

CONSISTENT APPROACHES
TO THE KNOWLEDGE OF
THE UNIVERSE

Atheism, Islam and Christianity
in the Language of Metaphysics

+

RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF ATHEISM

Commentaries on the debate between Lawrence
Krauss and Hamza Tzortzis on the topic: “Islam
or Atheism — Which Makes More Sense?”

THE EXPERIENCE OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES

DISPUTE ABOUT A HUMAN
ATHEISM AND RELIGIONS
PHYSICS AND METAPHYSICS

+

Konstantin Volkodav
Lupivenator Dei



FONTES HISTORIARUM

Institute of Fundamental
Anthropology

Consistent Approaches to the Knowledge of the Universe.

Atheism, Islam and Christianity in the Language of Metaphysics.

Series: Fontes Historiarum (Origins of History), Institute of Fundamental Anthropology.

Volkodav K. G. (Lupivenator Dei), Doctor of Theology (PhD)

Religious Aspects of Atheism

Commentaries on the debate between Lawrence Krauss and Hamza Tzortzis on the topic: “Islam or Atheism — Which Makes More Sense?”

The experience of religious studies

Volkodav K. G.

Annotation:

This book is devoted to finding answers to the main existential questions of every human's life: who am I ontologically, do I have a higher purpose? These are the very “eternal questions” that make a human being human, which distinguishes him from all other creatures in the universe. From time immemorial, people have argued about the criteria of truth, about the meaning of human life and about the nature of things. Usually this was expressed in a dispute between religions. About two hundred years ago, atheism arose in Christian Europe and began to take part in these disputes. For two hundred years, there have already been thousands of disputes on the topic “Religion and Atheism”, in which, as a rule, representatives of Christianity or Islam speak about religion.

However, to analyze them abstractly, in general, would be incorrect. Therefore, we will comment on one specific dispute here, by the example of which we will try to reveal the essence of all similar disputes. This is a debate between a representative of Atheism and a representative of Islam. In addition, we will comment from the point of view of Christianity. Thus, a trialogue will be presented here — three points of view, and the problems discussed will be shown as if “three-dimensionally”. The book is written in simple language and can be useful to many people balancing on the verge of faith and unbelief.

Copyright © 2020 by Volkodav Konstantin Gennadievich: text (except for the text of the debate), comments, layout, design, and cover jacket.

All rights reserved, including the right to reproduce this book or portions thereof in any form whatsoever.

For information address by e-mail:

logos@logoselpidas.com

eleosagapi@gmail.com

or through the sites:

<https://logoselpidas.com>

<https://bonumlibrum.ru>

Praise for *Religious Aspects of Atheism*

A very good and timely book! Today, many people who are looking for God or hesitant, especially observing the position, behavior and way of life of the Church hierarchy of various confessions, unfortunate people, easily fall under the influence of atheistic propaganda. This book is a good answer and refutation of this propaganda, written by a very good and competent theologian. Comments are intelligible and well-grounded, easy and interesting to read! I recommend to everyone!

Sergey N. Kurtalidi

The format of this book is very interesting — a discussion within a discussion. I hope that the questions posed by the author will resonate with readers, and a discussion will emerge that expands and complements this debate. The book is written in good language, easy to read and interesting. The density of thought is high. I also want to note that the author's suggestion to read the topics that interest you selectively makes sense. The book is made so that it can be read in arbitrary parts, and not just sequentially. The book touches upon not only theological and philosophical aspects, but also publicistic and historical plans.

Yaroslav Taran

CONTENTS

PREFACE	6
The Same “Dimension” of Atheism and Religion	12
Logical Arguments and Evidences are Counterproductive in Debates About Religion	16
Could the Universe Have Come into Existence from Non- Existence by Physics?.....	27
Three Options to Explain the Origin of the Universe	37
General Principle of Causality	70
The Particular Principle of Causality (the Phenomenon of Creativity)	72
The Particular Principle of Causality in the Book of Genesis	73
The Particular Principle of Causality in Cosmogony	75
The Particular Principle of Causality in Human Creativity	77
Problems of Nurturing Creativity	79
General Principles of Proving the Existence of God	80
Is Krauss Needed to Create a Book out of Nothing?	85
Believers Disbelief	94
Doubt and Critical Thinking as an Attribute of Christianity	94
Moral Values are Based on Metaphysics	120
Jurisprudence and Metaphysics	121
Foundations for Human Rights	121
What did not Know the Founding Fathers of the United States?.....	125
“Autoimmune Diseases” of States	128
Class Struggle and Human Rights	128
1. Chile under Pinochet	131
2. Russia in Modern Times	134
3. War with the Miners in Britain 1984–1985, “Thatcherism”	136
The Problem of Overpopulation of the Planet	138
Possible Solutions to the Problem of Overpopulation	149
Population Density	149
About Resources	151
Development of New Territories	153
Life on Water	155

Colonization of Seas and Oceans	158
Floating States	159
No Problem for a Thousand Years	160
War Between the Poor and the Rich?	168
What will Happen after the Arrival of the “New World Order”?.....	171
A Child’s Teardrop and a “Ticket to Paradise”: Aspects of Theodicy	173
Two Ideas, Two Paths	187
Different Meanings of the Term “Faith”	200
Faith in the Heart as a Commandment to Love	204
The Faith of Hope as the Foundation of Theodicy	205
The Last Judgment is not about Faith, but about Humanity ..	208
Atheism is a Religion of Unbelief	247
Metaphysics in the Field of Culture	250
Metaphysics in the Social Sphere	255
Bias in Science	257
Atheism as Religious Plagiarism	259
Metaphysical Motivation for Atheism	264
Metaphysics of Good and Evil, Freedom and Suffering	287
Relativity of Atheist Evidence, the Problem of Suffering	292
CONCLUSION	302
EPILOGUE	304
BIBLIOGRAPHY	307
MAIN SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS	308

PREFACE

We want to know in order to live. And to live means, on the other hand, to live not in blindness and darkness, but in the light of knowledge ... And in the last depth of our being, we feel that the light of knowledge and the highest good of life we are looking for are two sides of the same principle.

S. L. Frank

From time immemorial, people have argued about the criteria of truth, about the meaning of human life and about the nature of things. Usually this was expressed in religious disputes. About two hundred years ago, atheism arose in Christian Europe, and began to take part in these disputes. Many books have been written on these topics. Nevertheless, a book is a monologue of one author. A more complete picture is obtained when different colors and contrast are present in it. Therefore, it is advisable to conduct dialogues, trialogues, disputes, in which representatives of different points of view argue. For two hundred years, there have already been thousands of disputes on the topic “Religion and Atheism”, in which, as a rule, representatives of Christianity or Islam speak about religion. The titles of these disputes can vary widely. For example, there might be a title “Religion and Science”, “Religion and Evolution”, “I don’t believe!” etc. However, the

essence is the same everywhere and the arguments for each side are approximately the same. It is like a children's carousel where you can change animal figures. You can exchange horses for donkeys, camels, giraffes, etc., but the rotation mechanism and trajectory will be the same. Therefore, the disputes of the XXI century, in fact, differ little from the disputes of the XIX century. For two centuries, almost nothing has changed. Perhaps, it is impossible to reach a consensus between religions and atheism through disputes, controversies, and discussions.

