

11 *The Big Bang*

Misguided Snipes at The Big Bang

The most puzzling aspect of ICR's approach has been the attack on the big bang origin of the universe. Secular scientists of the explicitly atheist persuasion have been honest enough to say they want to resist this big bang cosmology with all their might. They admit the Big Bang proves a beginning. It proves the necessity of a beginner that transcends our space and time dimension (*i.e.*, exists outside it). This is the classic definition of the Creator/God.

Science without intending to do so has proven the necessity of a Creator unless the significance of this singular event can have any other explanation. Yet, Ackerman ridicules the big bang as "the dominant evolutionary scenario for the beginning." (*Id.* at 66.) This is a total misstatement. It is science pursuing science no matter where it led, even though it completely disproved the model that those atheists in the ranks preferred to be true (*i.e.*, the steady-state static infinite universe first suggested by Immanuel Kant).

The admission by the same atheist scientists of these facts shows the honesty and integrity of science when contrary to their assumptions are too overwhelming. They suffered their pet theories being demolished. They went down "kicking and screaming" as we will demonstrate below. (Most of evolutionary theory is suffering a similar erosion bit-by-bit.) Thus it is a falsehood that evolutionary-atheist scientists are pushing the big bang theory. They would prefer never to mention it if they could.

The Resistance to Big Bang Cosmology: Its True Impetus

Einstein discovered in 1905 the theory of general relativity. It demonstrated the universe was decelerating as if from an explosion. By 1917, this genius distorted his theorem to cancel out the deceleration. Einstein added a constant to keep the universe static, non-moving and infinite. Later, he acknowledged this as the greatest mistake of his career. His motive was to avoid and not embrace the big bang model which he actually was the first to detect.

Since then other scientists tried vigorously to disprove the theory of general relativity because it points to a beginning and deceleration of the universe. There are still some holdouts but general relativity has now been proven to five places from the decimal point, *i.e.*, 99.99999 percent. The overwhelming majority of scientists now concede general relativity is true, particularly since all other observational data proves the big bang.

Meanwhile, Hubble (an attorney turned astronomer) in 1929 examined forty galaxies and showed they were all moving away from each other. He demonstrated the model fit exactly Einstein's theorem without the constant added to cancel out deceleration. Einstein grudgingly abandoned his hypothesized cancelling force, and then conceded "the necessity for a beginning."¹ He also said it followed there must be a "superior reasoning power" that caused the beginning.²

The famous cosmologist, Sir Arthur Eddington (1882-1944), expressed his anti-theist perspective on the early evidence for a big bang in 1931, explicitly pointing to his anti-theist views. "Philosophically, the notion of a beginning of

-
1. A. Vibert Douglas, "Forty Minutes with Einstein," *Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society of Canada* 50 (1956) at 100.
 2. Lincoln Barnett, *The Universe and Dr. Einstein* (N.Y.: William Sloan & Associates, 1948) at 106.

the present order of Nature is repugnant. . . . I should like to find a genuine loophole.”³ He explained why: “We must allow evolution infinite time to get started.”⁴

Bondi and Hoyle in 1948 explicitly sought to circumvent the big bang by a fantastic supposition. They made clear they were opposed to any force being able to transcend (pre-exist or exist apart) from nature.⁵ So they said that the visible “expansion” was an illusion caused by the “continual creation” of matter in space, and thus you still have a “steady state” universe. There was no proof of this, and over the next 30 years numerous pieces of evidence gradually disproved the steady state model even with continual creation as an assumption. In 1976, physicist John Gribbin wrote in *Nature*, the highly respected British journal, that one must now accept the big bang. But he offered hope to minimize its theological implications:

The biggest problem with the Big Bang theory of the origin of the Universe is philosophical ***perhaps even theological what was before the bang?*** This problem alone was sufficient to give a great initial impetus to the Steady State theory; but with that theory now sadly in conflict with the observations, the best way round this initial difficulty is provided by a model in which the universe expands from a singularity [that is, a beginning], collapses back again, and repeats the cycle indefinitely.⁶

3. Arthur S. Eddington, "The End of the World: From the Standpoint of Mathematical Physics," *Nature* 127 (1931) at 450.

4. Arthur S. Eddington, "On the Instability of Einstein's Spherical World," *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* 90 (1930) at 672.

