# CONTEMPLATIONS ON "THE GRAND DESIGN"

## (OR A DEBATE WITH STEPHEN HAWKING IN HIS ABSENCE)

## PART ONE

## PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

VALENTIN VELCHEV

**ABSTRACT:** The debate between the exponents of the hypothesis of evolution and Christianity over the origin of the Universe, of living organisms and of man is regularly being resumed. The fundamental worldview is of vital importance to men: without it they would be lost in the nonsensical host of various scientific theories, empirical data and philosophical speculations.

In the ideal case science is called to gain knowledge of nature while religion is called to resolve issues of the viewpoint of the world as well as morality questions. However, from the time of The Enlightenment up to the present day atheists have been attempting to use science for the purpose of justifying their secular views and of opposing such views to Christianity. In the present article we will endeavour to demonstrate how the naturalist approach is wrong and flawed from a logical point of view.

**KEY WORDS:** God, design, science, naturalism, Multiverse.

### 1. The Challenge

In 2010 the book The Grand Design was published, written by the eminent British cosmologist and science promoter Stephen Hawking, with the American physicist Leonard Mlodinow as co-author. The book was successfully scandalized religious leaders[1] even before it was printed out, as theauthorsimplied that in their book they had managed to refute Sir Isaac Newton's assertion that there was no way for the Universe to have originated out of chaos, but it was rather the work of God's mighty hand.

In Peter Galison's words: "Any author would envy Hawking and Mlodinow for the attention their book The Grand Design received from the archbishop of Canterbury, from Britain's chief rabbi, and from the chair of the Muslim Council of Britain. All three of them are looking for theoretical "weapons" to help them resist the viewpoint of the two physicists who, in their joint work, shake believers' faith in God's existence."[2]

I quote Hawking's conclusion at the end of his book: "Because there is a law like gravity, the universe can and will create itself from nothing. Spontaneous creation is the reason there is something rather than nothing, why the universe exists, why we exist. It is not necessary to invoke God to light the blue touch paper and set the universe going."[3]

A number of other researchers also join in their support for the above viewpoint, arguing that science is the strongest antidote against retrograde philosophical and religious thinking. The famous physicist Laurence Krauss even advises us: "So, forget Jesus. The stars died so that you could be here today."[4]

We will "take up the gauntlet" and in a number of articles we will endeavour to respond to the challenge made to Christianity by naturalists among contemporary scientists.

## 2. What is the aim of science?

As paradoxical as it may sound, according to the words of an astronomer I know: "It is" namely scientists of Christian beliefs who have created the so called "methodological materialism", which applies observation and experiment and searches primarily for the natural explanations of natural phenomena." The prominent figures of the Enlightenment, with their fight against the Church, and, later, a number of atheist-minded philosophers gradually turned this approach into an ideological one, i.e. finally an equation mark is placed between materialism and science. But here I will dare to note that the task of science is rather not so much to find the natural causes of phenomena than to discover the objective truth of the things in reality.

Let me use a paraphrase of the classical example of William Paley's watch. A skillful craftsman invented the first (pocket) watch but he lost it while rambling in the woods. You come across this beautiful, copper-made object, you open it and youcarefully study its parts. Finally, you grasp that all its mechanisms are set in such a

way that the watch reads time with great accuracy. Then, you decide to show your finding to a professor you know and ask himto provide you with an explanation how this could have happened. You find the professor in his study, talking to a colleague of his. After long deliberations the professor starts his explanation as follows: "You have found something in nature, consequently, nature has created it. This object originated as a product of a prolonged and complex evolution of copper". And the theory starts: "At the beginning the Earth formed as a planet in a gigantic gas-and-dust cloud which thickened ... and it was heated up to thousands degrees. During its slow cooling down copper dissociated from the other substances as a pure metal, due to their different points of hardening ... In a particular type of crystallisation of copper atoms various small springs, rings, cogwheels, screws, dials, and watch hands formed. The primary matter was filled with these ... In a complicated way they have grouped in a clockwork and gradually, as a result of something like a "natural selection" the more accurate ones continued to exist, until this species that determines time with absolute accuracy appeared.

However, the other professor disagrees: "But the possibility to have this object formed by chance in nature is negligibly small. Why don't we assume, then, that it was contrived by an intelligent creator?"