Therefore, we will try to consider the discussed problems alone, in creative silence, that is, we will present our views in the genre of Plato's Dialogues. However, it would not be correct to analyze the dispute between atheists and believers in a completely abstract way, without reference to specific individuals. It is not very nice to argue with fictitious opponents and refute the arguments of marginal anonymous (as atheists often do). Therefore, we will comment on one specific dispute here, by the example of which we will try to reveal the essence of all similar disputes. This is a debate between a prominent representative of Atheism and a well-known representative of Islam. In addition, we will comment on their polemic from the point of view of Christianity. Thus, three points of view will be presented here, and the problems discussed will be shown as if in "three-dimensional".

Debate video source:

<https://youtube.com/watch?v=uSwJuOPG4FI>

Name:

The Big Debates: Islam or Atheism — Which Makes More Sense?

London, Saturday 9 March 2013

Participants:

Professor Lawrence Maxwell Krauss is a renowned cosmologist and popularizer of science, founder of the Faculty of Earth and Space Studies and honorary director of the “Origins” project at the University of Arizona (USA), author of about three hundred scientific publications and nine books, including international bestsellers “The Physics of Star Trek” and “A Universe from Nothing: why there is something rather than nothing”.

Hamza Andreas Tzortzis is a student of the organization “Islamic Thought”, author, lecturer, employee of the Islamic Education and Research Academy (iERA).

00:00:24: Introduction — Timothy Yusuf Chambers (Moderator)

00:06:30: Opening Remarks — Hamza Tzortzis

00:32:02: Opening Remarks — Lawrence Krauss

00:59:33: Rebuttal — Hamza Tzortzis

01:14:28: Rebuttal — Lawrence Krauss

01:22:43: Summary Discussion

01:42:07: Question & Answer Session

02:06:00: Closing Remarks — Lawrence Krauss

02:07:50: Closing Remarks — Hamza Tzortzis

Below we will alternate our comments with quotes from the debates, highlighting them in different fonts. For the sake of brevity, we have skipped irrelevant parts of the discussion.

The time interval is indicated in square brackets.

[00:00:58–00:03:03] Moderator: I start by praising God, the Compassionate, the Merciful ...Peace be upon whole gathering! ...Welcome and thank you very much for attending. This that I hope will be a seminal debate between two respected speakers on the left and the right. That is all about. It is about a debate and it is about of come together and been truth to each other ... Tonight’s challenging debates in title “Islam or Atheism: Which Makes More Sense?” is not happening in a vacuum, quantum and otherwise. It is taking place within a context of the world full of human beings looking for answers, in a world similarly full of Western promise, a world full of information hub by the IT. However, IT and we seem fail to adequately answer the most fundamental questions about life, our existence ...

1 COMMENT

In general, everything he said correctly, however, the formulations are not quite clear. Any instrument cannot measure meaning, and one cannot say where it is more and where it is less. The meaning is either there or not. It would be more correct to say, “Islam or Atheism: what gives a person the meaning of life?”

It is also not clear what “Western priorities” are meant? For the last two hundred years, the West has been dominated by secular, that is, atheistic priorities. Fundamental questions, which from time immemorial have occupied the best minds of humankind: “How to find the truth?”, “How to

distinguish between good and evil?” and so on, were previously solved in a metaphysical context. The atheistic worldview directed the search vector to purely material aspects. Only that which can be verified by experiment began to be considered true. In general, instead of asking, “Where is the truth?” the priority was given to the question: “What is more useful?” Instead of metaphysical moral truths, the priority was given to the question, “How to become successful and avoid failures,” etc. Information technology has nothing to do with it. This is just a technical tool that does not answer any questions. However, if people replace live interpersonal relationships only with dry transmission of information, then some metaphysical qualia¹ disappear from these relationships.

The poet Yevgeny Baratynsky well expressed this general tendency back in 1842 in the following stanzas:

The century walks along its iron path;
 In the hearts of self-interest, and a common dream
 Hour by hour vital and useful
 Clearer, shamelessly busy.
 Disappeared in the light of enlightenment
 Poetry, childish dreams

1. For more information on qualia, see the book: К. Г. Волкодав. Эволюция: тёмная сторона самого грандиозного шоу на Земле. Т. 1/Серпухов, 2016. С. 139.

And generations are not worried about it,
They are devoted to industrial cares.

Moderator: Which is, of course, the main core area, we gone be addressing tonight in this auditorium in London ...

I remember, you know, spending a large part of my life asking myself, “Why am I here? Who created me? Do I have a purpose?” Do we be certain about any of these questions?

2 COMMENT

Of course, these questions concern humanity throughout all its history. Exactly these metaphysical questions are underlying any religion. In search of answers to these questions, people look at these debates² and others like them.

Therefore, it would be logical to ask prof. Krauss, an cosmologist-atheist, how from the “quantum fog” or from the “Big Bang” to go to a person interested in the issues of being and the meaning of life, his own higher destiny. Evolution cannot be involved in this, since these questions are purely metaphysical and have nothing to do with natural selection or adaptation for the sake of survival. No animals ask such questions in principle, and they have nothing like this even in embryonic form. Unfortunately, the participants in the debate did not even come close to this important topic at all.

2. The video footage of this debate on <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uSwJuOPG4FI> has so far been watched by about 41 million people.

3 COMMENT

The Same “Dimension” of Atheism and Religion

This is perhaps the first religious aspect of atheism to pay attention too. In physics, the concept of dimension plays an important role. One can somehow compare and contrast values of only one dimension. It is impossible, for example, to compare mass and temperature, something triangular and something bright. The same is in the field of human thought and creativity. Nobody will have a debate on the topic: “Mathematics or Music — Which Makes More Sense?” “Chess or Swimming — Which Makes More Sense?” There has never been a debate on the topic: “Atheism or Architecture — Which Makes More Sense?” or something similar. However, the debate on the topic: “Atheism vs Religion” happen very often. Moreover, they happen in the same way as the debates between different religions.

Attempts are sometimes made to bring atheism to a “common denominator” with religions, considering it as a worldview. However, the worldview is an attribute of religion. Therefore, Krauss avoids the term, preferring to emphasize a “common sense”. Nevertheless, no matter how one characterizes atheism; common sense and whatever else and all the same can be found in any religion. Thus, the very fact of the debate between religions

and atheism speaks of their equal conditional “dimension” — this is one area of the human spirit.

Moderator: Once I asked a bishop, “What is the purpose of life?” And he said to me, “Go and do a theology degree.” I am not telling you to do theology degree, I am asking you to sit here in the debate for two hours with my two honorable guests over here.