5. Herman Bondi, *Cosmology* (2d ed.) (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1960) at 140; Hoyle, "A New Model for the Expanding Universe," *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* 108 (1948) at 372-82.

Thus, Gribbin would agree that the universe we know started 16-17 bya. However, he found it meaningful to say that it is part of a cycle of death and rebirth. Why? The only reason is that it makes the Creator look more impersonal and remove even more distantly how the first expansion ever took place. But you never truly avoid the need for a first expansion; you simply have removed it in time so it seems more vague and unnecessary to ask about.

In any event, since 1976, numerous disproofs of the oscillating “big bang” universe have been established. These include: (a) there is not enough mass in the universe to force a collapse; (b) if it did collapse, it would be with a thud like mud falling on a carpet; (c) if it had sufficient mass to collapse and could bounce, it would still have a maximum number of bounces due to thermodynamic dissipation which pushes the date of origin only back at most to 1 trillion years ago; and (d) if it oscillated previously, there would no remaining hydrogen in our current bounce, yet all stars burn hydrogen in abundance, which means we are on the *first and only* bounce.

Gribbin’s objections to the standard big bang model underscores how anti-theist evolutionary scientists have vigorously sought to resist the theological implications of the big bang.

In 1981, Fred Hoyle, an avowed atheist and world renown astronomer, added a new evolutionist objection to the big bang. He told a meeting of scientists at the Kellog symposium that they must reject the big bang because it leaves too little time to have allowed life to originate anywhere in the universe by chance. Hoyle said he lost patience with the big bang theory because its claimants had added few proofs beyond the microwave background radiation. It had a “‘good run for its money’ but he had now lost patience with this approach.” *Nature* reported why:

6. John Gribbin, “Oscillating Universe Bounces Back,” *Nature* 259 (1976) at 15-16.

Two of his reasons involve the origin of life the calculated time since the origin of the universe of 10,000 millions years or so [*i.e.*, 10 bya] is not enough to account for the evolution of living forms, while adiabatic expansion of the universe would have been inimical to the evolution of highly ordered forms. . . . The essence of his argument last week was that the information content of the higher forms of life is represented by the number 10 to the 40,000 power representing the specificity with which some 2,000 genes, each of which might be chosen from 10 to the 20th power nucleotide sequences of the appropriate length, might be defined. ***Evolutionary processes would, Hoyle said, require several Hubble times*** [*i.e.*, Hubble Time = 10-17 billion years] to yield such a result. The chance that higher life forms might have emerged in this way is comparable with the chance that “a tornado sweeping through a junk-yard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials therein. . . .” Of adherents of biological evolution, Hoyle said he was at a loss to understand “biologists widespread compulsion to deny what seems to be obvious.”⁷

Clearly, the big bang is a completely unexpected and undesired fact by evolutionists with 100% atheist assumptions.

But there is even more abundant proof how false Ackerman’s claims are that the big bang is an *evolutionary scenario*. The facts demonstrate again and again that atheist scientists have been consistently pushing ***against*** the big bang scenario.

7. See “Hoyle on Evolution,” *Nature* (Nov. 12, 1981) Vol. 294 at 105.

Kevin Lerner in his book *The Big Bang Never Happened* (N.Y.: Random House, 1991) acknowledges what Hoyle was saying: the laws of nature as we know them are insufficient to explain how any life came about by chance in the past four billion years on earth. He “acknowledges” Morris’ claim that this advance of life stands in violation of the second law of thermodynamics. (Remember, Mr. Morris was wrong that this law had any application to information-based increase in order.) Thus, Lerner concludes the second law broke down. And if it broke down on earth, it could have broken down for the entire physical cosmos, he suggests. Since the second law ties into the way we measure time (*i.e.*, the rate at which entropy or energy degradation increases), Lerner concludes that our observations of the age of the universe are incorrect. They cannot be used to argue for a beginning of the cosmos just billions of years ago. There was hence supposedly no big bang, and hence no Creator via a big bang. Lerner concludes we therefore any time that we need to accomplish evolution.

