

# God cannot be measured with science

I am amused by the recent spate of atheistic spokesmen who are clogging our media with their know-it-all attitude toward God. It might be better called a know-nothing attitude.

A news story tells me that recently there were 400 talks in Columbia on the existence of God in a single day. I don't really know this, can't prove it, but will take it on faith. That's a lot of God (or no-God) talk even for a university town.

One of the speakers was physicist Victor Stenger. Appearing at the Columbia Public Library at the invitation of the Show-me Skeptics and the MU Brights, he said that only by the scientific method can we determine God's existence.

Stenger stressed that we should be able to use the scientific method to detect God's presence. If such a God existed, he claimed, there would be effects that violate the laws of physics and these would be empirically measurable.

One question: How would one empirically measure God? One can, indeed, measure the material consequences (the natural world around us) of a Creator, but there is no way — supposing there is a God — that this God can be measured.

There are many things that cannot be measured by the scientific method. For instance, could Stenger say that nowhere in the vast universes no living creatures exist (maybe much like us) just because science cannot find them? Can he say that there is not a boundary or end to space just because science cannot detect it? I can maintain (believe) that miracles occur, that love exists, that UFOs are around us. But I can't prove these things scientifically.

I believe that since the universe exists and all that is in it, I can assume that something must have caused it, for beyond something there cannot be nothing. Even science would say that whatever is moved must have a mover, that whatever exists must have a creator.

What would people like Dr. Stenger wish to find with the scientific empiricism?

What would satisfy their belief in a God? Perhaps a physical heaven. Or maybe an actual measurable being sitting on a literal throne. Such a conception of God may well not be true, but the idea of God is beyond physical, measurable limitations.

Some scientists may not believe there is a God. That is certainly their privilege.

But must we conclude that no God exists simply because this God is not seen materially and not measured?

Stenger said that the question of an existing God was not beyond the competence of science "so long as we handle it in a rational way." OK. Then what is the rational way? Just what would be the rational arguments against the existence of God? I would think the scientific attitude toward God would be, at a minimum, that such existence is thus far not open to science — and may never be. That scientists do not (and cannot) know everything. That we simply can not comprehend existence beyond our mundane, everyday, empirical epistemology.

OK. OK. I know about the Big Bang theory, creature evolution and all that. But what caused the Big Bang, and before all those tiny slimy things slithered out of the water to become elephants, cockroaches, and human beings, what was there? As the poet James Weldon Johnson has written, "Some call it evolution; others call it God."

**JOHN MERRILL**



Even science would say that whatever is moved must have a mover, that whatever exists must have a creator.

**Merrill, a professor emeritus at the Missouri School of Journalism, has written and taught around the world and here in Columbia for more than 50 years.**