4 COMMENT

Of course, the bishop should not have rejected the person who asked difficult questions in such a way and put on him a burden that he could not bear. However, in theory, the bishop is right. In short, they may be misunderstood. Moreover, even a two-hour lecture will not help much. Jesus Christ taught the apostles for over three years, but they still did not understand much. Theological education takes much more time than, for example, studying physics or mathematics. In the 19th century in Russia, education at the Theological Seminary and Academy took 12 years. The same length of study now with Buddhists. I have been studying Christianity for over 25 years, got my doctorate degree, but I see before me a whole ocean of unexplored. In general, despite two thousand years of hard work of theological thought, a long series of important questions remain unanswered.

Thus, any debate is not able to reveal the topic completely. This is just an entertaining show for those who do not want to read books. Nevertheless,

we use them to provide a clear example of the points of view of the parties to the dispute.

[00:03:12–00:03:50] Moderator: But what, of course, we can do to inform our decisions about this debate tonight to use our reasoning, to use our mind, to use our intellect. And really to have an open mind set. Muslim, Non-Muslim, Christian, whatever you are, whatever you believe in, we should have an open mind set and really go at this with sincerity. I am just asking you, I am asking myself first ...

[00:03:55–00:05:17] Moderator: This evening two major belief systems, if you like, claim to the truth and going head to head. No matter which side of a fence you tend to reside on. But at the end of the night you will be better informed about Atheism and about Islam ...And after that there will be “crossfire”. Only without weapons! No heavy arms to be use in this section, both of you. Okay? Good? Although, I understand that tongue is a lot more dangerous than nuclear weapons ...

[00:07:18–00:07:47] Tzortzis: Today’s question: “Islam or Atheism — Which Makes More Sense?” I would argue that if we use our reason, our rational faculties, we will definitely come to the conclusion, that Islam makes more sense. I will use two simple arguments to verify that claim. Argument number one: Islam makes sense of the origin of the universe. Argument number two: Islam makes sense of the nature of the Quranic discourse ...

5 COMMENT

Tzortzis sets the direction of the whole discussion: “If we use our reason, our rational faculties ...”

Except for a very brief mention of morality, all issues were discussed from a purely rational point of view. This inevitably led to immersion in the field of physics and mathematics, which Tzortzis did not study deeply. Talking to a cosmologist about cosmology without knowing enough science is counterproductive. It is like a student arguing with an academician. Therefore, it is not surprising that Tzortzis looked like a rather weak opponent compared to Krauss, and his arguments were unconvincing even for many Muslims. He should have talked about the “Universe” inside a human, about those many amazing qualities that only a human has. Unfortunately, he did not do this, and we do not consider it appropriate to comment on his arguments in detail and will limit ourselves to just a few brief comments.

However, the weakness of Tzortzis’s argumentation does not yet mean the triumph of Krauss’s ideas. Not at all! If believing scientists, who are also among Krauss’s colleagues, were invited to the debate, they would easily expose him wrong.

6 COMMENT

Logical Arguments and Evidences are Counterproductive in Debates About Religion

One can relate to the Bible in different ways, believe it or not, but one thing is undoubtedly: on its basis it is possible to build a consistent theory of human psychology. It has stood the test for millennia. In natural sciences, no theory has been tested for so long.

One of the key points of the biblical concept is the story of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. As an educational measure so that the first man could show trust and love, the LORD God commanded the man: “You may freely eat of every tree of the garden; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall die” (Gen. 2:16–17). However, Eve succumbed to the temptation of the serpent (devil), lusted after the forbidden fruit of knowledge, ate, and gave it to her husband (Gen. 3:6). The devil always deceives by representing God as envious and wicked. However, the intellectual knowledge that devil offered, apart from trust and love for God, easily becomes evil. There have been and still are many evil geniuses in the world, people whose intellectual abilities are undoubtedly outstanding, but they are possessed by evil.

In the fallen world, knowledge has always been highly valued as a means that gives power over nature and other people. Pagan priests and magicians, Platonists, Gnostics and many others up to modern atheists — all gave priority to knowledge.

The biblical texts also praise wisdom and knowledge (and vice versa, ignorance and stupidity are condemned). However, the context suggests that wisdom and knowledge should follow sincere love for God and neighbor, truth and virtues. Thus, the Bible distinguishes between wisdom coming from above (which is full of mercy and good fruits, impartial and unfeigned), and earthly, spiritual, demonic wisdom (James 3:15).

King Solomon wrote, “My child, if you accept my words and treasure up my commandments within you, making your ear attentive to wisdom and inclining your heart to understanding; if you indeed cry out for insight, and raise your voice for understanding; if you seek it like silver, and search for it as for hidden treasures — then you will understand the fear of the LORD and find the knowledge of God. For the LORD gives wisdom; from his mouth come knowledge and understanding” (Prov. 2:1–6).

At the beginning of the 4th century, the persecution of Christians in the Roman Empire

ceased¹, and, shortly after the accession of Emperor Constantine, Christianity rose to the status of a state religion. However, because of this entry into the Hellenistic world, Christianity was subjected to the colossal influence of Greco-Roman culture. From Neo-Platonism, ideas about intellectual knowledge as a self-sufficient virtue were perceived. Of course, we note only a general trend, and there have been exceptions to it always and everywhere.

Theology began to appeal to the intellect, to be presented logically, as a scientific system. In the West, Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274) succeeded in this. In his fundamental work “Summa theologiae” (Lat. *Summa theologiae*), he outlined five proofs of the existence of God based on the Logic (science) of Aristotle. Almost the same was done in the East. For a whole millennium, this has become a trend. Many books have been written where the existence of God was proved, based on intellect and common sense.

By the way, Islamic thought followed in the same direction (it is no coincidence that Tzortzis refers to the rational evidence of medieval Islamic theologians). Islamic theologians could simply rewrite the evidences for the existence of God from Christians, since in this respect Christianity

1. The Edict of Milan (Lat. *Edictum Mediolanense*) of 313 proclaimed religious tolerance in the territory of the Roman Empire, and Christianity became legal.

and Islam speak of the same things. In general, the formation of Islam was influenced by Christian asceticism, Buddhism and Neo-Platonism. However, that is another topic.

In Christian countries, secondary and higher education included the study of various kinds of evidence of the existence of God. Then atheism appeared, other books were written, where, on the contrary, it was proved that there is no God, and with references to reason and common sense. They began to teach young people using these books. In the Soviet Union, for 70 years, atheism was actively promoted, forbidding access to any positive information about religion. However, as soon as the communist regime fell, people began to convert to Christianity en masse. Old and new religious books were reprinted. After 30 years, some of the Christians, seeing the unworthy behavior of some representatives of the Church, became disillusioned with Christianity and began to convert, some to another religion, some to Atheism.

It was the same in Turkey, where Mustafa Kemal began to instill secularism in the 1920s. Kemal admired science and saw the happiness of humanity in scientism. Nevertheless, propaganda of atheism did not help. After several decades, in Turkey people again began to turn to religion en masse.

This story repeats itself for centuries. Not all the numerous proofs, both on the one and on the other

hand, somehow help. It is high time to understand that logical proofs in the field of metaphysics do not work! This is an area where everything depends on the choice between good and evil, between virtue and vice. Logic and common sense can play a supporting role here, but not the main one.