Lerner thus has done the same thing as Morris, but turned it around on Morris. Lerner’s argument in a nutshell was: if evolution violates the second law of thermodynamics, but evolution in fact took place, then the second law did not operate at all times, and hence we cannot trust any measurements of time that we are looking at. Thus, evolution could have a very long time to occur and hence be still true.

The illogic in Lerner’s thesis is self-evident: it assumes its conclusion as a premise: evolution occurred. If it did, then it did. But this is circular.

Lerner also suffers from a false premise: the second law is supposedly violated by evolution. We have shown above that Morris’ argument on that score is wrongly applied to evolution.⁸ Moreover, the only dates that would be unreliable would be those based on heat loss entropy which is only one method of dating origins.

8. See “Thermodynamics” on page 51.

In sum, astronomers who are openly anti-theist repeatedly resisted the big bang scenario as it emerged from science. Thus Ackerman's claim that evolutionists endorse the big bang due to philosophical preference is false. Rather, it has been bitterly resisted by opponents of theism who are scientists. However, the integrity of the majority compelled them to tell the truth: the universe started 14-17 billion years ago in a big bang. Before that, neither time nor space in our dimension existed.

Musings of Ackerman on the Big Bang

Having ignored the foregoing, Ackerman in *It's A Young World After All* (1993) tries to ridicule the big bang scenario rather than disprove it.

To many the idea of a recent creation by the Word of God is an incredible concept. Agreed, the concept is incredible. However, in the area of ultimate origins [of the universe], all the alternatives are incredible. Consider the dominant evolutionist scenario for the beginning: the big bang.

According to the Big Bang concept all the matter of the universe all of reality was **once compressed into a tiny ball**. For some reason the tiny ball became unstable, exploded, and turned into stars, planets, strawberries, cockroaches, Good Humor wagons, committees, and this book.

A great portion of . . . the brainpower of modern science is being poured into an effort **to make this materialist scenario sound plausible**. . . . [T]he conflicting hard data are mounting up, and it is time for people to begin pointing out that 'the emperor has no clothes.' The view that the present universe **somehow**

created itself and is billions of years old is contradicted by the growing weight of powerful physical evidence. The creation is not billions of years old; it is quite young. (*Id.* at 66-67)

Ackerman then offers no specific rebuttal to the evidence for the big bang: either general relativity, the movement of galaxies away from one another, the background radiation, *etc.* Ackerman simply says the idea that all matter was once compressed into a tiny ball (smaller than a grain of sand) sounds ludicrous to him. Ackerman is borrowing a page from Voltaire's bag of tricks. Yet, did Ackerman really ever explain that it is impossible? No.

Ridicule and mockery are not substitutes for logic. Their use is known as the fallacy of the "appeal to ridicule."⁹ The notion of a spherical earth sounds ridiculous to any observer who only sees a flat earth. Yet, a flat earth is categorically false.

Who would believe the earth circles the sun by observing the sun apparently circling the earth by rising and setting over the earth? Four hundred years ago, the same common sense arguments were used to justify persecuting Galileo for telling us what we all know now to be true.

A British Earl and friend of the church, Anthony Shaftsbury, once correctly said:

9. "Appeal to ridicule, also called the Horse Laugh, is a logical fallacy which presents the opponent's argument in a way that appears ridiculous, often to the extent of creating a straw man of the actual argument....This is a rhetorical tactic which mocks an opponent's argument, attempting to inspire an emotional reaction (making it a type of appeal to emotion) in the audience and to highlight the counter-intuitive aspects of that argument, making it appear foolish and contrary to common sense. This is typically done by demonstrating the argument's logic in an extremely absurd way or by presenting the argument in an overly simplified way, and often involves an appeal to consequences." ("Appeal to Ridicule," *Wikipedia*.) An appeal to ridicule is invalid because it brings no new information or concrete discussion into the debate.

