

The Big Fizzle: Admissions from an Evolutionary Astrophysicist

Eric Lyons, M.Min.

No topic is more fundamental in the creation/evolution debate than the origin of the Universe. The theory advanced by evolutionists for several decades now, which supposedly best explains our existence from a purely naturalistic perspective, is known as the Big Bang. It has circulated via science textbooks all over the world. One of the leading publishers of science curriculum for many years has been Prentice Hall. In their 1992 *General Science* textbook, titled *A Voyage of Discovery*, they included the following section on “The Birth and Death of the Universe:”

How was the universe born and how will it end? Most astronomers believe that about 18 to 20 billion years ago all the matter in the universe was concentrated into one very dense, very hot region that may have been much smaller than a period on this page. For some unknown reason, this region exploded. This explosion is called the **big bang**. One result of the big bang was the formation of galaxies, all racing away from one another. This explains why the universe is still expanding (Hurd, et al., p. 61, emp. in orig.).

Since 1992 the “birth of the Universe” has been shaved substantially (from 18 to 20 billion years ago to 12 to 15 billion years ago—see Biggs, et al., 2003, p. 159), but the theory is more or less the same. Ask an evolutionist how the Universe came to be and you likely will hear that “it all started with a big bang.” (Good luck getting an evolutionist to explain from whence came the dense ball of matter that purportedly exploded and formed the Universe.)

Recent admissions from one astrophysicist in the popular scientific journal *New Scientist* are very significant in light of how saturated evolutionary science is with the Big Bang model. The cover of the March 3, 2007 issue of *New Scientist* reads: “What Put the **Bang** in the **Big Bang**” (emp. in orig.). The cover story was written by Dr. Peter Coles, who teaches astrophysics at the University of Nottingham in the United Kingdom. One might assume by the heading on the cover that *New Scientist* would inform readers what actually caused the explosion of the “pinhead” size ball of matter (193[2593]:33), especially since the heading was not a question, but a declaration. Instead, Coles elected to by-pass any explanation of the actual cause of the Big Bang. He wrote: “**Inflation** puts the ‘bang’ in the big bang” (p. 36, emp. added). Inflation is the “ultra-fast expansion just after the big bang” through which the Universe allegedly went in less than a millisecond, supposedly causing “most of the growth” of the 14-bil-

lion-light-year observable Universe (see Coles, pp. 33,36). According to Coles, this expansion puts the “oomph” in the big bang. “[I]nflation is now well established as an **essential** component of cosmology” (p. 33, emp. added).

Notice, however, the many blatant admissions Dr. Coles made throughout his brief, five-page article that completely invalidate any theory relying upon inflation and the Big Bang:

There is little direct evidence that inflation actually took place. Observations of the cosmic microwave background...are consistent with the idea that inflation took place, **but that doesn’t mean it actually happened.** What’s more, we still don’t know what would have caused it **if it did.** So how confident can we be that inflation is really a part of the universe’s history? (p. 33, emp. added).

Alan Guth (the physicist who proposed the inflation theory in 1981—EL) **cannot prove** that this “inflation” actually happened nor can he suggest a compelling physical reason why it should have (p. 33).

Within just a few years inflation had become an indispensable part of cosmological theory.... The only problem was that **there wasn’t a shred of evidence that inflation had actually happened** (p. 35, emp. added).

Inflation is undoubtedly a beautiful idea, but the problems it solves are **theoretical, not observational....** [T]he fact that the universe appears to be flat **doesn’t prove** that inflation happened (p. 35).

It is difficult to talk sensibly about scientific proof of phenomena that are so far removed from everyday experience. At what level can we prove anything in astronomy?... [D]o we really know for sure that the Universe is expanding?... **I would hesitate to say that it was proven beyond all reasonable doubt.**

The same goes for inflation. It is a beautiful idea that fits snugly with standard cosmology and binds many parts of it together **but that doesn’t necessarily make it true.** Many theories are beautiful, but that is not sufficient to **prove** them right (p. 36, emp. added).

Cosmology is now a mature and respectable science. Yet there are still **many gaps in our knowledge.** We don’t know the form of the “dark matter” responsible for unexplained extra gravity. Nor do we have any real understanding of dark energy (p. 37, emp. added). [NOTE: Considering that “dark matter” and “dark energy” supposedly make up 96% of the observable Universe (Thompson, et al., 2003), admitting that astronomers do not have “any real understanding” of them



speaks volumes about the speculations and assumptions upon which the Big Bang theory is based—EL.]