What do we get in practice? If the criterion for scientific characteristics is to find natural causes for the origin of everything, then the former explanation is scientific but not true. The latter explanation is true but not scientific.

Therefore, is it not better to assume that in fact **the task of science is to discover the objective truth**? Then everything comes in its place. That is, where natural phenomena and laws function, they could be used to explain things, and if there was an intelligent intervention somewhere, this should be acknowledged. The watch hands are actuated by the elastic force of the spring, but the watch itself did not come into existence as a result of a "complex evolution of copper". **By analogy:** all processes in nature are due to natural causes, but whether nature as a whole is not the work of a skillful Creator?

### 3. If we cannot prove the Divine intellect, how shall we then confirm the presence of human intelligence?

Now, try to put yourselves in the position of a genius scientist. You have made a great discovery, and on its basis you have built, let's say, an engine with very high efficiency. You take your theoretical treatment and the model of the engine for approval before the respective patent committee. There they tell you that they will appoint an appropriate expert who will examine your work. After the examination is completed, to your greatest surprise, you hear the following conclusion from the expert:

– The theoretical treatment is correct and does not contradict the laws of nature. Practical trials also showed that the engine actually possesses the stated characteristics. But can we be certain that all this is done by our colleague, as it could have also happened by chance.

– How come? – you are asking, perplexed.

– Very simple. It is possible, for example, that your cat rambled along the keys of your typewriter, as a result of which the concept of this invention appeared on paper. Also, a potential explosion in the workshop could have become the cause for assembling the engine presented here.

– What are you talking about? – your indignation is increasingly growing. – Don't you understand that since I have the intellectual potential and the physical capability to create these things, the probability for me being their author is completely one hundred percent? And the probability for them to be accomplished by chance is negligible. Besides, there is a great number of witnesses, who have seen me while working on them.

But the expert rejoins:

– Look, it is possible that the events I have pointed out to you happened before that. You have only reproduced all this for a second time before other people, to convince them that you are the true inventor of the machine.

– It takes a long time, however, for a negligibly small chance to be realized - you keep insisting.

– Not necessarily. According to the probability theory, it could be realized from the very first time. Besides, if we accept the contemporary Multiverse concept, then surely in one of the countless worlds the cat will manage to write the scientific article, and the motor – to self-invent itself from the explosion energy. It is possible that you

have obtained the invention through a spontaneously originated bridge, just like a postal parcel, directly to your house.

Listening carefully to both parties, the committee adjudicates, as follows:

– Until there exists even a minimal probability for all to have happened by chance, there is no way we can be certain that you are the author of the item. Therefore, you cannot gain any recognition nor reward for it.

Then, a brilliant response comes to your mind:

– In that case, you will probably say that all achievements of mankind that are considered a product of our conscious activity could have originated by chance. According to your logic, people who claim that they have created them have to give up their copyright, their entitlement, and also to return their remunerations. Do you agree to do that?

Atheists among scientists have always strived to spread the concept that if there exists some probability for the world to have arisen by chance, it is exactly this probability that was certain to have materialised in reality. But whether they will agree to the standard of measurement they usebe applied also to themselves? If there is a possibility for the achievements of our civilization to have happened by chance, according to the above contemplations it turns out there is no way to prove they have created anything at all. But, if this is so, they should not claim to be scientists at all. Why then is it necessary to believe them?

To put it in a different way: If the *Multiverse theory* explains intelligent design in nature, without God's interference, then it could be applied with the same success also to the origin of all artefacts, i.e. it becomes absolutely impossible to prove the presence of human intelligence as well.

Furthermore, here we should underline one extremely significant fact – you should note that at all times there exists one hundred percent possibility for the scientist to be the actual inventor of the engine. Likewise, the possibility for an intelligent and almighty God to have created this marvellously ordered world remains always fully valid, and this is the reason why no one could ever shake the faith in the Creation, not in the least.

Stephen Hawking indirectly acknowledges this fact, since he always uses the words "God is not necessary", but he never stated in the text that "there is no God".

Contrary to the publicly accepted view, *The Grand Design* does not refute God's existence at all. In fact, putting an equation mark between the phrase "God is not necessary" and the conclusion "there is no God" was merely a wrongful interpretation by the media, in their hunt for sensation!