[00:10:50] Tzortzis: ...But what have cosmologists said? They have said, for example, Alexander Vilenkin, in his book “Many Worlds in One”¹, which I believe is a friend of prof. Krauss, he says, “With the proof this we place, cosmologists can no longer be hide behind the possibility of the past eternal universe. There is no escape. They have to face the problem of the cosmic beginning”. And just to know, even prof. Krauss in his book affirms a beginning to the universe ...

7 COMMENT

Great quote! In it, atheists expose themselves. Not a single discovery of physics is spoken of in such terms. Elsewhere in the book, Alexander Vilenkin frankly says that the atheists really did not want to, but there was no way out, and they had to admit the fact of the beginning of the world, which was inconvenient for them. Moreover, it began from nothing, and not from the previous infinite universe.

1. Alex Vilenkin. *Many Worlds in One: The Search for Other Universes*. Hill and Wang, 2007 (first published 2006). ISBN0809067226 (ISBN13: 9780809067220)/Part IV — Before The Beginning, Chapter 16 — Did The Universe Have a Beginning? Beyond Unreasonable Doubt.

From the fact of the beginning naturally follows the question of the Cause of this beginning and this fact confuses atheists.

Therefore, in the atheistic USSR, the Big Bang theory was denied for thirty years, insisting on the postulate of the infinity and eternity of matter, that is, the “Big Bang” was viewed as the transition of uncreated and indestructible matter from one state to another. In 1955, a Soviet author wrote in an astronomical journal, “The Marxist-Leninist doctrine of an infinite universe is a fundamental axiom at the basis of Soviet cosmology ... Denial or avoidance of this thesis ... has nothing to do with science.”² This is how Soviet atheism, which proudly called itself “scientific”, considered Marxist-Leninist axioms, that is, statements taken on faith, as its foundation.

In fact, the so-called “scientific” atheism has nothing to do with science. It is a set of atheistic dogmas, as a sacrifice to which hundreds of real scientists were expelled from the profession, and many were arrested and convicted. For example, the world famous scientist Academician N.I. Vavilov (by the way, he was a deeply religious Orthodox Christian) was sentenced to be shot³ because he

2. Quoted from: Wetter G. *Dialectical Materialism: A Historical and Systematic Survey of Philosophy in the Soviet Union*. N.Y., 1958. P. 436.

3. Academician Nikolai Vavilov (1887–1943) died on death row. He was a famous geneticist, vice president of the All-Union

dared to criticize the erroneous views of Lysenko for the sake of scientific truth.

[00:24:00] Tzortzis: Before I get into that, we have to now discuss what a miracle is? The word comes from the Latin word *miraculum*, meaning something wonderful. And the traditional Western philosophical definition of the miracle, as summarized by David Hume in his *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*¹. He says that it is a transgression of natural law. We do not agree with that definition. Because what are natural laws? Natural laws are just inductive generalizations of patterns we can see in the universe ...That the profound Islamic theologians and thinkers have done, they redefined that a miracle is, based on the Quranic discourse. And they have said, that a miracle is an event that lies outside the productive capacity of nature. Which means, when you go to a nature of the event ... there is no naturalistic cause or link between the event and the nature of the event ...

[00:32:10] Krauss: Well, first of all, I want thank the people invited me, who been very gracious to me ... That does not mean I respect ideas. Some ideas are ridiculous. And that is perfectly reasonable. In fact, ridicule an ideas is that makes progress.

Academy of Agricultural Sciences. In 1948, all genetic research in the USSR was discontinued. Hundreds of leading professors and instructors have been fired. Biology books based on genetics were seized and destroyed from libraries.

1. David Hume (1711–1776) was a Scottish Enlightenment philosopher, historian, economist. *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* (1748) contains reworking of the main points of the “Treatise”, with the addition of material on free will, miracles, the Design Argument, and mitigated scepticism. Section 10, of Miracles, of the *Enquiry*, was often published separately.

8 COMMENT

Here Krauss introduces himself as a clown, determined only to make fun of. He does not want to ask, understand, or come to know the particulars. How can one make fun of what he do not know and don't understand? In order to more or less understand Christianity or Islam or Buddhism, they need to be studied much longer than any science. For example, in the Russian Empire, one had to study theology for 12 years.

It would be better if Krauss said that laziness is the engine of progress. Then you could at least smile. His ridicule of ideas is not at all funny. This is a crude propaganda trick. The real engine of progress is the desire to find out the truth. Unfortunately, Krauss does not show such a desire.

It is a pity! One might suggest that he analyze atheistic literature from the mid-19th century to the mid-20th. There are so many ridiculous ideas, mistakes, and contradictions with the data of modern science that one can laugh!

[00:33:42] Krauss: Debates that I watched were always exactly the same. So I thought will be different this time. And it is always begin to you and I have to respond to you. And I will to some extent, but it is hard respond to nonsense. And in fact, the point of this is not a question does God exist, that is "Islam or Atheism, which is more sensible". I was just shocked because I thought that you would not try to pretend you know science. Because you do not. And we will go through

that in real detail. Everything you said is nonsense what regards to science.

9 COMMENT

Here the style of speech is not at all decent for a scientist. There is a kind of discussion ethic in academia. If the interlocutor thinks about the opponent's statement that "this is complete nonsense," then the most rude thing that can be said aloud is "I don't understand you".

[00:34:30] — Let me just first begin with the fact that the premix of this debate is, in some sense, inappropriate ...First of all, it is suggest that Islam is something special. It is not! It is not special at all. It is one of a thousand religions, or more, that have existed since the dawn, which claim divine revelation. All of which claim perfection, proclaim infinite knowledge, uniqueness, beauty et cetera. So Islam is just a religion like any other religion. And there is no difference. It proclaims just as Rig Veda ... ancient Egyptians, that the universe had a beginning. Nothing special ...Ok ...Islam one of a thousand religions. All of which make same claims.

10 COMMENT

Even within the same religion, there can be different trends and significant differences of opinion. For example, Catholics, Protestants and Orthodox in Christianity, Sunnis and Shiites in Islam. Even about these confessions within one religion, one cannot say, "It's the same everywhere. Nothing special."

It is completely incomprehensible how, from the fact that there are a thousand religions in the world, it can be concluded that there is not a single unique one among them? For example, there are millions of paintings in the world. However plots, maybe only a few dozen. Does it follow from this that among the hundreds of thousands of paintings with a similar plot, there is not a single unique one? Why does one sell for two dollars and the other for a hundred million? In addition, it is sometimes difficult for a nonprofessional to distinguish a fake from the work of a genius. The nonprofessional will say, “In one picture, a fruit, and in another picture, the same fruit — the same thing, nothing special.” The expert will say, “One picture is a simple consumer goods, and the other is a unique masterpiece.”

