

General Topics :: Faith Statements**Faith Statements - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/12/26 11:43**

On occasion I like to read up on scientific theory. I decided about 3-4 weeks ago to dive into Quantum Theory, String theory, Big-Bang Theory. It wasn't long before I had found some of the most entertaining and humorous pieces of information found within those theories.

Now, before you decry me as an unscientific and superstitious ignoramus I will say I really enjoy science in numerous fields of study. I believe there is a great deal to learn and in fact aid our society.

I also know that there are a growing number of creationists that are scientists of high quality and standing in their professions and I know they in their own way make a stand for biblical truth.

Allow me to begin.

I will attempt in the next week or so try to fill-in some of my claims with quotes and examples.

Fields of study in Quantum mechanics and Landscape theory + String theory have no doubt intimidated the average Christian and for the most part the above average Christian. Terminologies for mathematics, physics, astronomy can get pretty heady and downright foggy. The un-initiated will hear and read of terms that are not clearly defined and worse linked to other verbiage that sends the head spinning.

So, what is left to do? Well, push the whole thing to the side and hope that these guys really don't have what they claim to have...namely a way to explain the universe without God.

Many of the top scientists in these fields are atheists and proud of it. These elite mathematicians and theorists are open about the un-necessary religious theories that seek to gain their audience. They patently dismiss these theological explanations of the cosmos.

My simple quest: "Do these men have a silver bullet that in fact can shoot down scripture?" Secondly, if they claim to have this 'silver bullet' "I need to know exactly what it is and what exactly does it do to negate biblical cosmology?"

I start reading, first about Evolution and the Big-Bang Theory, Then about the problems that theory has within its own ranks. Next I read about the very elite such as Stephen Hawking who found the Big-Bang sounded too loud a drum which pointed at a 'singularity' that was forcing the scientific community to entertain thoughts of "well something had to start the bang". This would never do, So, Professor Hawking devised even more fantastic and highly conceptualized versions that sought to remove the singularity.

Think of the Big-Bang theory as a Dunce Hat. The singularity being the point, a finite beginning to the hat, then an expansion until the whole appears to look like a cone.

First question? Why was the 'singularity' needing a redo? Because the scientific community has a bias...that bias is God cannot be the answer, nor can any scientist worthy of the name offer materialist explanations for a metaphysical cause. It's important to know this clearly, The Big-Bang and its subsequent improvements are asserted by reason of a preconception of the scientist himself, namely, God cannot and must not be a solution to the causation of anything.

Do not forget this first question nor it's answer, much more hinges upon it.

Re: Faith Statements - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/12/26 14:37

In my own words: First statement of Faith from the Atheist Cosmologists;

1. The human mind (some ones mind) will find the key to explaining ultimate causation and from that derive the 'why' its the causation.

Early Theologians such as Thomas Aquinas or Anselm put forth their propositions as to the beginning of creation. Aquinas felt he could offer philosophical reasoning that was sound enough that a statement of faith from the scriptures need not be applied. Thomas Aquinas a good Catholic, was born in a sweet-spot in history. Right where the scholastics and nd philosophy had some free course Thomas was positioned to offer up a Catholic/Greek Philosopher mixture.

It goes as follows :

Third Way - Contingent and Necessary Objects

This Way is sometimes referred to as the modal cosmological argument. Modal is a reference to contingency and necessary. This Way defines two types of objects in the universe: contingent beings and necessary beings. A contingent being is an object that cannot exist without a necessary being causing its existence. Aquinas believed that the existence of contingent beings would ultimately necessitate a being which must exist for all of the contingent beings to exist. This being, called a necessary being, is what we call God. Follow the argument this way: 1.Contingent beings are caused.

2.Not every being can be contingent.

3.There must exist a being which is necessary to cause contingent beings.

4.This necessary being is God.