Naturalists constantly try to conceal the fact that the possibility of God being the actual Author of the universe always remains one hundred percent and no one is able to confute this situation. All they ponder over is whether there is any possibility for the Universe to have self-constructed itself out of the chaotic seething of vacuum.

However, someone would object: "Unlike the scientist who invented the engine, God is transcendental and there is no way we can be certain of His existence". Let us note, however, that the other universes utilised by naturalists in their attempt to equalize the result for a one hundred percent origin of medium suitable for life and intelligence, also fall outside the range of our measuring equipment. That is, no one has ever seen or registered them yet (and this will hardly ever be possible!).

There are number of scientists who do not accept the Multiverse concept as an explanation of the anthropic principle. We shall quote a few of them. Cosmologist Edward Harrison drew the following conclusion: "The fine tuning of the universe provides prima facie evidence of deistic design. Make your choice: blind chance that requires multitudes of universes or design that requires only one... Many scientists – provided they are ready to acknowledge their view – lean toward the theological explanation".[5]

Oxford philosopher Richard Swinburne speaks with utmost clarity: "To postulate trillion trillions other universe, rather than one God in order to explain the orderliness of our universe, seems the height of irrationality".[6]

Rudiger Vaas wrote: "Of course, one could always argue that there are other, strictly causally separated universes; but then they do not have any explanatory value and the claims for their existence cannot be justified by any scientifically useful benefit".[7]

That is, theology requires only one God and one single Universe, and in this case "Occam's razor" "shaves off" the more complex and unacceptable Multiverse explanation.

**4. Possible reasons**

In science, acknowledgement of the possibility for a supernatural intervention is considered equal to rejection of cognition. Indeed, when God makes miracles they are related to some breach of natural laws, in consequence of which such phenomena cannot be repeated and studied in our laboratories. The creation of the space-time continuum ex nihilo (i.e. out of nothing) is a drastic breach of the law of energy preservation and since this act is unverifiable, philosophers are forced to accept the primacy of Consciousness or of matter only as a postulate. Man creates articles which practically cannot arise through natural processes but at the same time our activity is in agreement with natural laws. In some cases, however, God does the same and this will allow us to apply the ***method of analogy*** in seeking the answer of the origin of the universe.

We are going to use a rather extensive quot from the article "In Pursuit of Intelligent Causes" by the American scientist in physical chemistry and history of science Charles Thaxton.

There he states:

"Even though both natural and intelligent causes are known to us from experience, the modern empirical science of nature typically acknowledges only natural causes. Is this prejudice on the part of scientists, some kind of conspiracy to ban intelligent causes? Not in the least. Science will allow any cause, natural or intelligent, for which there is *uniform sensory experience*.[8] In the history of modern science, however, uniform experience has associated only natural causes with regular events. That is why we do not include intelligent causes in the science of regularities today. It is not a ban, however. If intelligent causes were associated with regular events, they would be allowed in science.

In lieu of uniform experience we are unjustified in positing a cause, natural or intelligent, for any phenomenon, as a substitute of uniform experience. To illustrate, suppose we are detectives investigating a person's death. Is this a case of murder or did the person die of natural causes? We cannot know the answer in advance. We have to look and find out. If a detective announced at the beginning of his investigation that the person's death could only have been natural, we would object that this was an illegitimate restriction of the possible causes. Since what we hope to *discover* through

our investigation is precisely whether death resulted from an intelligent cause (murder) or was natural, we need a method of inquiry open to either explanation. A method is needed that will enable us to determine with the highest probability which one it was.

As we have seen, throughout the history of experimental science regularities have been associated with natural causes. Other events, most notably origin events, are not regular, and may be unique. What we need is a methodology that will get beyond *a priori* commitment to causes and give us criteria for building a case for either natural or intelligent cause.

*Analogy*

How would one decide in favour of an intelligent cause of some event in the past? In general, we use the same method to identify an intelligent cause that we use for a natural cause, i.e., uniform sensory experience. It is called the analogy method.