How can we entrust or use our Reason, if in any case we fear to be convinced? How are we masters of ourselves, when we acquire the habit of horror, aversion, fondness, or any other temper than that of mere indifference and impartiality into the judgment of opinions and the search for truth?¹⁰

Hence, Ackerman is wrongly using mockery to dismiss the fact that all mass can at one time have been compressed into a tiny speck of ultimate mass. He laughs out loud that anyone could ever believe such a fact. However, such shock merely reveals the amount of ignorance of the speaker; it does not prove a scientific fact as impossible.

Then Ackerman in the above quote says the big bang is a “materialist” scenario. Far from it! Rather, it points to an origin that must transcend matter. From absolutely nothing came something: the original speck of sand — the original highly compressed mass. Bible expositors prior to ICR regarded this as the meaning of Genesis. Thomas Aquinas wrote seven centuries ago that Genesis was the “story of God’s will effortlessly plucking from nothingness the whirling suns of the universe. . . .” (*Summa Theologiae* Ch. IV (1952) at 55.) And no matter how long ago this beginning took place has no effect on the transcendent nature of the origin. Even if millions or billions of years have passed, the fact of a beginning points to a non-material cause — a transcendent cause external to our dimensions of time and space. Aquinas explained:

No matter how many blankets of centuries we pile on the question of the beginning of things, that question is not smothered. ***That the world began yesterday or a million years ago has nothing to do with the mystery of how it***

10. Anthony Ashley Cooper Shaftesbury, *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times* (J. Baskerville: 1749) at 47.

began. It is no help to plunge into the middle of things, and go on from there [Note: He anticipated the purpose of oscillating universe advocates], pretending that there was no beginning and will be no end, or that beginnings and endings are trivial things compared to the zest of the world right now. (*Id.*, at 56.)

Rather than see evidence for a big bang points to the Aquinas' interpretation on Genesis 1:1, Ackerman above "concedes" that God as Creator is an incredible concept.¹¹ Then why call yourself a scientific creationist? Simply call yourself a believer in God and leave science out of it. Ackerman insists that one can have confidence in God as creator by seeing how ludicrous the big bang sounds. Ackerman is arguing that if you are given two options — both unbelievable — you must believe in the one that is "easier" to believe. This is pernicious advocacy of being deceived by things one can give no rational assent. It is, needless to say, a flight from reality. Have atheist scientists been far too charitable calling "scientific creationists" merely "absurd," "bizarre" and filled with "nonsense?"¹²

When someone tells you to believe something they say is "incredible," we must seriously wonder about what role science has in the discussion.

Also in this quote, Ackerman says scientists claim the speck "created itself." No scientist says that. There are theories that analogize to a quantum fluctuation, but time must be in existence for such an event. There is currently no adequate explanation offered of how the speck came to exist. Many physicists are willing to agree that they will never determine the physical cause of the universe, and the question will

11. To repeat, he said: "To many the idea of a recent creation by the Word of God is an incredible concept. Agreed, the concept is incredible."

12. Dalrymple, *The Age of the Earth* (1991) at viii.

remain how the speck ever came to be. Thus, Ackerman is once again misstating the arguments of scientists and thereby making Straw Men arguments against self-made opponents.

Morris' Misplaced Arguments Against the Big Bang

In *Scientific Creationism* (1985), Morris cites and quotes a critic of the steady-state universe, Herbert Dingle, from an article in the respected journal, *Science*, from 1954. (Dingle is trying to persuade scientists to open their mind to the big bang.)

