on this question with.

I will now attempt to fairly state the multiverse theory, with the briefest explanation possible of the theory and its attendant and supporting concepts.

### Spoiler Alert!

Not even a decade after The Grand Design was published, criticism and critics forced Hawking to throw stones at his own theory. Hawking would prefer I write that he fine-tuned his theory. His fine-tuning of his theory reminded me of a burglar I was once sitting in a cell with. The burglar went on and on about the burglary of this gas station here and that insurance office there, etc. I then boasted of my own burglaries and, of course, boosted the amount stolen in each burglary considerably. Burglar bragging isn't any different than real-estate agent bragging, it's mostly the deal plus a good deal of exaggeration.

The young burglar with me was facing considerable jail time if convicted. When he was pulled from his cell and questioned, he would admit to the burglaries where he couldn't explain away his fingerprints. But, the amounts stolen? His story was that they were all under \$300. He randomly chose \$270, \$175, \$210, etc. Why? Because \$300 or more stolen in a burglary was a felony, less than \$300 was not. This is precisely what Hawking appears to have done before he died in 2018. After bragging up and exaggerating the soundness of his theory in 2010, eight years later he reshaped his tale for the cosmology police and admitted his theory's flaws and recast the publication of his exaggerated claims

as misdemeanors. Burglars, real estate agents, and famous scientists are all pretty much the same man.

But for now I will lay out the multiverse theory, cast as it was, in 2010. The following is as simple a review as I could locate.

### The Times Review of The Grand Design

#### #1 New York Times Bestseller

“When and how did the universe begin? Why are we here? What is the nature of reality? Is the apparent “Grand Design” of our universe evidence of a benevolent Creator who set things in motion – or does science offer another explanation? In this startling and lavishly illustrated book, Stephen Hawking and Leonard Mlodinow present the most recent scientific thinking about these and other abiding mysteries of the universe, in nontechnical language marked by brilliance and simplicity.” (Note: This last statement will be proven false by the next paragraph)

“According to quantum theory, the cosmos does not have a single existence or history. The authors explain that we ourselves are the product of quantum fluctuations in the early universe, and show how quantum theory predicts the “multiverse” – the idea that ours is just one of many universes that appeared spontaneously out of nothing, each with different laws of nature. They conclude with a riveting assessment of m-theory, an explanation of the laws governing our universe that is currently the only viable candidate for a ‘Theory of Everything’: the unified theory that Einstein was looking for, which, if confirmed, would represent the ultimate triumph of human reason.”

#### A couple of thoughts

I think it wise to simply address the review above so that you have a handshake acquaintance with the lingo used. First though, I must mention the “big bang theory”. Proponents of this theory maintain that it is today's best explanation of the observable universe (note emphasis on today's). This, of course, assumes one summarily dismisses the Genesis account (unwise). Frankly, to be today's prevailing theory is not a great achievement, and the prevailing theory today may be the also-ran tomorrow.

The big bang's main reason for being necessary is some folk's insistence that a way be found to make God unnecessary. Hawking said,

*"One can't prove that God doesn't exist, but science makes God unnecessary."*

So, proponents of the "big bang" hold that the universe is the consequence of the laws of physics alone. To these adherents the universe expanded from an initial state of high density and temperature. You should ask,

***"So, there was something, and that initial state of high density and temperature as well? So there was never nothing? Then, when did the nothing become something?"***

As I have said and will say again, their "nothing" *always* is a little "something".

Back to the theory: The further away a galaxy is from Earth, the faster it is moving away from Earth. So, let's extrapolate backwards using the laws of physics. (I think it may still be a violation of the law in some southern states; doesn't it just sound like a crime?) Where does our backwards extrapolating get us? Well, it gets us an increasingly concentrated cosmos preceded by a point of singularity in which space and time lose meaning (kind of convenient don't you think? Don't concern yourself, they will be back.) Well then,

***"How big is this point of singularity? Big as Rhode Island or more like a pinhead? What do you mean no one knows? Huh? Did you say it may be one dimensional or it may not?"***

Confused? You well might be. Might be one of those, "a smart guy said so, so I believe it times"? Even that would be fine, but even a cursory look at what the purveyors say makes you scratch your head. Atheism is a large church with more sects and contradictory doctrines than you can imagine. They never do tell you that, as you likely guessed.

I dare you to ask the proponents to shed a little light on this for you – this is the type of response you get (I'm not making this up).

*"The singularity is a point where volume goes to zero, not where mass goes to infinity. It is a point with zero volume, but which still holds mass, due to the extreme stretching of space by gravity."*



I bet you feel like you are clear on it now, and all owing to that explanation – what do you mean “no”?

In the end, the word theory should be in capital letters at the minimum. But like all such theories, it is molded wax, so it can be reworked a hundred more times. So, we have a point of singularity no one understands or agrees on, but at least it explodes, right? Any reason whatsoever it would have exploded? Quantum fluctuations, not the butler did it. Why? No one knows. Here is as close to an Atheist consensus as I can get:

“The initial singularity was the gravitational singularity of infinite density thought to have contained all the mass and space-time of the universe before quantum fluctuations (told you so) caused it to rapidly explode in the big bang and subsequent inflation, creating the present-day universe.”