In the 19th century astronomer John F. W. Herschel advanced the analogical method of reasoning from observed causes to unknown causes: "If the analogy of two phenomena be *very close and striking*, while, at the same time, the cause of one is very obvious, it becomes scarcely possible to refuse to admit the action of an analogous cause in the other, though not so obvious in itself."[9] Scientists have relied on this method for more than 150 years. The tremendous success of science is at least a partial attestation of the method. [...]

As an illustration of the analogical method, consider the field of archaeology. The principle of analogy is used regularly in archaeology to determine whether some finding had an intelligent cause. The reasoning goes like this: In the present we see a craftsman making pottery. Therefore, when we search through the dust in a hill in Mesopotamia and find a broken clay pot, it is reasonable to infer that its source was likewise a craftsman. [...]

Incidentally, the same reasoning is employed by astronomers in their search for intelligent life in the cosmos. It is routinely used by NASA imaging teams to evaluate data from planets and their moons: these teams use criteria for recognizing evidence of intelligent life on the planets – some distinctive mark of things produced by intelligence. [...]

Astronomer Carl Sagan has maintained that even a single message from space would establish the existence of extraterrestrial intelligence. He wrote: "There are others who believe that our problems are soluble, that humanity is still in its childhood, that one day soon we will grow up. The receipt of *a single message from space* would show that it is possible to live through such technological adolescence: the transmitting civilization, after all, has survived."[10]

If we do discover radio waves that exhibit the characteristics of a message, would we not be justified in positing an intelligent being as their source, based on analogy with the messages we know in our experience are produced by intelligent beings, namely humans? In other words, the analogical method would detect generic intelligence, not specifically human intelligence." – Thaxton winds up.[11]

### 5. Applying the analogy method

Let us try to draw some simple examples, characterizing our mental and creative activity, and let us see whether they can be seen in the structure of the universe and the living creatures.

*First* – provision of suitable parameters for the operation of a system. We calculate in advance the optimum conditions for the running of the production processes, after that we set the instruments to maintain them constant. In an absolutely *analogous* way seem selected and fixed the exactly needed constants, laws and interactions, the so called fine tuning of the Universe.

*Second*. It is not difficult at all for the intellect to realize processes with infinitely small probability of realization. The automobile is a product of our intelligence. Is it possible that it is assembled as a result of natural elements? We will look at only one of the engine parts. Let us say that we have a ready cylinder. What is the probability for the piston that goes with it to arise by chance with the appropriate form and dimensions? Simple considerations show that it is $(1/\infty)^2$, since forms are infinite in number, as well as the dimensions. And if the cylinder itself should emerge in the same manner, so that these two elements can be assembled and the system can work, the total probability is $(1/\infty)^4$, i.e. less than an "absolute zero". The designer, however, with no particular efforts, can immediately determine the appropriate parameters of the elements, out of the infinite number of possibilities, and by making some calculations

he can assemble the above items. (We are very seldom aware of the extraordinary faculties of our mind!) In the second part we will find out that for the appearance of the universe we get probabilities of the order of $1/\infty^n$, but the further conception of our surrounding reality is much more complicated. That is, for a conscious God it is one hundred percent possible to create the world, whereas no perspective opens before the blind chance (the "watch-maker", in Richard Dawkins's words) to accomplish a similar task.

*Third*. When designing a bridge, a building, a machine, etc., or when we strive to create a scientific model for some mental phenomenon, we use the laws of logic and mathematics to justify veraciously our deliberations. The fact that the material and the abstract realities and their behaviour canbe described through mathematics implies that its symbolic formulae actually conceal information that gives expression to the design of the author of the objects and theories in question. The Italian mathematician Mario Livio wrote: "Not without reason mathematics is considered the only science that God condescended to grant to humankind. A proof of that is the fact that the Great book of the created world seems to be pedantically written in the language of mathematics, that the laws that govern everything around us, from the movement of the planets to trading on the stock exchange, have crystal clear mathematical form".[12]

*Fourth*. The most complicated items in our practice – computers, robotised machines, artificial intellect appliances, etc. – are in fact complex systems which were built from a multitude of hierarchically ordered and interacting subsystems.

The lowest levels of each line here are considered as the main "building bricks" of the system.

A group of building bricks constitute a subsystem of a higher level.