Therefore, those people who have not yet grown to understand it may simply not notice the value and uniqueness of something. For example, paintings by the French artist Camille Pissarro sold very poorly during his lifetime. One day they paid for his painting with just one cake. During the Franco-Prussian war, soldiers lodged in his house (in his absence). They used canvases instead of aprons, laid them on the floor, and threw them in the trash heap. About one and a half thousand paintings were damaged. Now paintings by Camille Pissarro cost hundreds of thousands of dollars! It is impossible to assess anything adequately until the

very criteria by which they are judged are inadequate. It makes no sense to throw pearls in front of pigs, for them it is no more valuable than sand.

Krauss's attitude to religion is frankly swinish. How can Krauss, who has not studied Islam, be so self-confident in claiming that Islam is no different from other religions? He says: "In Islam, as in the Rig Veda or the beliefs of the ancient Egyptians, it is stated that the universe had a beginning." Yes, but the beginning of the universe is understood in different ways everywhere! The so-called Abrahamic religions (Judaism, Christianity, and Islam) profess that time, space, matter (and all the laws of physics) were created by God out of nothing (Lat. *ex nihilo*, Gr. οὐκ ἔξ ὄντων). In this they fundamentally differ from other religions, where it is said that the universe is either eternal or has a beginning, but is created by God from Himself or from eternally existing material. Many religions (Gnosticism, Neo-Platonism), gravitated towards pantheism, that is, towards the elimination of the substantial difference between God and the universe. Therefore, these religions essentially deified nature. Atheism simply replaces God with nature. That is why atheists insist (without proof, of course) that at least some attributes of the material world (the path is not matter, so at least its laws) exist eternally (and even outside of time). This is where "the needle of Koshchei the Deathless" is hidden.

*Could the Universe Have Come into Existence
from Non-Existence by Physics?*

From time immemorial, people believed that nothing comes from nothing (Lat. *ex nihilo nihil fit*). This principle was formulated back in the 5th century B.C. in the philosophy of the era of Parmenides and has since been considered an obvious truth. Therefore, the best way to get people's attention is to show that it is not.

In the 1830s, the Scottish illusionist John Henry Anderson (1814–1874) came up with a trick, the demonstration of which gathered full houses. The magician shows the audience his top hat, demonstrating that there is nothing in it. Doubters may even pick it up and check it out. After several magical passes, he puts the hat on the table or makes an arc movement with it in the air, as if scooping something up, and immediately pulls out a rabbit or even two in a row from the hat. The secret of performing the trick is that the illusionist discreetly puts the rabbits into the hat from the secret pockets of his tailcoat or from under the table.

Now, getting a rabbit out of a hat, in which initially there is nothing, you will surprise no one, but the concept of the formation of the universe from “nothing” has become the excitement of people's minds. The prerequisites for this concept have been gradually taking shape since the beginning of the 20th century. Protestant rationalism grew out of

atheistic scientism and positivism. These doctrines deny philosophy and absolutize the role of natural sciences and mathematics not only in the epistemology of science, but also in explaining everything in general. They say that physics and mathematics can explain any phenomenon (even in the field of culture and anthropology!), If not just today, then in the near future. Several generations of scientists have already been brought up in the mainstream of this paradigm of thinking.

It is not surprising, therefore, that when physical and mathematical models had developed sufficiently, cosmologists began to try to answer the philosophical question about the beginning of the universe¹. In 1973, the Soviet physicist P.I. Fomin and a little later the American physicist E. Tryon² announced the possible emergence of the universe from “nothing”³. In 1988, the journal “Priroda” published the last article by Ya. B. Zeldovich entitled

1. In 2003, cosmologists Arvin Bordet, Alan Guth, and Alexander Vilenkin proved the singularity theorem. It says that the expanding space time does not continue infinitely into the past, but has a beginning, that is, the universe has a beginning. See: Borde A., Guth A. and Vilenkin A. Inflationary space-times are not past-complete. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 90151301, 2003.

2. “In 1973, I proposed that our Universe had been created spontaneously from nothing (ex nihilo), as a result of the established principles of physics.” Edward P. Tryon, prof. of Physics, New York University, USA. article “What Made the World?” from the *New Scientist*, 8 March 1984. P. 14.

3. Климишин И. А. Релятивистская астрономия. М.: Наука, 1989. С. 243.

“Is it possible for the universe to form ‘out of nothing?’”⁴ with a positive answer to this question⁵. In 2012 L. Krauss published the book “A Universe from Nothing”⁶.

These and many other similar works of scientists on the emergence of the universe can be figuratively summarized like this:

— With the help of what did the universe come into existence?

— With the help of physics (ie, the totality of the laws of matter).

— With the help of what did physics come into existence?

— Eh ..., hmm ... with the help of physics.

This type of “proof” is called a “vicious circle”. There is a tale about Baron Munchausen, who pulled himself out of the swamp by the hair with his horse. Alternatively, the same, about the boy who pulled himself out of the swamp by the laces of his own shoes. This is a metaphorical image of how physics created itself with the help of physics. The universe,

4. Зельдович Я. Б. Возможно ли образование Вселенной «из ничего»? // Природа. 1988. № 4.

5. However, in the Afterword to it, Academician A. D. Sakharov considered it necessary “to point out the great uncertainty in our understanding of the situation. This uncertainty is deeply fundamental, even philosophical. Philosophically acute is, in particular, the question of the so-called anthropic principle, which explains the peculiarities of our universe by the fact that only in such a universe could intelligent life arise, in contrast to an infinite number of other, spontaneously arising ‘dead’ universes.”

6. Lawrence M. Krauss. *A Universe from Nothing*. Preface. 2012.

as it were, pulled itself out of “nothing” by its “own laces”. This metaphor was even taken seriously as an explanation, and the process itself was called “bootstrap”. The universe, as it were, spontaneously aroused in itself all the energy that was necessary for the “creation” and “revitalization” of matter, and initiated the explosion that generated it. This “self-extension”, of course, is absurd and is a logical error, but nothing else can be invented in this atheistic paradigm. Scientists and positivists categorically reject philosophy, since for them “god” is physics, and its “prophet” is mathematics. Therefore, when asked about the origin of physics, they have to build a vicious circle of evidence. After all, otherwise their minds will go off the “rails” on which they were put at school and at institute¹.

Let us explain the above with examples. Spontaneous electromagnetic radiation by atoms or spontaneous fission of heavy atomic nuclei occurs due to the instability of their energy (or other) state. The time of this event cannot be precisely determined, but is described probabilistically, according to the corresponding distribution function.

1. Albert Einstein remarked on this topic: “The only thing that prevents me from studying is the education I received.” (Quoted from: Известные цитаты и афоризмы/Альберт Эйнштейн [Электронный ресурс] — URL: <http://tsitaty.com/автор/альберт-эйнштейн/1> (дата обращения: 11.05.2018).

However, can we talk about the spontaneous emergence of the laws of physics (as Krauss says)? Of course not. For spontaneous occurrence of a photon, at least a hydrogen atom is needed. If the atoms (matter) themselves do not exist, then there will be no phenomenon of spontaneity, no wave functions of electrons, etc. The same can be said about the vacuum, which has energy and is capable of producing particles. Krauss writes in his book *A Universe from Nothing*, “The existence of energy in empty space—the discovery that rocked our cosmological universe and the idea that forms the bedrock of inflation—only reinforces something about the quantum world that was already well established in the context of the kinds of laboratory experiments I have already described. Empty space is complicated. It is a boiling brew of virtual particles that pop in and out of existence in a time so short we cannot see them directly.”² But this means that the “empty space” that cosmologists study is not “nothing” at all, but a physical (material) object under the conditions of space-time and the existing laws of physics.

