Essay

Stephen Hawking's Hotchpotch

Himangsu S. Pal *

ABSTRACT

Atheist scientists usually say that as there is no evidence for the existence of God so far, so it is reasonable to believe that there is no God. Here I will clearly show that neither there is any evidence so far that something can come out of nothing. On the basis of this lack of evidence we can also say that it is reasonable not to believe that the universe has actually originated from nothing. We can also demand that atheist scientists should immediately stop deceiving us in the name of science. If atheistic scientists cannot believe in the existence of God due to lack of evidence, then it is equally true that due to this same lack of evidence we cannot also believe that the laws of gravity and quantum theory were already there at the beginning of our universe to govern that beginning. So how did Hawking particularly come to know that these two laws governed the beginning of our universe? Is he all-knowing God?

Key Words: God, universe, Grand Design, Hawking, creation, atheist.

Part I. Something from Nothing?

Stephen Hawking in "The Grand Design" states that:

"Because there is a law such as gravity, 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."

"As recent advances in cosmology suggest, the laws of gravity and quantum theory allow universes to appear spontaneously from nothing. Spontaneous creation is the reason there is something rather than nothing, why the universe exists, why we exist. It is not necessary to invoke God to light the blue touch paper and set the universe going."

That an entire universe can come out of nothing is not a scientifically proven fact, rather it is merely a speculation. This speculation is also based on a logically flawed assumption, the assumption that the void is a real void. Here atheist scientists have assumed that our universe is a Godless universe, and that therefore the void is a real void. But it may be true that this is a Godless universe, or it may not be true. As the believers cannot claim that they know with certainty there is a God, so also atheist scientists cannot claim that they know with certainty there is no God. However there is a definite way to know with certainty that there is no God. Here I am not claiming that there is a definite way to know with certainty there is a God, but I am only saying that there is a definite way to know with certainty there is no God. And this definite way is the scientific way.

If atheist scientists ultimately become successful in explaining everything in this universe, including its origin also, without invoking God, then we will have no other option but to admit that the universe we live in is a Godless universe. But there is a very big "IF" here, if

* Correspondence: Himangsu S. Pal. E-Mail: sekharpal@rediffmail.com

they become successful. Until and unless they achieve their success here, they do not know whether they will be ultimately successful or not. So until and unless they achieve their success here, they do not know whether it is a Godless universe or not. All their earlier successes cannot give them any assurance that in future also they will be equally successful. If anybody claims that there is no reason as to why they will not be successful, then I will have to bring in Hume here, but I think it will not be necessary. It is like climbing a mountain peak. So long as you are not there at the peak, you do not know whether you will be able to reach there at all. But once you have reached there, you know with certainty that you have done it. So in order to coming to the conclusion that we live in a Godless universe atheist scientists will have to be able to give scientific explanation for each and every single fact, every single event, or every single phenomenon of this natural world, and not a single fact, single event, or single phenomenon should be left unexplained.

Covering a big part of the series by scientific explanation and leaving the remaining part unexplained will not do. If the atheist scientists claim here that they have explained almost everything of this natural world without invoking any kind of god, then I will have to point out to them that the origin of the universe has not yet been explained in a properly logical way. Before proceeding further here I want to quote a single line (or, a part of it) from an essay by Keith M. Parsons, an atheist philosopher: "…prima facie the most promising location for a Creator would be in the "creation" event itself, the origin of the universe." (No Creator Need Apply: A Reply to Roy Abraham Varghese (2006)). If the most promising location for a Creator would be in the "creation" event itself, then this Creator must have to be eliminated first from the "creation" event, because that act only can ensure that there is no such Creator.

So until and unless this so-called Creator has been eliminated from the creation event by providing a most plausible, and natural, scientific explanation for it (A), we cannot have any idea as to whether the void is a real void (B) or not. This is because if there is a creator God, then as per the religionists that God is everywhere and therefore the void is no longer a real void. So let A be provided first by the atheist scientists. Then only we can be sure that the void is a real void. Therefore A should always come first, and then only can come B. But in the case under consideration B has come first, and then came A. And that makes all the difference.

Let me try to make my point more clear. Let e_0 be the event zero, the origin/birth/creation of the universe, and let e_1 to e_n be all the events that have so far happened in this universe after its origin. Let ne0 be the natural explanation for event zero, and let n_{e1} to n_{en} be the natural explanations for events e_1 to e_n respectively. Let us now suppose that atheist scientists have already been able to provide n_{e1} to n_{en}, but that they have so far failed to provide n_{e0}. Will this situation allow us to conclude that there is no God? No, we cannot come to any such conclusion, because if there is a God then there will definitely be His hand behind the event zero. Yes, we can say this with absolute certainty, because God, if He is really God, and if He is really there, will not be our God at all, and neither will we recognize Him as such, if He has no control over our destiny. In other words, if this universe is not His creation.