Several such subsystems could form a subsystem of an even higher level, etc., until an overall structure is formed.

Each level of ordering could be regarded as relatively independent and its properties represent a qualitative leap, and it cannot be adduced to the mechanical sum of the properties of the levels preceding it. In Aristotle's words: "The whole is greater than the sum of its parts". The most astonishing finding is that this hierarchical principle is observed also in nature – elementary particles, atoms, molecules, cells, tissues, organs, and systems, linked in an overall organism. The human individual, for

example, is composed of the subsystems in question, the conscious level being something radically new and could not be deduced to the biologic one, and the latter, on its turn – to the chemical, physical, etc. We could assume that in the basis of it all lay the quantum phenomena, governing the behaviour of the particles, and later on, even though the unity is kept, there come qualitatively different levels of organization. As Ian Barbour successfully phrased it: "The existence of each object is determined by its interactions with other objects and by its participation in more general systems. Without these holistic quantum phenomena there will be neither chemical properties, ... nor nuclear energy, nor life".[13]

*Fifth*. There is no way a football ball can change its state of repose or its direction of movement on its own. But the players can change its impulse by giving it some speed with their force, directing it according to their will. Also, there is no hindrance whatsoever for the intelligent and omnipotent Creator, after creating the celestial bodies, to "push them along their orbits" (according to Newton's words). Let us remember the paradox that exists in our Solar system. *The mass of all planets is hardly 1/750 of the mass of the Sun, but in the distribution of the general moment of the quantity of movement (the moment of momentum) over 98% of it falls to the planets, and less than 2% - to the Sun.* However, is it possible to reach in a natural way such a drastic breach of the moment of momentum, or an additional intelligent intervention is required? Because, if it is proven for at least one of the structures of our world that it was not formed as a result of the action of the natural laws, this would necessarily justify the existence of an intelligent Creator (paraphrasing Sagan).

*Sixth*. The German professor of informatics Werner Gitt states: "To every piece of information imanently belong the following hierarchical levels: Syntax (code, grammar), semantics (meaning), pragmatics (action) and apobetics (result, purpose). These categories are nonmaterialist in their essence ... That is, the information is a probabilistic notion, although the signs could be considered also from a statistical point of view (as with Shannon's theory)." Further on he continues: "Information is always something settled and it arises only through will (intention, intuition, planning). In other words: at the beginning of each piece of information there is its planning by a spiritual source (transmitter)."[14] Thus, the question on the originat of the genetic code and its translation receives the best answer possible.

*Seventh.* Let us assume for a moment that we do not know how automobiles came into existence. One day we visit an auto showroom, which exhibits different brands of passenger cars, presenting examples of their models from their first to their most recent model. What would be our conclusion then, if we are led by the contemporary scientific premise that requires us to search only for the natural reasons for their origin. Taking into consideration the organization that becomes increasingly more complex, we could assume that the whole variety of forms is due to a prolonged and complexly ramifying evolution. That is to say, the resemblance in their structure and functions could force us to come to a rather misleading conclusion. However, if the above two principles are followed, we will find that there is no way even for such simple systems to have originated through a series of accidental processes (and natural selection!); but rather that a purposeful and planning intelligent activity is required. In that case, why don't we assume that plants and animals were also "created according to their species" – a conclusion that is substantiated also by the total lack of transitional forms.

Analogy is not a proof yet, of course, but scientists' point of view is that if it walks like a lion, it looks like a lion and it roars like a lion, it is most probably a lion. That is to say, if so many principles in nature testify of an intelligent design, then most probably the world is the work of an intelligent Designer.

Hawking and Mlodinow acknowledge in their book: "The relatively recent discovery of the extreme fine-tuning of so many of the laws of nature could lead at least some scientists back to the old idea that this grand design is the work of some grand designer."[15]

It turns out that the authors of The Grand Design approve of the M-theory and the cosmological model of a Multiverse, **which in practice are beyond proof**, mostly to 'protect'scientists from believing in the 'heresy' of the grand Designer.

What is more: note that even the conclusion "God is not needed" turns into a completely speculative one, since, in order to reach this conclusion, Hawking and Mlodinow refer to theories which not only are not corroborated, but it will hardly ever be possible to test them empirically!