Dingle said that proponents of steady-state cosmology *i.e.* the universe is infinite in time and space, do not want to “conceive” how the universe “had begun,” and “it seems better to them to suppose that there was no beginning and will be no ending to the material universe.” Dingle points out that this steady-state model is accepted without empirical evidence because it “conforms to their tastes,” and “so [they] declare that this must have been the case.”¹³

Extraordinarily, Morris then says that “although Professor Dingle was referring especially to the steady-state theory, the remarks quoted are equally applicable to the big bang theory.”¹⁴

Morris never articulates why Dingle’s statements are equally a criticism of the big bang origin of the universe. There is no similarity between the bias Dingle criticizes and the one that Morris claims exists. This is because the bias of scientists to find only material explanations led them to the ultimate conclusion that matter has a transcendent cause outside of time and space — the Big Bang.

Ironically, this escapes Morris. He somehow does not comprehend what Dr. Dingle really meant was that the Big Bang refutes Steady State. The Big Bang requires a Begin-

13. Herbert Dingle, "Science and Modern Cosmology," *Science* (Oct. 1, 1954) Vol. 120, at 519.

14. *Scientific Creationism* (1985), *supra*, at 27 fn. 1.

ning, and hence a Beginner. Thus, Dr. Dingle was saying that because the big bang does not conform to an anti-theist taste — it points to a beginning, steady-state proponents were seeking to avoid this result. They saw the theistical implications of the big bang. They were refusing to change their views, despite lacking any scientific support for a steady-state universe.

How Morris could take remarks directly supportive of big bang cosmology and twist it the other way around evidences once more a flaw in Morris' approach to evidence.

Morris then makes a misplaced critique of the big bang. He lumps it with “evolutionary models of the beginning,” and then he says the following: “The big bang theory does not account for the initial super-dense state. . . .” (*Id.* at 28.) Precisely! That is why the big bang points to creation, not evolution. Morris cannot even see right in front of his nose the most significant proof of creation — the big bang. Morris is even encouraging Christians to look away and ignore it when it is a most persuasive proof of an origin that defies chance and naturalistic explanations.

Morris then provides a fallasciously false dilemma.¹⁵ He says that either you believe in “evolution *ex nihilo* [*i.e.*, evolution out of nothing]” or “creation *ex Deo*.” (*Id.* at 36.) This is a patently wrong effort to distinguish the big bang from creation *ex nihilo* by God: it is the same thing. The Big Bang is based on physical laws which still teach nothing can come from nothing. It is synonymous with “creation *ex Deo*.”

15. Morris engages in a rare form of the false dilemma fallacy. Both choices in his proposition are true, and hence this is not a false dilemma on one or the other side. What is false, however, is the effort to make appear distinct *creation ex Deo* from the *big bang*. This is a false choice. One does not have to reject the big bang in order to believe in *creation ex Deo*. They are totally compatible and in fact identical, as currently proposed by science. Thus, the undistributed middle is the proposition that *creation ex Deo* rules out the *big bang*, and vice versa. It is this unstated assumption that is false, and makes the choice a false dilemma.

Hence, there is no need to choose one over the other. If the evidence of the big bang shows everything that exists came from *nothing*, this is identical to creation by God. This necessarily follows because such creation violates a basic physical law of the universe. ***You have in the big bang scientific proof of a variance of that law. A miracle!*** You have an event whose probability was more absolutely zero than any other event in history. ***Yet, something that cannot happen in fact happened.*** How? There must be a cause that transcends this universe. At least a practical person would be justified in this conclusion.

Hence, Morris, by focusing on the dirt on the ground, cannot see the sun gleaming him straight in the face. Morris even mentions how scientists in 1968 had once mocked those who claim the universe came from absolutely nothing (*i.e.*, both proponents of the big bang and traditional creationists).¹⁶ Yet, bizarrely Morris cites it to attack Big Bang cosmology. He does not realize that here is the scientific proof for a transcendent Creator! Here is what Morris should be proclaiming from the house tops rather than ridiculing!

Finally, Morris argues that the big bang is just one more cosmological model. All the others have been discarded, and thus there is no reason to suspect this one will do much better. (This is a fallacy because it hardly proves one view is the same as another.)