Therefore in order to prove that there is no God one must have to show that there is no hand of God behind the creation event. All the other natural explanations n_{e1} to n_{en} put together cannot prove that there is no God. But once n_{e0} is given, it is firmly established that God does

not exist. Therefore so far as the question of non-existence of God is concerned, we can say that when n_{e0} has already been given, n_{e1} to n_{en} will become unnecessary, and when n_{e0} has not yet been given, ne1 to n_{en} are simply useless. And thus we can say that the necessary and sufficient condition for establishing the non-existence of God is that there will have to be a natural explanation for the origin of the universe (n_{e0}).

Therefore so long as n_{e0} has not been given, we cannot come to the conclusion that there is no God. And therefore so long as n_{e0} has not been given, neither can we conclude that the void is a real void. And therefore so long as n_{e0} has not been given, neither can we say that as virtual particles can appear from out of nothing, so also an entire universe.

Here atheist scientist Victor J. Stenger will perhaps say that so long as there is no proof for the existence of God, the default position is that there is no God. So in that case they are fully entitled to treat the void as a real void. But in an article titled "Circular Reasoning Case Reexamined" I have clearly shown that this universe even if created by a God might not display any proof of His existence if it is the case that this God is non-interventional, that is, if it is the case that He has not intervened at all after the creation of the universe. So from the mere fact that so far there is no proof for His existence it cannot be concluded that this universe is a Godless universe. In such a case the matter regarding the existence or non-existence of God can only be settled at the creation event itself. So atheist scientists are in no way entitled to treat the void as a real void until and unless it is firmly established that this void is really a void, that is, until and unless the creator God is eliminated from the creation event by providing a natural explanation for it.

Atheist scientists usually say that as there is no evidence for the existence of God so far, so it is reasonable to believe that there is no God. Here I have very clearly shown that neither there is any evidence so far that something can come out of nothing. On the basis of this lack of evidence we can also say that it is reasonable not to believe that the universe has actually originated from nothing. We can also demand that atheist scientists should immediately stop deceiving us in the name of science.

Whatever I have written here so far can be considered as a valid criticism of the science fiction that the universe can appear spontaneously from nothing if, and only if, there was really a beginning of this universe. But if it is the case that the universe has no beginning or no end at all, as proposed in a theory by Stephen Hawking and Jim Hartle, what will we have to say then? Will this criticism remain valid then also? I will try to answer this last question in the second part of this article.

Part II. Stephen Hawking's Hotchpotch

In "The Grand Design" Hawking has really messed up things. In his earlier book "A Brief History of Time" he advocated a no-boundary model. According to this model the universe will have no beginning and no end, it would simply be. It means that the universe has never begun, it was always there. Only that it has gone through unending cycles of expansion and contraction, but it has never completely died down. When the universe has come to a zero size after a contraction, all the physical laws of the earlier universe remained intact. From there the universe has again started a new life. But this beginning cannot be said to be an absolute

beginning, and this beginning should not be confused with the beginning of a universe practically from nothing due to a vacuum energy fluctuation in a void. The latter beginning can be called an absolute beginning, because in this case there will be no pre-history, no prior universe that has left its seed at its demise.

In "The Grand Design" Hawking has never said that he has abandoned his earlier model. Rather he has written in one place that in no boundary model the universe will have no beginning. Or if it was having a beginning, then that beginning was governed by the laws of science and does not need to be set in motion by some god. This generation of the universe cannot be called a spontaneous generation from nowhere, because the seed of the universe was already there. Therefore an atheist scientist who is advocating the no-boundary model cannot at the same time say that as because there is a law such as gravity, so the universe can and will create itself from nothing. A universe that would simply be cannot again pop into existence from nothing. So it is presumed that Hawking in his book "The Grand Design" has mixed up two distinct models of cosmology that try to explain origin of the universe:

1) The no-boundary model; and

2) The popping-up model.

In case of no-boundary model we will not raise any question regarding the origin of the physical laws that will govern the beginning of the universe, because all those laws will already be there in the seed of the universe. But in case of popping-up model we will ask just those questions. Whence appeared those laws that governed its beginning? In case of no-boundary model we will rather question the validity of the model itself. This model is valid only if time is imaginary, not only at the beginning of the universe, but throughout its life, from beginning to end, because Hawking himself has written in "A Brief History of Time" that if at any point of its past history the universe had entered from imaginary time into real time, then there would be a singularity, and all the laws of science would break down there.

