

The Doctrine of Creation is a matter of blind faith or guessing

One sign that the notion that all things come from nothing is a mark of blind faith is how it is useless as an explanation.

Science says everything maintains everything else and all things are connected. This is the bootstrap theory or the bootstrap fact as we should say. This contradicts the notion that what exists came from nothing thus is "not amenable to further analysis" (The Tao of Physics F Capra page 286). "The world cannot be understood as an assemblage of entities which cannot be analysed further. In the new world view, the universe is seen as a dynamic web of interrelated events. None of the properties of any part of this web is fundamental; they all follow from the properties of the other parts and the overall consistence of their mutual interrelations determines the structure of the entire web" *ibid*. These two statements show that God and creation silence analysis and the need for an explanation. Nothing would be explained if we said that what we have in our larder just gets there – is a brute fact – or comes there from nothing which in practical terms is just as useless. Or correction: as bad as the brute fact idea is the creation one is worse. It is one thing to argue that the jug of water on your table is just there and there is nothing further to be said but worse to argue that it was just created there now.

Notice how the bootstrap fact turns the cosmos into a sort of demigod. If you want a god it will do. There is no need for the Christian God.

Christians say that God created or made all things from nothing of his own free will!

Is God the creator? It is a "statement of faith" to say that God can create. You cannot prove how he can or that he can. In fact it is guessing not faith. People mistake guessing for believing all the time. You cannot try to have a belief in such a huge matter. It is refusing to admit that you don't know and then you invent a doctrine to give the impression that you have suitable reasons to say God made all things. Why not just say you don't know?

A faith built on a guess is not a faith. And do not forget that Christianity teaches that its a religion about a creator God and that everything else including how God became Jesus is just part of that doctrine.

Creation out of nothing is a guess. Even if there was a big bang and even if physicists think that there was nothing before the big bang (they don't) it could mean the big bang came from some element outside of science and its scope. Perhaps this element was spirit. Spirit being an entity without parts would be pretty close to nothing and there is nothing we can do to verify the possibility of spirit except argue from reason. But many of us of us think such reasonings are wrong. Something coming from spirit would be like something that came from nothing. "Nothing" is undetectable. Spirit is undetectable as well. God could make a spirit that makes a spirit force that provides the something that the big bang came from. So nothing at all can ever prove creation from nothing or creation ex nihilo. It is simply a guess.

If God makes a spirit, how can you test it to see if it had to have been made out of nothing? Scientific experimentation could never prove that matter came from nothing. The best it might be able to do is guess that matter came from nothing or spirit which is just as undetectable as nothing is.

The believers get their argument for a creator God back to front. Let me explain.

A fact always matters. Nothing else can matter like a fact does or as much. An idea can never match a fact.

The believers surmise that creation out of nothing must have happened because they work it out from the fact that nothing can make itself. Nothing coming from nothing is a fact and they put an idea, the notion of creation from nothing, above it. That is irrational and an insult to what a fact means.

The believers surmise that creation out of nothing must have happened because they work it out from the fact that nothing can make itself. But they contradict themselves so they are only guessing not working out that creation out of nothing happens. For such an extraordinary idea as creation out of nothing, we need more than guesses and even evidence. We need proof.

What is really happening is that the believers are reasoning, "Okay we are here. The universe is here. Therefore God made all things." But the universe being here only says the universe is here not how it came to be here! Believers are guilty of assuming God's existence when they should be and pretend to be presenting evidence for it.

Sir Arthur Eddington said that the origin of the universe is replete with insuperable difficulties unless we regard the origin as supernatural. There are problems then with the natural explanations. But that still does not entitle us to look for a

supernatural explanation. What is natural and cannot be understood will do. There is no need for a supernatural that cannot be understood and which is beyond all understanding. Better 1% understandable than 0%.

The supernatural is held to be its own evidence. You can have evidence that something supernatural may have happened. But you must still assume that it is natural. Natural evidence + natural evidence = natural explanation even if unknown. You can only believe in the supernatural if you experience it and verify it thoroughly.

It is hard enough to work through natural evidence without bringing in the supernatural. Better to ignore the supernatural and focus on the natural.

The supernatural is seen as an exception to the way nature works. If the supernatural made all things that must have been an exception to the rule, "Out of nothing, nothing comes."

If we endorse such exceptions, then we must be consistent. If somebody says, "All human beings can die", you will say, "All human beings can die but there may be exceptions." If you endorse exceptions in the supernatural you must endorse them even more strongly in the natural realm.

God believers say that science just deals with what is there and cannot comment on God. God is a question which science can address.

A universe made by God and a universe that was made naturally without God should not look the same.

Believers say, "The existence of God in itself is not testable. The reason is that God is not physical. He is a different kind of power than anything we can find in the universe."

This is actually an assumption and nothing else. If God is something then it is possible that some kind of test for this something may exist. Maybe we just haven't found it yet. Just because something is not physical does not mean it cannot be tested.

Perhaps the fact that we have no scientific test for him exists is evidence that there is none?

Those that think science can show there is a God say, "What is testable is if the universe needs a God to make it." Those that suspect science disproves their beloved God disagree. They say, "Science can neither comment on the existence of God one way or the other. We have other ways of knowing he exists."

Science can apply tests to see if the universe shows signs of design. If something appearing to be a machine is found on Mars science will test to see if it is a natural formation or made by some kind of intelligence like ourselves. It is true that science can comment on whether or not the universe is designed. That is as far as it can go. It cannot say a God designed it for that remains to be proven. Design does not in itself mean that God was the designer.

What if the universe were made of spirit not matter? Christians remember argue that most of it probably is! The main reason why people are pliable when it comes to supposing that a spirit God made matter is that matter seems crude and messy so something better than it made it. A spirit universe would not be all made of bits and parts like matter is. It would be a pile of spirit units being organised into a universe.

The bias they display is a scandal.

Though the Church says it believes in creation out of nothing it does not believe in creation when there was literally nothing. It says it believes there was an entity: God but that all God did was order things to appear and they did. He did not make them from anything. All you need is the fact that if there was always something. That is enough to argue that the origin could have been done not by a God but by something more unimaginable. It opens the door to thinking that something was indeed there to become the universe and there was no creating as such.

If something, namely the universe, has come from nothing then no one created from nothing but something did. That is a variation of atheism. If we can guess that the creation has happened then we can guess that some blind force created.

Question for discussion, Nothing is just nothing. Religion says God cannot create nothing. You cannot make or create what is not there. You cannot make nothing from nothing either. Can he create nothing by turning something into nothing?