Then amazingly, Morris says: “Sir Fred [Hoyle] and many others have also rejected the big bang theory. As Weiskopf says [in 1983], ‘No existing view of the development of the cosmos is completely satisfactory, and this includes the standard big bang model which leads to certain fundamental questions and problems.’”¹⁷ (These main problems were resolved by the COBE satellite results in 1990-92.)

What is incredible is that Morris is so intent on debunking everything regarding the big bang that he ignores that Hoyle’s critique of the big bang is because it leaves inadequate time for evolution to have occurred by chance! Hoyle is admitting Morris’ case for creation is proven if the big

bang were true. However, Morris ignores this admission. Or he misses it due to inadequate research. Or Morris suffers from a misconception of what is proven by the big bang. Or, he suffers from a mix of all of the above problems.

16. Morris quotes at page 18 of his book *Scientific Creationism* the following passage from McCrea's article in *Science* in 1968:

The naive view implies that the universe suddenly came into existence and found a complete system of physical laws waiting to be obeyed.... Actually it seems more natural to suppose that the physical universe and the laws of physics are interdependent. This leads us to expect that if the universe changes in the large, then its laws might also change in a way that could not be predicted;

W.H. McCrea, "Cosmology after Half a Century," *Science* (June 2, 1968) at 1297. (Morris cited this solely as an example of an "unanswered" question that "creation science" does "tell us why": God made it so.)

Putting aside Morris simple approach, it turns out exactly that the universe popped into existence where numerous physical laws were waiting to be obeyed, and they have never varied since. Big bang reconstruction and quantum physics have shown how present physics, astronomy, and the big bang converge moment-by-moment right up to the .0 [35 zeros]1 second after the original density came to exist. This is corroborated by Maxwell's deductions in 1875 that light particles are photons, and thus molecules are the same in distant places. We also know that no matter how far we see, the stars are obeying physical laws of thermonuclear processes that apply in our solar system. This is mentioned by McCrea at 1298, but he asks "we should expect a sufficiently sophisticated theory to tell us why this is so." McCrea implicitly was disturbed by the emerging big bang cosmology in 1968 (Hubble, et al), and sought a loop-hole where physical laws break down. He was hinting we should infer they evolve upward because any other thought requires thinking the universe began with the laws ready made. This view he labels "naive," because evidently it defies chance and seems unnatural (or supernatural). However, this naive view has now been proven conclusively.

Tragic Loss of Public Awareness

Sadly, the Institute of Creation Research promotes book after book with such mistaken outlooks on the big bang. For example, Creation Research Society promotes *Design and Origins in Astronomy* (Ed. George Mulfinger, Jr.) (Ind. 1983) — still sold by ICR many years later — but in it the author complains that the big bang theorist “assumes” a created universe and this is “not proper for a legitimate naturalistic treatise on origins.” (*Id.* at 31.) Scientists do not assume creation by a big bang; rather, they infer its necessity. As George Smoot, the COBE project leader, said in 1992 about the now indisputable proof for the big bang: “We have found proof for the birth of the universe. It is like looking at God.” Thus, the big bang theory can only be true if this is a created universe, and **hence science has found proof of what is a non-naturalistic origin.**

Yet, Mulfinger’s book goes on and on about how wrong the big bang must be because “natural processes or forces simply are unable to perform the task” that the big bang says occurred. Exactly! This is what science has proven: **an historical event that cannot be explained naturalistically but which astrophysicists concede occurred.** If a Christian faults the big bang for not having a naturalistic explanation, then such sniping “creationists” really sound like atheists who reject the big bang on principle because it points to God! This is the contradictory and absurd view of the Institute of Creation Research. They teach Christians to ignore the big bang because scientists cannot fully explain it without God. How tragic that they misunderstand the best evidence for proving to non-believers that God made this world!

17. He cites Victor P. Weisskopf, “The Origins of the Universe,” *American Scientist* (Sept/Oct. 1983) Vol. 71, at 474.

The Big Bang