If that were not enough, Coles then concluded his article with the following words.

We don't know for sure if inflation happened, and we are certainly a long way from being able to identify the inflation. In a way we are still as confused as ever about how the universe began. But perhaps now we are confused on a higher level and for better reasons (p. 37, emp. added).

Though man now knows more about the Universe than ever before, evolutionists are “as confused as ever about how the universe began,” albeit “confused on a higher level.” Such confusion should come as no surprise. After all, “[t]he fool has said in his heart, ‘There is no God’” (Psalm 14:1). “Professing to be wise, they became fools” (Romans 1:22). Aside from the fact that an explosion of a period-size ball of matter causing an orderly Universe defies both logic and the law of cause and effect (see Thompson, 2004, pp. 19-138),

Coles' recent admissions testify loudly against the best explanation evolutionists have for the origin of the Universe. Instead of titling *New Scientist's* issue “What Put the **Bang** in the **Big Bang**,” perhaps a better heading would have been “Confusion Taken to a Whole New Level.”

REFERENCES

- Biggs, Alton, et al. (2003), *Science* (New York: McGraw-Hill).
- Coles, Peter (2007), “Boomtime,” *New Scientist*, 193[2593]:33-37, March 3.
- Hurd, Dean, George Mathias, and Susan Johnson, eds. (1992), *General Science: A Voyage of Discovery* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall).
- Thompson, Bert (2004), *The Scientific Case for Creation* (Montgomery, AL: Apologetics Press).
- Thompson, Bert, Brad Harrub, and Branyon May (2003), “The Big Bang Theory—A Scientific Critique [Part II],” *Reason & Revelation*, 23[6]:49-63, June, [On-line], URL: <http://www.apologeticspress.org/articles/30>.

IN THE NEWS

Embryos are fully human and deserve to be given all the rights inherent in personhood. This premise has been validated both biblically and scientifically (see Thompson and Harrub, 2001). Those in the scientific and medical communities who are pushing for expanding efforts in embryonic stem-cell research believe that human embryos should be created and destroyed for the sole purpose of harvesting the lines of embryonic stem cells they contain. In an effort to convince the masses that such barbaric injustice against human embryos is ethically permissible, embryonic stem-cell research supporters insist that research using embryonic stem cells will yield cures for a host of diseases.

Yet for all the potential that embryonic stem-cell research supposedly maintains, research and treatments using adult stems cells, in which human embryos are not murdered, has yielded far superior results (see Harrub, 2006). The latest research continues to provide promising stem-cell research options that do not result in the deaths of human embryos.

In the June 18 edition of *Newsweek*, Mary Carmichael reported on recent stem-cell research done with mice. She said: “Scientists revealed on Wednesday a new technique for bestowing all the flexibility of embryonic stem cells on mature skin cells in mice—an approach that could revolutionize medicine without the destruction of embryos” (2007, 149[25]:14). Concerning the newly discovered abilities of adult mice cells, Carmichael wrote that “scientists were ecstatic about the quasi-embryonic cells they'd created” (p. 14). In the

brief, two-column article, Carmichael cited two other studies, reported in January and April of this year, that offered alternatives to embryonic stem-cell research.

We must understand that even if embryonic stem-cell treatments offered the world a panacea for all illnesses, it still would be immoral and unethical to destroy human embryos (Proverbs 6:16-19). Similarly, it never would be acceptable to kill five-year-old children to harvest their organs so that others might live. But, the truth of the matter is, embryonic stem-cell research holds less promise than research being done with adult stem cells, a fact that is underscored by the latest findings reported in *Newsweek*. As the scientific and medical communities attempt to bulldoze their way through moral boundaries established by God, we, as Christians, must be aware of the issues and take a stand for the rights of all humans, including those who are still in their first stages of life.

Kyle Butt

REFERENCES

- Carmichael, Mary (2007), “An End to Debate or ‘Déjà Vu,’” *Newsweek*, 149[25]:14.
- Harrub, Brad (2006), “False Marketing of Embryonic Stem Cells,” [On-line], URL: <http://www.apologeticspress.org/articles/2976>.
- Thompson, Bert and Brad Harrub (2001), “Human Cloning and Stem-Cell Research—Science's Slippery Slope,” [On-line], URL: <http://www.apologeticspress.org/articles/2877.w>