<https://www.bing.com/search?q=thomas+aquinas+cosmological+argument&qs=SC&pq=thomas+aquinas+cosmology&sc=3-24&cvid=AF88DBDF4C74460BAF4C4B055C4B0328&FORM=QBRE&sp=1&ajf=70>

Now, no scientist would ever piggy back on Aquinas 3rd proof for God, but in earlier years this argument laid the basis for some men to give reason Aquinas was all wet.

A necessary being is a difficult conclusion and has been a nuisance to the modern scientific community for many decades.

But yet, escaping the gravitational pull of logic is not easily done with science, you need something more efficient than logic you need theorem. Aristotle has played his hand, the modern cosmologist is telling with a quick smile and instant 'up the ante' he is ready to show.

As I mentioned earlier, Professor Hawking was not appealing to logic in order to find a theory to supersede a 'singularity', he needed theorem. Theorem is that neat little word that signifies the compilation of thought process, reasoning and inference. You merely add in the subject matter as the base. Oversimplification yes, but for brevity it'll do.

The idea of an eternal universe...well that belonged to Einstein and others, but with the increase in cosmological pursuit an eternal universe sounded to 'old school'. With Hubbell just around the corner, the Big-Bang was set to go off in the scientific community and crush the eternal universe. Red-shift came into play, reverse engineering the linear time flow backwards pointed to a 'single event' that launched the career of a universe.

Einstein backed off his eternal universe views and turned more favorably toward others scientists offering theories with the current data included.

Added note: The 1940's through to the 70's carried a Rationlist mindset. You see it made fun of in shows like 'Twilight Zone', even in the 3 Stooges. That rationalist thinking where everything was to follow logic/rules/rationale that accorded with science and reason. If you watch the Miracle on 34th street movie you saw rationalism confronted by faith-feeling...and there faith wins out.

It is this backdrop or maybe seed bed where quantum mechanics are introduced as a real player in the future of cosmology. But, I'm jumping ahead.

Faith Statement #2 Cosmological origins cannot be understood outside of a Rationalist Materialist worldview.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/12/26 15:55

Faith Statement #2 Cosmological origins cannot be understood outside of a Rationalist Materialist worldview.

Question: What scientific evidence do we have to substantiate the Rationalist Materialist worldview is requisite to understanding current cosmological theory?

Answer: None: It presumes itself into the arena with credibility and validation all deriving from those with Rationalist Materialist perspective/mindset.

Question: What if someone outside the scientific community were to call 'foul' on such a statement?

Answer; They would be told that they do not have the credentials, the peer approved works, the study, the critique of the ir own theories to qualify them as legitimate judge of the Rationalist/Materialist presuppositions therefore they are dismissed outright.

Answer in street-terms: You are not in the in-crowd go away.

Re: Attraction or repulsion? - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/12/26 23:31

It is a worth while question to ask "is the scientific community that contains these elite cosmologists, physicists, mathematicians running away from God or are they in-mass running toward something?"

An atheist scientist always has time to recount the horrors of religious persecution and terror. This of course is to set the dark and dreary backdrop where they may appear as angels of light. The National Science Foundation is reported as saying "Science extends and enriches our lives, expands our imagination and liberates us from the bonds of ignorance and superstition". To this we acknowledge the propaganda found in every high school and college text book.

Ivan Karamozov made the claim "If God does not exist then everything is permissible". It would be appropriate here to suggest a little syllogism.

First Premise: If God does not exist then everything is permissible.

Second Premise: If Science is true God does not exist.

Conclusion: If Science is true, then everything is permitted.

But were not done patting ourselves on the back yet. In 2007 at the convention of Beyond Belief: Science, Religion, Reason and Survival Physicist Steven Wienberg who received the Nobel Prize for his work in electroweak unification added a dimension of dignity to their ranks said "Religion is an insult to human dignity. With it or without it you would have good people doing good things and evil people doing evil things, but for good people to do evil things you need religion for that".

He was warmly applauded, no one questioning their own track record. The question could be asked just 'who' exposed the human race to poison gas, barbed wire, high explosives, experiments in eugenics, the formula for Zyklon B, heavy artillery and so on. I don't think it was the Southern Baptists.