### 6. The opinion of "retrograde" philosophers and scientists

Philosopher David Hume who lived in the 18th century is one of the most influential personalities in the Scottish enlightenment. The main traits of his creative works are scepticism and naturalism, i.e. in no way we can reproach him for being biased in favour of Christianity. In a famous passage of his book "Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion" David Hume makes an analogy between the human mind and God's mind.

Cleanthes, one of his characters in the book, says: “Look at the world around. Contemplate the whole and every part of it. You will find it to be nothing but one great machine, subdivided into an infinite number of lesser machines, which again admit of subdivisions to a degree beyond what human senses and faculties can trace and explain. All these various machines, and even their most minute parts, are adjusted to each other with an accuracy which ravishes into admiration all men who have ever contemplated them. The curious adapting of means to ends, throughout all nature, resembles exactly, though it much exceeds, the productions of human ... intelligence. Since, therefore, the effects resemble each other, we are led to infer ... that the causes also resemble each other; and that the Author of Nature is somewhat similar to the mind of man, though possessed of much larger faculties, proportioned to the grandeur of the work which he has executed."[16] In that case Hume reasons from the point of view of 18th century knowledge, when nature was compared to an enormous machine.

British astronomer James Jeans further developed this thesis in line withcontemporary science viewpoint: "Phenomena in the Universe take place not according to mechanical principles, as was considered until recently, but according to purely mathematical principles. Comparing nature to an enormous machine should be abandoned due to the stream of scientific knowledge on the non-mechanical reality. The universe begins to look more like a great thought rather than like a great machine. If this world is a world of thought it is clear that it should be the thought of some Creature That thinks, and His creations should have been an act of that thinking Creature’s thought. We, scientists, begin to accept the view that it is the Spirit that has to be hailed as Creator and Governor in the realm of matter. Contemporary scientific theories compel us to think of the Creator of the world as someone operating outside time and space. The Universe provides us with evidence of a controlling power which

has operated with a view of a certain goal and which has something in common with the human mind."[17]

The same is stated also by a number of other scientists.

Richard Lewontin, a geneticist at the Harvard University, admits that naturalism was superficially brought into science: "It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, on the contrary – it is by our a priori adherence to materialist causes that we are forced to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce materialist explanations."[18]

**Therefore, is it not time to break off with the established naturalistic paradigm and to accept that things in nature can also have an intelligent Cause for their own genesis?!**

**7. "He catches the wise in their craftiness" (I Cor. 03:19).**

Naturalists assert that evolution is a universal phenomenon, and because of that it should have naturally given rise to centres of life on a multitude of other planes in the cosmos. As part of the SETI project, researchers have scanned the sky all over the world in search of signals from intelligent beings. Cosmic spacescraft launched into a trajectory beyond the borders of the Solar system carry golden-plated phonographic records as a message to our galactic brothers-in-intelligence. Quite a few scientists are even prone to consider our biosphere as an experiment of an advanced extraterrestrial civilization. According to a famous statement by Hawking: "Our creator could be a physics student in an advanced civilization carrying out a routine lab experiment".

But here a contradiction that is difficult to explain springs up. The same authorities, who are flatly against the Divine origin (and have declared any such doctrine as unscientific), readily accept the intelligent interference by another civilization?! Blaise Pascal poses the question: "Why so many people do not believe in Divine truths? Is it because they have not been proven to them?" And he replies: "No, it is because they do not like them."

The reason why we deny God but accept the evolutionary idea instead, as we have assured ourselves, is not its persuasiveness, it is some other reason. Perhaps every one should admit to oneself what that reason is.

At first glance, the debate on the Origin brings conservative Christians against scientists of the naturalistic conviction. But whether this debate has not also another more farreaching perspective, i.e. whether it does not concern all people? If we were not misled by Darwin, then everything, from the formation of the cosmic systems to the origin of life and its evolution, is due to self-organization of matter. After all, the Universe, as well as every form of life in it are destined to death and the best conclusion for us remains, in Apostle Paul's words: "let us eat and drink for tomorrow we die" (I Cor. 15: 32). But what will follow if we assume for a second that the Sufferer from the Golgotha could be right? Then His cross turns into a demarcation line for the whole humankind - to some for eternal life, for others ... So, it turns out that ***we are all in the same boat***, since the truth about the world, both about the world today and about the future world, is equally important and valid to each of us? In that way what we believe in could turn out to be a **"Pledge larger than life"!** (the wittily chosen title of a Polish movie from my childhood).