“There are places in the universe where our laws of physics simply break down. To understand what a singularity is, imagine the force of gravity compressing you down an infinitely tiny point, so that you occupy literally no volume. That sounds impossible...and it is. These “singularities” are found in the centers of black holes and at the beginning of the Big Bang. These singularities don’t represent something physical. Rather, when they appear in mathematics, they are telling us that our theories of physics are breaking down, and we need to replace them with a better understanding.”

Paul Sutter, There are Places in the Universe Where Our Laws of Physics Simply Break Down, in Live Science

Ugh – little help here. Besides, Bill, you promised infinite universes, not just one. Hang on.

“In fact our universe could be just one of an infinite number of universes making up a multiverse.”

Please notice the use of language such as “could be” and “thought to have contained”. Those phrases don’t instill confidence, do they? The average Joe you speak to won’t understand any more about this than you do, but they have bought this theory up without visiting it, the way a friend once bought a five acre plot in the Amazon jungle. He called to complain that he couldn’t find the five acres or the road to it. Pretty apt corollary to this theory, don’t you think? But it prevails today. Honestly, the reason for all

this is the need to answer, "Why is there life here and nowhere else?". The Hawkins premise is that more universes equals more planets which means, perhaps, more "lucky" planets like Earth. The fine-tuning required to have life here will be discussed later, and it is a death blow to Atheism which has necessitated one inane, and sometimes comical, theory after another to be trotted out.

### **Panspermia**

Let's move on (please). Have you ever heard of panspermia? It's a doozy and it's about four lengths behind the big bang at the three-quarters pole, but it's gaining fast.

Okay, take a deep breath and blame this one, panspermia, on an old Greek. This was first proposed by Anaxagoras in the 5<sup>th</sup> century B.C. Yes B.C.

The hypothesis is quite simple, alien civilizations have been distributing life sperm throughout the universe by a variety of methods. Larry is in charge of cosmic dust distribution, Moe heads up the meteor distribution team, and Curly is in charge of the comet distribution sector. There are, apparently, three shifts working feverishly each day to load and fire off cosmic dust, meteors, and comets laden with alien life sperm. It does appear to be random firing off. The hope is that some life sperm will randomly hit an atmosphere and a planet that has all the fine-tuning our planet has. Then, the life-sperm blossoms into a U.S. Senator, a tiger, and a mosquito in a relatively short time (500 million-500 billion years). But, I'm assured it is rewarding work; everyone loves working at The Sperm Works.

This is the hypothesis – and it's one with zero evidence – that life exists throughout the galaxy and/or universe specifically because bacteria and microorganisms are spread around by meteors, comets, space dust and possibly even interstellar spacecraft from alien civilizations.

In 2018 a paper concluded that the likelihood of galactic panspermia is strongly dependent upon the survival lifetime of organisms as well as the velocity of the comet or asteroid – positing that the entire Milky Way could potentially be exchanging microbiotic components across vast distances.

### **Forbes Article**

Christopher Hitchens once pondered the idea that this planet might be some sort of asylum for the criminals and crazies from other planets and galaxies.

What if it's worse, what if this planet is an alien garbage dump?

Please remember, all of this hypothetical, theoretical, and fanciful is necessary because they need to void Genesis, chapter one.

## Spontaneous Creation/Generation

"I think the universe was spontaneously created out of nothing."

Stephen Hawking

You will hear of this, but it's a bit like the time I was visiting the dog pound, you learn quickly that variety is the correct word for what stands before you. For example, there is a Dachshund. I know little about dogs, but even an ignoramus like me knows what a Dachshund is. On the other side I spied a Miniature Greyhound, A.K.A. an Italian Greyhound. I have been to dog tracks, so I also know what a Greyhound is. But, in the tent-like contraption behind the Greyhound I found something small. I was perplexed. Any idea what this unrecognizable, at least to me, dog was? It was a product of a date between the Dachshund and the Miniature Greyhound. The staff called it an Italian Doxie, but I was afraid to ask why. At any rate, scientific theories are often like Dachshunds, Miniature Greyhounds, and Doxies. That is, they are all dogs, but once you see them in person you know you have a category "dogs" with a lot of variety within it. In scientific theory, you soon figure out that the category is "spontaneous generation/creation", but within that category there are varying types of dogs (theories). The problem is, the scientists are not as good at naming their breeds as the dog breeders are. If God had put a scientist in charge of naming animals, all dogs would be just dogs without a further breakdown.

So, I will give you the classic take on spontaneous generation, then I will do my level best to comprehend which breed Stephen Hawking had at his house.

Spontaneous generation is a body of thought on the ordinary formation of living organisms without descent from similar organisms.

Reread the above. This question arises, "**So what did the organism descend from?**" The answer is "nothing."

Actually, a person believing in this theory would say, "Bill, that's incorrect, I hold that living creatures arise from non-living matter." That does not make

sense to me, but I'm trying to relay it to you so that the true believer in spontaneous generation can't say I misrepresented the theory. By the way, the theory holds that living creatures from non-living matter is commonplace. It's one of those Ho-Hum things, it goes on all the time.