Steven Pinker made the incredible claim that "something in modernity and its cultural institutions has made us nobler".

As if to sweeten the drink he goes on "On the scale of decades, comprehensive data again paint a shockingly happy picture"

Some of the evidence Pinker says has been under our nose all along. Conventional history has long shown in many ways we have been getting kinder and gentler.

Pinker goes on...

Cruelty as entertainment, human sacrifice to indulge superstition, slavery as labor saving device, conquest as a mission statement of government, genocide as a means of acquiring real estate, torture and mutilation as routine punishment, death penalty for misdemeanors and differences of opinion, assassination as the mechanism of political succession, rape as spoils of war, pogroms as outlets for frustration, homicide as the major form of conflict resolution-all were the unexceptionable features of life for most of human history. But, today, they are rare to nonexistent in the West far less common elsewhere than they used to be, concealed when they do occur, and widely condemned when they are brought to light"

But, I think the Psychologist should have done some investigation. Here is a more accurate assessment of the last 'decades' where atheism, aided by scientific cohorts and godless ideologies mixed offered no distinction between the blood thirsty Aztecs and modern man.

The above quoted from David Berlinski "The Devils Delusion" Pages.19-23

Re: a more accurate depiction - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/12/26 23:53

This is what Psychologist Steven Pinker left out.
These are shockingly happy improvements

WW 1 1914-18 15 mil
Russian civil war 1917-22 9 mil
Soviet Union Stalin's regime 1924-53 20 mil
WW2 1937-45 55 mil
Chinese civil war 1945-49 2.5 mil
P.R.C Mao Zedong's regime 1949-75 40 mil
Tibet 1950 et seq 600K
Congo free state 1886-1908 8 mil
Mexico 1910-20 1 mil
Turkish massacre of armenians 1915-23 1.5 mil
China 1917-28 800 K
China Nationalist era 1928-37 3.1 mil
Korean war 1948-et seq 2.8 mil
North Korea 1948-et seq 2 mil
Rwanda and Burundi 1959-95 1.35 mil
Second indochina war 1960-75 3.5 mil
Ethiopia 1962-92 400 K
Nigeria 1966-70 1 mil
Bangladesh 1971 1.25 mil
Cambodia Khmer Rouge 1975-78 1.65 mil
Mozambique 1975-92 1 mil
Afghanistan 1979-2001 1.8 mil
Iran Iraq war 1980-88 1 mil
Sudan 1983 et seq 1.9 mil
Kinshasa Congo 1998 et seq 3.8 mil
Philippines insurgency 1899-1902 220K
Brazil 1900 et seq 500K
Amazonia 1900-12 250K
Portuguese colonies 1900-25 325K
French colonies 1900-40 200K
Japaneses war 1904-5 130K
German east africa 1905-7 175K
Libya 1911-31 125K
Balkan wars 1912-13 140K
Grego Turkish war 1919-22 250K

This is one-half of the wars that can be mentioned.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/12/28 9:37

Statement of faith 3

If the scientist is confronted with only three options:

God, Logic, Nothing. God is removed immediately, logic requires intelligence and reasoning...inanimate objects cannot reason, therefore Nothing is to be preferred over God.

The question 'are scientists running from something or to something' is answered by their normative response "anything but God".

Important note to consider.

The brain trust who are dictating to the population at large what science is telling us cannot be trusted.

Second important point to consider.

Science has no 'consensus' or singular voice representing anything.

Science has no standardized methodology to determine their conclusions. Empirical data is required for structural analysis, but there is none for String theory, Landscape theory which are both prevalent theories in cosmology and mathematics.

Science cannot connect and never has been able to connect the abstract theories of quantum mechanics and how to overcome depression or be a better person.

Science has no way to answer moral or ethical questions.

But science does in fact influence moral and ethical questions by its philosophical methodologies.

When Philosophical materialism is offered as the guiding principle behind what conclusions must come from the study of natural things, this is a statement that the 'elite' of our society is making. Shouldn't the rest of us follow suit? Shouldn't the rest of us allow no other answers to our problems than what can be deduced from natural means interpreted by rationalism and materialism?

