

## The First Miracle of Naturalism and the Two Basic Worldviews

“The theories and discoveries of thousands of physicists since the 1930s have resulted in a remarkable insight into the fundamental structure of matter: everything in the universe is found to be made from a few basic building blocks called fundamental particles, governed by four fundamental forces. Our best understanding of how these particles and three of the forces are related to each other is encapsulated in the Standard Model of particle physics...

...Although the Standard Model accurately describes the phenomena within its domain, it is still incomplete. Perhaps it is only a part of a bigger picture that includes new physics hidden deep in the subatomic world or in the dark recesses of the universe” ([CERN](#), 2017).

People are enamored with modern science for its ability to provide mechanistic explanations. The idea is that scientists do the responsible thing and actually uncover *how*, scientifically, things occur rather than invoking some supernatural explanation. The holy grail of science would seem to be a mechanistic explanation for the origin of the universe of itself. I know at least one scientist has attempted such a grand unification theory—a mechanistic explanation for all of life and the universe. However, isn't it apparent that a mechanistic explanation for the ultimate origin of the universe is impossible? Clearly, if naturalists/materialists trace our universe to its material point of origin, they are going to hit bedrock: the existence of some set of components that cannot

be reduced any further and that cannot account for their own existence. (To suggest that these components brought themselves into existence is a logical contradiction. For something to bring itself into existence would require the thing to exist before it existed.)

In other words, materialists have to invoke their own miracle at the earliest stage of the game. They must work from a bedrock that is inexplicable by the laws of nature. This suggests that a cosmologist's preoccupation with mechanistic explanations is little more than an elaborate stalling technique. If methodological naturalism doesn't save scientists from invoking a miracle, why do many scientists insist that it is critical to deny creationists theirs?

Logic, rather than science, should be used to define the parameters of what is reasonable. A personal creative force is wholly reasonable. It fits our universe and ourselves. But for the past two-hundred years, since the publication of Darwin's *On the Origin of Species*, this conclusion has become increasingly unpopular. Many appear to agree: "Why conclude God when you can dream up an impersonal force?"

To each his own. However, those who *insist* upon impersonal forces must invoke their own miracle and, on top of this, neglect basic logic.