Cosmologists talk about quantum fluctuations of the physical vacuum, about the spontaneous emergence of particle-antiparticle pairs in very

2. Lawrence M. Krauss. *A Universe from Nothing: why there is something rather than nothing*. Chapter 10: Nothing is Unstable. NY, 2012. P. 154.

strong electric fields from “nothing”, about fluctuations of the scalar field (which allegedly gave rise to the universe). However, all these examples are taken from the material world with already existing physical laws. Thus, by “nothing” cosmologists mean, as it were, a special “pra-matter” that existed outside space and time. All theories that talk about the possibility of the emergence of the universe from “nothing” require the preliminary existence of the laws of physics and a special “nothing” that has the potential to give birth to quantum particles.

However, it begs the question: how did the laws of physics themselves emerge if there was nothing material yet, and why the original “nothing” could have any potential. Krauss quotes Richard Feynman in Preface of *A Universe from Nothing*: “The laws of physics could be like an infinitely layered onion, with new laws becoming operational as we probe new scales.” In addition, a little earlier, he recalled about the famous “story of an expert giving a lecture on the origins of the universe (sometimes identified as Bertrand Russell and sometimes William James), who is challenged by a woman who believes that the world is held up by a gigantic turtle, who is then held up by another turtle, and then another ... with further turtles ‘all the way down!’” ¹

1. Lawrence M. Krauss. *A Universe from Nothing: why there is something rather than nothing*. Preface. NY, 2012. P. 18.

However, after all, it is physicists-atheists who put more and more “turtles” — more and more new laws and essences! The situation in cosmology resembles not only a metaphor with turtles, but also a trick with getting rabbits out of an “empty” hat. The only difference is that quantum cosmologists imperceptibly take out of their pocket or from under the table not rabbits, but the formulas of quantum mechanics, wave function, scalar field, etc. and put all this into the original “nothing”.

For example, in the theory of the quantum creation of the universe, it is postulated (ie, it is proposed to believe!) That the universe arose from an unreal quantum field that did not exist in the physical sense, that is, it is a purely mathematical abstraction, called by A. Vilenkin “literal nothing”². Then watch his hands! This mathematical “literal nothing” due to spontaneous fluctuations was able to give rise to a pseudo-real particle, representing the embryo of the future universe. Moreover, it, in turn, with the help of quantum tunneling overcame the barrier separating the abstract mathematical world from physical reality!

Good trick! However, physics cannot arise from mathematics just because some physicists want it, and they skillfully juggle formulas. Materialists go beyond the applicability of scientific theories that

2. Vilenkin A. Creation of universes from Nothing//Phys. Lett. Vol. 117B, # 1, 2, 1982. P. 25–28.

describe our world when they try to talk about something “before” the world came into being. The trick does not cease to be a trick from the fact that “serious people” with high ranks and regalia and with an intelligent look perform it. “A smart face is not yet a sign of intelligence, all stupidity on Earth is done with just such an expression”¹. In any case, all this rhetoric does not remove the main question: how did the laws of physics arise and why are they exactly like that?

Maybe there will be a boy who will say, “But the king is naked!” It is only in fairy tales that you can lift yourself into the air by your hair or by your laces. Ontologically, physics (that is, the totality of the laws of matter) cannot create itself. Albert Einstein once remarked that it is impossible to solve a problem by thinking the same way as those who formulated it. To solve the problem of the emergence of the material universe, it is necessary to go beyond the “level of physics”; after all, not without reason, the outstanding thinkers of humankind spoke about metaphysics and philosophy.

1. “That same Munchausen” Soviet artistic two-part television film in 1979. The play “The Most Truthful” by Grigory Izrailevich Gorin served as the literary material for the script. It was written in the play: “A serious face is not yet a sign of intelligence, all stupidity on Earth is done with just such an expression.” However, when dubbing the film, Yankovsky made a reservation, saying: “A smart face is not yet a sign of intelligence.” In this form, the phrase, despite G. Gorin’s protests, remained in the film.

Could physics give the initial impulse for the emergence of the universe, if it did not exist at first? The question is rhetorical. What comes first, physics or metaphysics, matter or spirit? There must be a final limit, beyond which there is no longer physics. This limit is non-being (Lat. *nihilo*, Gr. οὐκ ὄν). This is absolute non-being (non-existence, nothingness), a denial of any existence (any of its forms), and a denial of any being. It lacks any essence, potency, inner laws and anything else. In non-being, there are not only the laws of physics, but also even the laws of abstract mathematics.

A great many scientific books and articles on the emergence of the universe from “nothing” have been written. Although the approaches and methods in these scientific works may differ, they are all based on one glaring logical error and can only fascinate science fanatics. The error lies in the fact that the authors speak the language of physics and mathematics about the moment of the origin of the universe, about the initial singularity, ie in the language of the material world, which did not yet exist at that moment. The universe arose not from a physical or mathematical vacuum, but from non-being (nothingness), in which there was no physics, no mathematics. Obviously, when there was no “physics” (ie the material world), there were no laws of physics either. Therefore, no scientific formulas

and equations make sense in the original singularity.

It remains to recognize that the act of creating out of nothing requires a person, a creator, who is transcendental in relation to his creation. Moreover, this is not just a philosophical conclusion, but also a fundamental ontological Law, similar to the First and Second Laws of thermodynamics. Just like the Laws of thermodynamics, this Law is not proved, but enunciated inductively.

The centuries-old experience of humankind, no exception from which has ever been found, says that only a creator, a person, can create something out of non-being. A genius poem or musical symphony is not created by physical or chemical processes in the human brain, but is the fruit of his creative act. No tomography and electron microscopes will help you find out how a piece of music is born in the head of a brilliant composer. It cannot be described in the language of physics and mathematics. Nevertheless, it is given to us to feel it through experience.

No physicists will ever answer where the laws of physics come from, which cause the universe from nothing. An honest scientist can only say that the mystery that caused and created everything will always be an insoluble mystery for materialistic science.

Thus, it would be reasonable and logical to admit that only a metaphysical Cause could give the initial

impulse to the universe. Only the Reasonable Creator, possessing free will, not bound by any laws of necessity, causality or anything else, and therefore “calls into existence the things that do not exist” (Rom. 4:17), could call the universe from non-being into being. He did not need a beginning, since He is Being itself (Gr. *ὁ ὄν*) and generally transcendental to the material world. However, that is another big topic.

Three Options to Explain the Origin of the Universe

All versions of explanations of the origin of the universe in the entire history of human thought are reduced to three main ones: 1) the universe, or some “part” of it, existed forever, that is, it had no beginning; 2) the universe is “an emanation from the divine nature”, that is, it receives its origin from the essence of the beginningless non-material primary cause; 3) The universe was created by the will of the transcendental First Cause out of non-being (nothingness).