In doing this, Christianity and other religions are in fact competing with science for acceptance in our minds.

Have we not all heard ad-nauseum "religion is a crutch for those who cannot deal with the realities of our material world".

The implication is that religion is detrimental to our society and harmful to understanding and living in our world.

It is exactly this kind of 'connection' to science that we all have in our culture and it's this connection that pulls us toward humanism and secularism in every facet of human life.

The seeds of atheism in the right people spring up into a harvest of untold millions who believe rationality/materialism is the proper mindset and humanism is the vehicle to accomplishing our goals as a society.

When science says "HIV is contracted through homosexual activity" it then does its work to locate and isolate the virus... then attempt to kill it.

But what science will not do is say "homosexuality is wrong therefore the answer to HIV is abstain from homosexuality".

But remember we have been told again and again, science is no moral arbiter and has no voice in moral issues.

But that is patently a lie, remember the syllogism

Conclusion: "If science is true all is permissible"

We are told every single day "science is true" and we are told God should not be invoked to solve our problems since his existence cannot be scientifically proven.

The final and ultimate conclusion Science is the only voice that is available and the only voice that should be heard.

So, while String-theory at first blush has nothing to do with our moral choices it is in fact an outcropping, not just of advanced mathematics but of an attempt to find causation and explanation for the world we live in excluding God and any supernatural occurrences.

Re: An Aside - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/12/28 11:36

This is just the tip of the iceberg.

Combine all of this with 4 years of high school, 4 years or more of college where all of what I have stated is taught/indoctrination to our children.

Then, with our scant 1 church service a week, maybe a home bible study probably not, influx of every kind of worldliness mediated by their cell phones, every kind of abomination televised on our TV sets...

You need not think too hard on why Jr is rebellious, angry, despairing, always pushing toward worldliness, always pushing away any Christian restraint or morals, independent thinking but thinking that is just a parroting of humanist ideology.

Our society is feeling the pressure of Principalities and powers that are shifting the whole base of our culture away from any religious/moral constraint to that of free-thinking free-living amoralism.

I understand many of us will say "yea tell us something we don't know". My humble suggestion is to make sure your kids and your grandchildren (speaking to my own self) know what we claim to all know. Do they know science is geared towards humanism? Could they even articulate it?

My suggestion is your 10 year old should be able to articulate it. Why? Because he/she is getting the theory of evolution, sexual-gender propaganda, religion is to be discouraged attitudes, parental power and authority are by permission of the state. All of this is packaged within their music, TV, schooling, peer chats and even within some churches.

In short, thousands of hours of humanist ideology preached and taught over against the few dozen hours of actual biblical instruction...your kids, my kids, our young adults will really only have one option...follow the pattern of the world, the second option know and love Jesus Christ, they can say easily "I really don't know enough to make that choice".

Re: - posted by romanhog (), on: 2018/12/28 14:04

Thank you for this thread. I find it very interesting and informative.

Natalie

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/12/28 15:03

You're welcome Natalie:

No doubt for some reading one of my posts is equivalent to taking a shot of night-time Nyquil. But, I ventured to post it and will seek to finish up with the remainder of the elite-scientist statement of faith.

To the rest:

For the record I am not attempting to portray the scientific community as dressed in black-hoods standing in a circle sacrificing a cat. I am saying that notwithstanding the common lives and dress and schooling these folks have, their depiction of how we obtain knowledge and truth carries us into devilish practices. Reject God, reject written revelation from God, despise theological insights, relegate Christianity to nothing better than paganism. With this utter rejection of divine truth all that is left is devilish imaginations of men all clothed in scientific credibility and validated by high academic achievements.

This is the paganism of the 21st century man, this is the worship of Baal, the adoration of Venus, the dread of Molech. There is a priesthood, there is a temple, there is a ritual, there is a following.