**Conclusion**

Finally, let us briefly reiterate the major points of our reply to the challenge made by Stephen Hawking:

1. The task of science is to discover the objective truth, assuming to that end both natural and intelligent causes for the realization of reality events.

2. If the *Multiverse theory* explains intelligent design in nature without God's interference, then it could be applied with the same success also to the origin of all artefacts, i.e. it becomes equally absolutely impossible to prove the presence of human intelligence.

3. The conclusion "God is not necessary" is speculative since, in order to come to that conclusion, Hawking and Mlodinow refer to the M-theory and the cosmologic model of a Multiverse, which, in essence, are incapable of being proved.

4. It is time to break off with the naturalistic paradigm superficially brought into science, and to accept that phenomena in nature can also have an intelligent Cause for their genesis?!

5. The assumption that life on Earth could be an experiment of an intelligent civilization, and the rejection at the same time of the Creation doctrine, bespeaks not

only of inconsistency, but also of a negative attitude towards the Bible, which obscures the possibility for an objective assessment of things by naturalists.

NOTES:

[1] Religious leaders hit back at Hawking
http://edition.cnn.com/2010/WORLD/europe/09/03/hawking.god.universe.criticisms/index.html#fbid=VXQB4-kvyiF&wom=false

[2] Stephen Hawking slammed the door right under God's nose
http://goo.gl/DUwyk6

[3] Hawking, St., L. Mlodinow The Grand Design, IK BARD LTD, Sofia, 2012, page 214

[4] Krauss, L. "A Universe from nothing" Iztok-Zapad, Sofia, 2012.
http://iztok-zapad.eu/books/book/940

[5] Harrison, E., "Masks of the Universe", Macmillan, New York, 1985, p. 252, 263

[6] Swinburne, R., "Is There a God?", Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1995, p. 68

[7] Vaas, R. *Time before time. Classifications of universes in contemporary cosmology, and how to avoid the antinomy of the beginning and eternity of the world*
http://arxiv.org/pdf/physics/0408111

[8] It was the Scottish philosopher David Hume who introduced the term "*uniform experience*". By this term he designates one objective experience of the five senses, not a subjective or religious experience.

[9] John F. W. Herschel, 1831. *Preliminary Discourse on the Study of Natural Philosophy*. London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, p. 149.

[10] Carl Sagan, *Broca's Brain*, 1979. New York: Random House, p. 275

[11] In Pursuit of Intelligent Causes: Some Historical Background
http://www.leaderu.com/offices/thaxton/docs/inpursuit.html

[12] Livio, M. "Is God mathematician" Iztok-Zapad, Sofia, 2010.
http://www.book.store.bg/p41555/matematik-li-e-bog-mario-livio.html

[13] Barbur, I. "Religion and science: history and contemporaneity", St. Andre's Biblical Theological Institute, M. 2000, p. 213.

[14] Gitt, W. "Did God use evolution" Veren OOD, Sofia 1997, p. 69, 70

[15] Hawking, St., L. Mlodinow The Grand Design, IK BARD LTD, Sofia, 2012, p.196

[16] Hume, D. "Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion", p. 9.
http://mind.ucsd.edu/syllabi/02-03/01w/readings/hume-dialogues.pdf

Many suppose that Cleanthes presents the view of Hume himself, i.e. that the philosopher has secret personal convictions as regards the intelligent origin of the Universe. As we have noted, however, in the rest of his creative work there are no other grounds for a similar conclusion; therefore it is more logical to assume that this is some passing insight of his. In fact, Hume tries to criticize the teleological argument for the existence of God in his work, but as early as one hundred years later Charles Darwin actually succeeded to find an acceptable alternative of this argument (and not to refute it, as some wrongly consider).

[17] Popov, S. "Why do I believe in God", Sofia, 1992, p. 35, 36.

James Jeans – Wikiquote

https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/James_Jeans

[18] Richard Lewontin, New York Review of Books, January 9, 1997