

Does God Exist?: Implications from the origin of the universe

Kirk Durston

The consensus among cosmologists (those scientists that deal with the origin of the universe) is that regardless of which theory one prefers, the universe had a beginning. In an article published January 14, 2012, Steven Hawking responded to this by stating, 'A point of creation would be a place where science broke down. One would have to appeal to religion and the hand of God.' Hawking appears to be an atheist, but he is intelligent enough to see the implications of where the logic points.

Logic dictates that we cannot assume the existence of natural processes in order to come up with an explanation for the origin of natural processes. That would be a circular fallacy. For the same reason, we cannot assume the existence of something dependent upon time in order to explain how time came into existence. If we define *natural* as the category of all things bounded by space, time, matter and energy, and *supernatural* as the category of all things not bounded by space, time, matter and energy, we can construct the following argument:

1. The cause of nature is either natural or not-natural (i.e., supernatural)
2. The cause of nature cannot be natural, for that would be a circular fallacy.
3. Therefore, the cause of nature must be supernatural.
4. The cause of time was either dependent upon time or not.
5. The cause of time was not dependent upon time, for that would be a circular fallacy.
6. It is logically impossible for an entity independent of time to be caused by something; there is no temporal beginning in front of which to put a cause.
7. Therefore, the cause of nature was supernatural, timeless and uncaused.

This is not a god-of-the-gaps argument; it is an argument driven by cold, hard logic. Some may object and propose that even though we do not know at present what caused the origin of nature, maybe someday we will discover it. Maybe, but we already know one thing about that future discovery; it will not be natural. Logic simply does not permit a natural explanation for the origin of natural explanations.

Others have suggested that the universe came from nothing, but they do not mean nothing at all. By 'nothing' they mean zero energy and matter was required. The universe-from-nothing theory still requires a law of quantum gravity and some sort of space-time continuum within which physics can operate and produce new universes. Hawking's fundamental 11-dimensional M-theory system is an example. That just pushes the problem back one notch, it solves nothing, and falls victim to Ockham's Razor.

Of course, this only gets us to a general notion of God held by many different civilizations throughout history. To narrow it down to the Judeo-Christian God one would need an additional argument, an argument from history.