But the lingo has changed, we leave out words like worship, faith, following, fear. Those 'religion' charged words are exchanged for new ones. worship=intellectual approval, faith=scientifically accepted, following=peer approved, fear=invoking God is for crack-pots.

Walk the halls of a college...Those who are in-the-know intellectually approve of skepticism/atheism as a main tenant of becoming a peer-approved scientist. Such a fellow has believed and accepted the scientific theorems of their professors and have learned their youth-Christianity needs to be shed in favor of rationalist thinking. The Crack-pot in the class...he's the guy still clinging to his crutch Jesus. He's also the guy who cannot get an A from the class.

My Son who graduated College as Magna Cum Laude in his class had one B, that class he refused to acknowledge the credibility and validity of evolution...so he wrote a rebuttal to it. The professor accepted the well written refutation but an A was to be had on acceptance of Evolution, not a rebuttal.

Re: more to come - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2019/1/8 13:31

I haven't forgot about my thread, I'll finish up over the next week.

I'll try and give a 30 second read on quantum mechanics and string theory...only in the form of linking them to the ongoing stampede away from actual science toward pseudo-science and the validation of anti-theistic ideology.

Re: Religious faith is not approved - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2019/1/11 0:21

We have a scientific community...as I shall call them and if I may borrow a piece of text from Hebrews...

They claim, western science is above all the substance of things hoped for the evidence of things not seen.

Ah yes, they have faith. Though modern science is saturated with faith in a wide variety of disciplines, these folks cannot see the forest for the trees. They're resolute in ignoring an elephant in the room or even a herd of them if need be.

Physicist Clifford Johnson observed...failure is a possibility in any worth while endeavor. But his stance on the necessity of his faith being 'unfailing' is over against those who have religious truth-searching. He cannot afford to lose.

To put it as clearly as I can, a 19th century British mathematician W.K. Clifford said "It is wrong always, everywhere and for anyone to believe anything upon insufficient evidence". Powerful statement, but the dear math-man couldn't see his own statement was merely a statement of faith that had no scientific evidence to validate it's claim. It's this very sentiment that becomes a premise for the popular argument regarding the non-existence of God. It starts off with an assertion with built in defeaters, that would fail the first test given in logic 101.

Now the word battles begin and the question that should be asked "who is making the rules that approve faith in science and disapprove faith in God"? Well, as we will find out, they are happy to make the rules.

Remember, if you are privy at all to scientific disciplines 'evidence' is really slippery, its elastic, it bends and molds into a variety of shapes. Evidence for the presence of cancer and evidence for the presence of a multiverse (as if there is such a thing) needs to be reinterpreted a little don't you think? One mans evidence is another man's sci-fi channel.

Now, dont forget, they know this, but want our 'evidence' to conform the strictest forms of evidence for metallurgy or chemistry. So, I hope you can see the obvious duplicity, the term double-standard never seems to cross their minds.

But, we as Christians are intimidated, we cower at the Dr. So-and-so when he says "but we dont have evidence for God"

Pastors go into damage control and young Christians just hope they dont meet someone who will challenge them with such a question.

Have no fear, they have nothing, zero, zilch. They are offering their faith over against ours that is all.

But to make sure the smoke is thick, the reality of an open and empty cravasse plunging into the unknown depths must be hidden from the public. Why? Because if we know they don't know, they know we cannot trust in them; to get the dollars, the accolades, the grants, the meetings and the prestige you cannot for a second concede the emperor is wearing no clothes.

But what Clifford lacked as a logician others ran quickly to shore up with other statements. Far more advanced theories begin to come into play and these alarm our culture and we like them join in the run...away from something and toward something else.

Re: That nasty ole big bang - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2019/1/11 0:47

Nasty is the word. Since Einstein's theory was working so well, others Aleksandr Friedmann and Georges Lamaitre discovered the answer to Einstein's field equations...and cosmology has never been the same. The expanding universe as I said in an earlier post can now be looked upon as a cone. It's now traceable backwards towards that 'singularity'.

