

Do Black Holes Create New Universes

For this video, I have two main points to consider. The first, and most important I think, is that this video PROVES there is a chance for Christianity and Science to reach out to each other, and the time might be right to start making such a move publicly (I don't think at the personal level, there is really much problem here, it's society's views as a whole I speak of). The second is something I think very few others will even notice: a recognition of the fundamental flaw modern day Atheists have in their philosophies.

I don't know that it is necessary to watch the whole video to see the first point. If one pays attention to the first few minutes, you will see that science is essentially admitting that our Universe is too organized for it to be credibly attributed to chance. Here is a clear and obvious introduction to the Christian idea of God as Creator.

If you move on a bit longer, you will see Matt O'Dowd talk about a theory that can be "testable". This is because the traditional dividing line between science and non-science (religion in particular) was drawn by Karl Popper's Falsifiability Criteria. It holds that, for a theory to be scientific, it must be testable in such a way that it could fail. A classic example is "All swans are white" is scientific because swans can be tested for color and such a test could fail if a non-white swan was found (and there is, a Black Swan is native to Australia).

This video is admitting (without using these words) to a very real problem in explaining how our Universe could be created without God. In fact, it borders on a paradox. Almost any theory science could be able to come up with would not be science because of the inability to test it, and the one "testable" theory they have right now was proven wrong! And even if a testable theory could be found, it would have very little credibility because of the inherent limits of such a test.

This test would be analogous to the till of a cashier at a store that had \$100 at the beginning of the shift and \$500 at the end. A theory could be made that \$400 in sales must have taken place, and the test of $\$100 + \400 does indeed equal \$500. But anyone who manages a store will see how weak this theory really is, even if it passed the test. This theory does not include returns or credit/debit card transactions, for example. Furthermore, other additions and subtractions can (even if only rarely) take place: theft, miscounting change, etc.

In short, for science to solve the mystery of why the Universe is so perfect for life, they may need to become a religion itself. And, fortunate for them, Christianity is already available.

I could speak much about the philosophical aspects of this video, but I will try to keep it short (I hope to discuss these in more detail in future postings). The classical Atheists (Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud, Friedrich Nietzsche... all the way up to Albert Camus and Jean-Paul Sartre) ALL lived in a time when an inherent belief in the universe was that it always was and always will be (what I call Classical Materialism). Albert Einstein's theories quickly paved the way to discover that the Universe was NOT infinitely old, nor would it exist as a dynamic entity forever. So, why is this important?

The classical Atheists, by assuming an infinity for evolution to take place, had no such problems with the Universe being "too perfect for life", as it would happen eventually anyway. Therefore, the need for God the creator to not only create but to design the universe was not needed. Unlike mainstream science, which could remove this aspect from Classical Materialism with little or no impact

on their theories, a fundamental truth of Classic Atheism has now been proven wrong.

Modern Atheists, however, do not seem much interested in what their philosophical forefathers thought. While the Classical Atheists were true enemies of Religion, they respected Religion and took it seriously. Generally, Classical Atheists assumed that religion's evolutionary purpose was to create a Morality that more enlightened people could enjoy without the "shackles" of religion. A few were even realistic on how long morality could survive without religion, even if they continued to promote the idea of Atheism. Neitzche looked to Nihilism while Sartre and Camus actually admitted that God was a "necessary absurdity".

Instead, Modern Atheists are not characterized as being philosophical. They are skeptical at best and emotional at worst in their beliefs. Perhaps God is working to undermine Atheism through the very science so many Atheists hold dear, and perhaps He is calling us to help science down the right path.

video link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rFgpKlcpzNM&t=486s>

Raymond Mulholland
Original Publication Date: 9 September 2020