The first concept is characteristic of many pagan religions, Platonism and Atheism. It does not matter in principle whether the universe has existed forever in its modern form, or whether it was formed from some preceding “pra-matter”. In ancient Greek cosmogonies, the formless primary matter was ordered by the Demiurge according to the model of eternal ideas. Atheists, at first for 150 years,

self-confidently asserted that the universe (matter) is eternal. However, modern cosmologists have already proved several decades ago that the universe had a beginning. Now atheists reluctantly admit this fact, but at the same time claim that the universe arose “with the help of physics.” However, physics is an attribute of matter. Thus, one way or another, atheists talk about the eternal beginningless existence of some “physics”, or, what is the same, some “pra-matter”.

The second concept was adopted by the Gnostics, Neo-Platonists and their followers. They taught that the various cosmic “eons” originate in the divine being itself. However, if God created something out of His essence, this would not mean that He actually creates.

The third concept is affirmed by the Abrahamic religions. They teach about the creation of the universe by God from nothing, that is, from non-being. The Second Book of Maccabees directly states this: “Look upon the heaven and the earth, and all that is therein, and consider that God made them of things that were not [Lat. *ex nihilo*, Gr. οὐκ ἔξ ὄντων]” (2 Maccabees 7:28). Here, the “things that were not” (Lat. *nihilo*, Gr. οὐκ ὄν) has a completely clear and definite meaning: it is non-being (non-existence, nothingness), the denial of any existence (any of its forms), the denial of being, that is, non-being. In nonexistence, there is no

essence, potency, law, or concept; moreover, there is no “physics” in it. Therefore, non-being cannot be an object of physics study, like a vacuum or “nothing” specially invented by atheists.

Moses, when describing God’s creation of the world, uses the verb “bara”¹ (Heb. בָּרָא “bara” — Strong’s lexicon number 01254, Gen.1:1) to designate the creation of something fundamentally new, which cannot be deduced from the previous, from the pre-existing. He lived around the 18th century B. C. Thus, the idea of the creation of the universe from non-being preceded Greek philosophy, and could not be borrowed from any other religion.

In Christianity, the creation of the world from non-being (nothingness), except for the text of the Bible, is expressed with all clarity in liturgical texts¹ and in theological treatises². Time began with the universe (Gen. 1:1; Ps. 146:6; John 1:3; Col. 1:16–17; 1 Cor. 8:6; Rom. 11:36). Since God does not create the universe from Himself, but calls it out of

1. For example, in the order of the Liturgy in the priestly prayer of the Trisagion Singing (“Who from non-being has brought all things into being”), в The Funeral Service — Eulogetaria for the Dead (You Who of old did fashion me out of nothingness, and with Your Image divine did honor me), which was written by St. John Damascene, etc.

2. John Chrysostom In Gen. 13. 2; Cyr. Hieros. Catech. 4. 18; Nemes. De nat. hom. 2; Theodoret. Haer. fab. V 9; Hieron. Adv. Rufin. II 10; 5th anathematism of the Council of 561 in Braga — Enchiridion symbolorum. N 455; The fact that everything created was brought into being out of nothingness was written by St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Basil the Great, St. Athanasius the Great.

non-being (Rom. 4:17), Christianity denies all types of deification of the world (nature).

The first concept contains ontological conditioning, determinism: the universe was supposed to appear. In the third, biblical concept, the universe is ontologically unnecessary. Its cause lies only in the free will of the transcendent Creator. Archpriest George Florovsky wrote about this remarkably, “God is completely self-sufficient. Rather, it is a miracle that God began to create. There is no necessary or compelling connection between the divine nature (or essence) and the law of creation. The absence of creation in no way diminishes the absolute completeness of the Divine Essence, the vastness of this Ocean of Essence, as St. Grigory Nazianzin ¹ “God had no beginning, and He will have no end. He dwells in the “motionless radiance of eternity”². And His infinite present is not time but eternity³. God is completely unchanging and immovable, — “with whom there is no variation or shadow due to change”⁴ (James

1. Endless and limitless sea of essence (Gr. τί πέλαγος ουσίας άπειρον και άδριστον). S. Greg. Naz. Or. 38, in Theophan. 7//PG. XXXVI. C. 317.

2. B. Augustini Conf. XI, 11//PL. XXXII. C. 813: splendorem semper stantis; aeternitatis cnfr.: De Trinit. V, 1, 2//PL. XLII. C. 912: sine tempore sempiternum.

3. B. Augustini Conf. XI, 14//PL. XXXII. C. 816: praesens autem, si semper esset praesens nec in praeteritum transiret, non jam esset tempus, sed aeternitas.

4. Gr. “παρ’ ὧ οὐκ ἔνι παραλλαγή ἢ τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα”.

1:17). He cannot gain or lose anything. Moreover, we can say that the created world is an absolute excess, something additional, which could not exist at all.

The omnipotence of God must be defined not only as the supreme power to create, but also as absolute power not to create at all. God could have allowed nothing to exist outside of Him. To create and not to create the same good for God and it is useless to find the underlying cause of the reason for the Divine choice, for the act of creation was not even conditioned by the mercy of God and His infinite perfection. The “Creative Essence” is not the main and not the determining quality of God: God creates in unlimited freedom ...

For the human consciousness, there is something mysterious, paradoxical and contradictory in this. The created mind is always looking for the necessary reasons, inevitably closing in on itself. To the idea of creation is absolutely alien such an approach. The world undoubtedly has a Cause that is supreme and sufficient. Nevertheless, this is a Cause given in absolute freedom of expression and manifestation. The creation cannot exist without the Creator. However, the Creator may not create.”⁵

⁵. Georgy V. Florovsky. Creation: its beginning and end. The idea of creation in Christian philosophy/Прог. Георгий В. Флоровский. Творение: его начало и конец. Идея творения в христианской философии.

Krauss: The question is Islam, as one of a thousand religions, all of which makes the same claims, but mutually inconsistent ones ...

11 COMMENT

How can identical statements contradict each other? Krauss argues mutually exclusive things. This is completely incomprehensible, and he should have given at least one example. Although, this is hardly possible.

Krauss: Thousand religions, they all make mutually inconsistent claims. So, they cannot all be correct. In fact, at best, one of them can be correct. They not consist with each other. So that means “a priori”¹, [referring to Tzortzis] I know you like that term ...A priori, Islam is probably 0.1% have been correct. Because this is just one of a thousand religions. But since they all make the same claims, is probable that none of them are correct. So treating Islam specially is inappropriate.

12 COMMENT

Here are examples of demagoguery and sophistry in almost every sentence. This is how they usually “prove” that white is black and vice versa. People have created as many scientific theories as religions. Should we conclude from this that among the many scientific theories there is not a single true one?