But the question to ask, "What is this 'singularity' that brought the known universe into existence? Well the FL cosmology disrupted Einstein in that he wanted his equations to point to a single world model. The problem was later exacerbated by the Hawking Penrose singularity...where all physics begin to collapse into infinity. There is no description that science can give for something like that. So, what is the singularity?

Is it physical or is it not?

We just don't know. So if there is an initial singularity and we really cannot describe it and cannot understand it...it seems to be irrelevant or the universe DID NOT begin as they said.

But, the reality of what was found concludes clearly the universe had a beginning. But what is that beginning?

Some will jump into the deep end of the pool.

Here too is where theologians and scientists also meet at the stop light, the faith of one takes them forward, the other must turn and so he does.

Re: heads up - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2019/1/11 13:40

Some of you might not know...

Physics math that has been 'proven' IS the evidence offered for the theories of Quantum Mechanics or String Theory or Landscape Theory.

It's not as though atomic particles that are here and gone or photons that wave at us or just poke out and disappear have been test-tubed weighed and packaged. The mathematics behind these theories VALIDATE the theory.

It is this deep end of the pool that the best of the best mathematicians swim with complex equations which baffle the other 99.99999999 percent of the world.

It's in this pool of theory that someone dives deep and finds quantum theory.

Now, I think all this stuff is really cool, I enjoy it. But where it takes a turn and ends in an out-house is when these theories spawn philosophical postulates.

Remember Naturalism is the spirit in which all of this scientific/mathematics/physics is approached and warranted. Because of that the birth of Methodological naturalism proceeds to inform the philosophers how and what to make of Neutrinos, Quarks etc.

Now, philosophy and science are old wrestling adversaries, they are not in actuality friends. However, they both exploit each other's "advantageous claims" to further their own agendas.

If Naturalism as a philosophy is advantageous to modern scientific thought, the scientist goes one step further and designs Methodological Naturalism.

If the philosopher can use mathematical 'multi-dimension' an extrapolation into multiverses is perfectly acceptable. In this way they win together.

It's at this stage the regular Joe reads "in a vast amount of universes it is possible that God is existent". But a quick caveat pops up... in THIS universe the court is out and we should not make claims when the findings are inconclusive.

The discerning reader must take note here: whose court are we talking about? The court that has as a working methodology a philosophy that negates the existence of God as a working premise? Does Jury-rigging come to mind?

General Topics :: Faith Statements

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2019/1/11 14:59

Do you think the "spiritual realm" is another dimension, or something else?

For example, if we had the most advanced starships etc that could go anywhere in *our* universe, could we find "the heaven"? If not, where is it?

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2019/1/11 15:39

Hi Todd: Since God is Spirit, his domain is everywhere at all times. The realm of the Spirit has no boundaries.

An analogy (this could be considered very cheesy so if someone balks I don't blame them) If I were to consider God a 'blue smoke', this blue smoke would be everywhere in all places at all times surrounding us, we drive through it we look into the long expanse of the universe and the universe is filled with it. So I consider God's Spirit unbounded where if its physical manifestation were to be 'blue smoke' we would know it as permeating all things physical and spiritual at once.

DO NOT LOAD THE GUNS this is analogy...I don't want to hear claims I am a Panentheist. I know what they believe and this aint it.

Error joined to Omnipresence produces panentheism...but that's another thread.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2019/1/11 18:52

I don't disagree- at least I don't think I do. But the fact that we can't see the spiritual realm (recall Elijah's servant who had to have his eyes opened to see the angelic army) suggests that that realm is alongside, but not part of, our physical realm. There is a veil of separation between these two realms. I don't know if I would necessarily call it another dimension because I cannot imagine what another dimension would be like.

Maybe you saw the episode of the Twilight Zone called "Little Girl Lost" that explores the idea of two dimensions that exist in seemingly the same space.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2019/1/11 21:40

Hi Todd: I still enjoy those old twilight zones. I did see that episode and I didn't like the word dimension either, it just didn't seem to fit God's Spirit realm.