

# Perspectives

## Big Bang 'not Creation'

To coincide with the showing of a new (secular) film **Genesis: The Creation and the Flood** at the Venice film festival, a high-profile meeting on the origin of the universe was arranged in that city. The conference involved not only scientists but theologians, philosophers and others in the arts and humanities sphere.

Those who might have entertained fond hopes that the Big Bang could somehow be reconciled with a 'creation event' received cold comfort from the scientists. Nobel laureate Steven Weinberg said that those who did this were only deluding themselves. He said that modern cosmology 'cannot be used to cheer us up or give us spiritual comfort'.

A new theory from Stanford University was described, involving an individual big bang 'creating our own mini-universe' . . . 'just one of many strong fluctuations that is occurring all the time' in a (presumably eternal) larger universe. In this theory, there is 'no genesis, no moment of creation'.

According to the report of the conference in **New Scientist**,

*' . . . anyone who interprets the big bang as the beginning of the Universe, or the Bible's version of Genesis, is practising bad philosophy. Here today, gone tomorrow could be the motto of the big bang theory.'*<sup>1</sup>

How will theistic evolutionists and progressive creationists who promote the Big Bang as God's method of 'creating' the universe now respond?

### REFERENCE

1. Biggin, S., 1994. Do we really need the Universe? **New Scientist**, 144(1953):51-52.

C. W.

## Did the Universe have a Beginning?

*'The big bang theory postulates that the entire universe originated in a cosmic explosion about 15 billion years ago. Such an idea had no serious constituency until Edwin Hubble discovered the redshift of galaxy light in the 1920s, which seemed to imply an expanding universe. However, our ability to test cosmological theories has vastly improved with modern telescopes covering all wavelengths, some of them in orbit. Despite widespread acceptance of the big bang theory as a working model for interpreting new findings, not a single important prediction of the theory has yet been confirmed, and substantial evidence has accumulated against it. Here, we examine the evidence for the most fundamental postulate of the big bang, the expansion of the universe. We conclude that the evidence does not support the theory, and that it is time to stop patching up the theory to keep it viable, and to consider fundamentally new working models for the origin and nature of the universe in better agreement with the observations.'*<sup>1</sup>

So says T. Van Flandern in the

abstract to a paper in which he dismisses quickly two pillars of the Big Bang, that is its supposed predictions of the cosmic microwave background and the abundances of light elements in the universe:—

*'The big bang made no quantitative prediction that the "background" radiation would have a temperature of 3 degrees Kelvin (in fact its initial prediction was 30 degrees Kelvin); whereas Eddington in 1926 had already calculated that the "temperature of space" produced by the radiation of starlight would be found to be 3 degrees Kelvin. And no element abundance prediction of the big bang was successful without some ad hoc parameterization to "adjust" predictions that otherwise would have been judged as failures.'*<sup>2</sup>

### REFERENCES

1. Van Flandern, T., 1994. Did the Universe have a beginning? **Meta Research Bulletin**, 3:25.
2. Van Flandern, Ref. 1.

**Science Frontiers**,  
No. 97, 1995, p. 2.