Atheist scientists will also be at a loss to specify as to how the universe began its course. Here is a quote from Hawking's book: "…the universe could be finite in imaginary time but without boundaries or singularities. When one goes back to the real time in which we live, however, there will still appear to be singularities." Here he is admitting that we live in real time and that in real time there will be singularities. Only in imaginary time there will be no boundaries or singularities. Then he goes on to suggest that the so-called imaginary time is really the real time, and that what we call real time is just a figment of our imagination. So as per Hawking himself the no-boundary model is a valid model so long time is imaginary, not real. Imaginary time behaves just like space, and so in imaginary time the universe instead of having three dimensions of space and one dimension of time will have only four dimensions of space and no time dimension. If imaginary time is another dimension of space, and if present time is imaginary time, then present time must also exhibit all the characteristics of space. Time is imaginary means we can go back to the earlier periods of our life if we wish. But I can go back to the place where I have spent my childhood days, but that does not mean that I can go back to my childhood period also. So there is no evidence that present time is imaginary time. If present time is real time, then as per Hawking there was a singularity in the past, and therefore this present universe was having an absolute beginning. But Hawking proposed the no-boundary model in order to eliminate this singularity at the beginning of the

universe, and if singularity again comes back, then there is no reason for upholding that model any more.

(In an interview with Sue Lawley in the year 1992 Hawking very clearly said that he believed that the universe had a beginning in real time, at a big bang. He also said that there's another kind of time, imaginary time, at right angles to real time, in which the universe had no beginning or end. Here he has not said anything about singularity. So as per Hawking himself, singularity or no singularity, universe will have a beginning in real time.)

Perhaps the most serious objection that can be raised against no-boundary model is this: Even if it is conceded that in no-boundary model beginning of the universe will be governed by known laws of science, still one thing is sure and certain in this scenario. Beginning of any universe cannot be governed by its own laws, for the simple reason that a universe that has not yet come into existence cannot have any laws in it. But Hawking has written that when the universe was small enough it was governed by both general relativity and quantum theory. But these are the two laws of our universe and therefore these laws could not be there when the universe has not yet begun. So Hawking cannot legitimately use these two laws in order to study the beginning of our universe, because at its beginning these two laws have not yet come into existence.

Singularity theory of Penrose and Hawking was correct in showing that all the known laws of science would break down at the point of singularity, because when there is no universe there is also no arena in which these laws can appear. Nothing is truer than this that there cannot be any laws of science when there is no universe. Universe coming to an end means all the known laws of science will also come to an end with it. So, if the theory of Hawking and Penrose (1970) has shown that at the beginning of our universe there was a singularity, we find no reason as to why Hawking later on attempted to eliminate this singularity by inventing an absurd concept like imaginary time. If atheistic scientists cannot believe in the existence of God due to lack of evidence, then it is equally true that due to this same lack of evidence we cannot also believe that the laws of gravity and quantum theory were already there at the beginning of our universe to govern that beginning. So how did Hawking particularly come to know that these two laws governed the beginning of our universe? Is he all-knowing God?

Part III. Some Notes on Naturalism

That naturalism is true as a philosophy has not yet been established. Naturalism assumes that natural causes exist for all phenomena. If this is true, then scientists will be able to explain all phenomena of this universe by natural means, without having any need of invoking any kind of supernatural agent at any time. But science has not yet finished its job, and so we do not know yet whether all the phenomena of nature will be ultimately explained by natural means. If there is any single gap in scientific explanation (scientists failing to explain some particular phenomenon of nature by natural causes or by natural laws) in near or distant future, then that will indicate that naturalism as a philosophy and as a world-view is not adequate. Something more is required. I am not saying that there will definitely be such failure. I am only saying that we do not know yet whether scientists will enjoy a 100% success in future also as they have so far enjoyed in their endeavour. If somebody claims that there is absolutely no chance

for failure, then that will indicate that he already knows the future. That will further indicate that he is omniscient.

Here failure will mean parmanent failure, not temporary failure.

References

Pal, H. S. (2010a), God, scientists and the void. Scientific GOD Journal, V1(6): pp. 428-432.

Pal, H. S. (2010b), Timeless & climax. Scientific GOD Journal, V1(7): pp. 492-496.

Hawking, S. W. & Penrose, R. (1970), the Singularities of Gravitational Collapse and Cosmology. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, V314(1519), pp. 529-548.