Aristotle looks to be at fault here originally as he was a believer. When science boasts about how intelligent and all-knowing it is, please remember that the scientific choir sang this tune for 2,000 years! Finally this lame "scientific" theory was slain by none other than the only good Frenchman in history, Louis Pasteur.

There is another theory vying for attention... Thomas Huxley, Darwin's bulldog, coined the term "abiogenesis" for a similar but variant theory. In short this theory maintains that all life started from inorganic materials. I only include this to further your education and your perplexity.

In the end, both theories, spontaneous generation and abiogenesis, attempt to explain the emergence of life from "non-living" materials. Abiogenesis purports to explain the generation of the primitive organisms, while spontaneous generation purports to explain the generation of complex organisms.

All I can do is familiarize you with these asinine theories. That Hawking and others held these theories puzzles me. I truly hope he had the equivalent to an Italian Doxie when discussing dachshunds. If spontaneous generation is a dachshund, I want Hawking to be the owner of an Italian Doxie, a Dachshund that isn't truly a dachshund. But, I will give you Hawking's direct quote once more.

"Because the law of gravity exists, the universe can and will create itself from nothing. Spontaneous creation is the reason there is something rather than nothing, why the universe exists, why we exist."

Stephen Hawking

He is very plain here. I'm amazed. It reminds me of what Aristotle once wrote,

"There is a foolish corner in the brain of the wisest man."

**Primordial Soup: A Warm Little Pond**

I've tortured you enough. Rather, I've tortured myself enough. I shall mention only one more candidate that Atheist desperados have put forth from time to time in their crusade to have any theory, no matter how inane, rather than to have God.

**"The fool has said in his heart, there is no God."**

### **Psalm 14:1**

What it means is, no God for me.

Primordial means existing from the beginning of early Earth. The use of primordial dooms this sad attempt at an explanation of "Why is there anything at all?" Why? **The beginning always must begin before their beginning.**

Herbert Spencer wrote a book around 1865, so a handful of years after Darwin published On the Origin of Species by Natural Selection in 1859. His basic idea was that life originated from non-living matter in slow stages. We have seen this idea, or a version of this idea before (in the last few pages). Every time another of these "life from non-living matter" theories canters onto history's stage, I want to quit reading. I don't, but I want to – I am asking why there is anything at all and they answer by saying "my thing was". In other words, I will tell you my recipe, but I don't want to answer why there is a house or kitchen at all.

Charles Darwin himself ventured a guess at how the cake was baked, including the ingredients he'd like to have in his cake. Darwin speculated the original spark of life may have begun in a "warm little pond", with all sorts of ammonia and phosphoric salts, light, heat, electricity and so on. You will note that there is no attempt to answer once again, "Why is there anything at all?" Why do Atheists try to divert your attention from the real question with fanciful recipes with all the ingredients already on the counter of an already existing kitchen in an already existing house? They haven't even one theory of "Why is there anything at all?" to trot out that isn't lame. At least Darwin was smart enough to write that as to the beginning of all things, he found that insoluble.

Last and least, in my mind, and if you ignore today's crop like the Traveling Medicine Show troupe is J.B.S. Haldane. J.B.S. is another Brit. I will reserve my snide remarks about Brits until a later time. He was an evolutionary biologist and mathematician, as you've likely begun to anticipate. J.B.S. was one of the founders of the Neo-Darwinism of the 1920s.

Aside from being a poor dresser, he authored an article on abiogenesis (discussed previously) in 1929. Jack, as his friends and enemies called him, introduced the “primordial soup” moniker to add a catchy name to the early “warm pond” idea. I will not waste more of your time on the theory itself, as it is merely a rehash of others’ ideas. The “chemical origin of life” theory always avoids the question of “Why is there anything at all?” Like the rest of the “no-God-for-me” brotherhood, Haldane’s recipe makes for tedious reading. Here’s a bit of his recipe for life:

### **Recipe for Life**

From: Jack Haldane

- Inorganic precursors (lifeless stuff already on kitchen floor)
- mixture of methane
- ammonia
- hydrogen
- water vapor

Stir and add a pinch of oxygen. Wait 90 minutes for your U.S. senator to appear.

Pretty nifty, don’t you think? Rev up the blender, which turns out to be time if you aren’t careful, and bake for 500 million years, not the 90 minutes forecast above. In the end, the wait is worth it as you get Sam Harris as lead singer in the Atheist, band, Sam The Sham and the Dreamers.

Enough. I needed to introduce you to all these men and their theories because someone just might, though it’s not likely, mention their names or theories. Again, the person bringing them up is certain to know little about them, so relax. Stick to

***“Why is there anything at all?”***

When they attempt to distract you with inane pond scum recipe talk, arrest them, that is, stop them. Politely say,

***“You are answering a question I didn’t ask, let me repeat my question again. Why is there anything at all?”***

The only coherent theory is found in Genesis, chapter one, which is why I began my answer with it:

***In the beginning God created the heavens and the Earth. The Earth was without form, and void; and darkness was on the face of the deep. And the spirit of God was hovering over the face of the waters. Then God said, "Let there be light"; and there was light.***