Krauss does not mind, for example, that quantum mechanics and the theory of gravity contradict each

1. A priori — knowledge obtained before experience and independently of it, i. e. knowledge, as it were known in advance.

other, since gravity is not quantized. But physicists use both. Why is each of the thousands of religions equally likely to be true? Krauss did not confirm or substantiate this thesis. Moreover, if cosmologists come up with a thousand theories of the origin of the universe, will they all have the same probability (0.1%) to be true? And why make any judgments about the truth a priori? On the contrary, everything must be tested, checked. Christianity teaches this too, “Test everything; hold fast to what is good” (1 Thess. 5:21).

[00:36:00] Krauss: Then Atheism as somehow have been described speaker as a belief system. It is not a belief system like Islam, or Judaism, or Christianity, or the North’s myths, or Zeus, or Thor or any other myths have been create in human history. It is not a belief system. We do not choose to believe that stuff, because it is not sensible. So, it is not saying, “We belief that.” An atheist can say, “This myth is unconsent with this myth, or this myth is unconsent what we know about the universe. And therefore, it is unlikely it be true.” So, the atheism is just saying, “This is unlikely to be true.” It is not a belief system ...

13 COMMENT

It is obvious (and there are many examples of this) that both among atheists and among adherents of any religion, there are both genius scientists and people who are completely ignorant and even stupid. Faith or disbelief does not depend on

knowledge or intellect, but on the state of the soul. Atheists are reluctant to admit this obvious fact.

Krauss and other atheists try to make things seem like they alone have a “monopoly” on reason and common sense. They argue that people have been mistaken for thousands of years in absolutely everything, and only atheists (who have appeared quite recently by historical standards) act reasonably. However, this is not true. For example, the theory of the multiverse has no more scientific evidence than the existence of Zeus or Thor. Then why is it better than any other long-standing invention of humankind?

In fact, mythology is full of politics, science, and culture. Mythology is everywhere. Of course, it is good when a person “turns on the brain” and thinks reasonably. The trouble happens when at the same time everything else that is characteristic of a person is turned off.

All over the world, religious people were looking for wisdom and engaged in science long before atheists. Indian, Arabic, and ancient Greek mathematicians made great contributions to mathematics 35 thousand years ago, when there were no atheists. Yes, their religious views were sometimes wrong. However, the scientific views of the same time were also erroneous. Many scientific theories have over time been refuted, and they could be called “fictions” and “myths”.

The thesis that atheism is not a belief system is also wrong. In the USSR and other communist countries, atheism was a belief system. A lot of literature has been written on this topic. On the other hand, it is absolutely wrong to identify all religions only with a belief system. This is oversimplification. It is like looking at the world through a small hole covered by a thick light filter. Only a small part of the complete picture will be visible, and only in one color.

Sharpie looks at the world through the prism of probability theory. However, not all people are like that, and the theory of probability is not applicable everywhere. Let us say that Krauss meets a young man with a burning gaze, and he will happily tell that he has fallen in love with a girl. "She is beautiful, the one and only," the young man will say. Suppose, Krauss will reply, "Your statement is ridiculous. There are hundreds of millions of girls in the world with exactly the same shapes, with exactly the same physiology. There is nothing special about it. Moreover, hormones, brain substances, and social patterns trigger your emotions. Therefore, the likelihood that your statement is true is low." Will Krauss leave unbeaten after that? Great question!

Krauss's picture of the world is dull and uncheerful. This is the picture of formulas and equations. This is a world without love, without spiritual achievement, without spiritual enlightenment. Everything in it is

subject to the theory of probability, the impersonal laws of physics and chemistry. It has no purpose, no meaning.

Krauss's theses testify to his complete lack of understanding of the essence of the issue. Religions are, first of all, spiritual states that defy description and cannot be expressed in words. Moreover, no science can say anything about them. Even religious scholars who study any religion from its texts, but have not experienced its spiritual experience, cannot adequately describe it. They are like people studying musical notation, but not knowing how they sound.

Christian ascetics and Islamic Sufis said that their goal was the comprehension of the Truth. In addition, this goal can be achieved not through reason, logic, and reasoning, but only with the help of love, conscience, and purity of heart¹. In a state of spiritual imperfection, in an abnormal state, people are not able to see things as they really are. An imperfect person, due to his imperfection, without even realizing it, perceives the truth as distorted, and not as it really is.

1. Hereinafter, everywhere by "heart" we mean a metaphor meaning a certain spiritual center or spiritual depths of a person. This metaphor is used very often in the Bible. In general, the "heart" in it is often called the center or depth. For example: "For just as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the sea monster, so for three days and three nights the Son of Man will be in the heart of the earth" (Matt. 12:40). It is obvious that the Earth does not have a heart (as a physical organ), but has depth.

Yet, Krauss never said, in what way is Islam or Christianity or Judaism contrary to what we know about the universe? He did not say because they did not contradict anything. So all Krauss's accusations are unfounded.

On the other hand, Krauss's argument can be rephrased in relation to atheism. Atheism is not unique. Everything has been said thousands of years ago. Even the ancient sophists wrote down all possible lines of thought, long before Krauss. Moreover, atheism can also be called one of a thousand religions. After all, religious people have always looked for common sense and engaged in science. Moreover, the penchant for myths is a feature of culture and psychology. There have been and are myths in science too.

[00:36:51] Krauss: The first part of the false promise is that Islam is special. Not special at all ...It is just like all the rest.

14 COMMENT

Krauss did not study Islam, and he cannot say how Islam is similar to other religions. Therefore, all of his statements about the similarity of religions are groundless and fundamentally wrong. Although in Islam there are some borrowings from Christianity, Neo-Platonism, and Buddhism, the presence of some borrowings from three religions does not at all mean similarity with all. If we talk about Christianity, then everything in it is connected

with the Incarnation from beginning to end (Matt. 16:15–18). This is the meaning of the creation of the world, and the meaning of human life. There is nothing like this in any religion.

[00:37:00] Krauss: And atheism is not a religion. It is just, in fact, it could be described as “common sense”. Ok? What make sense? I will think that those things that make sense are likely, and others things that do not make sense are unlikely prefer to assume that rationally understood events are probable, while are unlikely. In fact, science is all about. Okay ...

I am an educator (may be it is flaw, but it is that it is). That means I believe in actually trying illuminate ideas and lead to discussion, critical thinking, and eventually learning things and increase in knowledge. Debates are not made for that. Debates are rhetorical devises ...

[00:38:20] Krauss: So, the first thing I want to say, however, I want to clear some misconceptions. This idea of deductive arguments, which sounds good, is not the way we learn about reality. Okay. Deductive argument is just do not work. It leads to irrational actions. In fact, if we discuss “what common sense is?” The common sense is taking your beliefs to conform of the evidence of reality so you make rational actions.

15 COMMENT

Socrates and Plato would say the same thing about religion: “It’s just common sense, and aligning your beliefs with reality data to perform rational actions.” By the way, in the Byzantine era they were portrayed in the vestibules of churches and were called “Christians before Christ”, since long before

Christianity they presented some Christian theses. Note that no angel from heaven said anything to Socrates and Plato. They made their conclusions solely based on logical reasoning and common sense.

In the Bible, the word “wisdom” occurs over two hundred times. For example, King Solomon wrote, “Get wisdom; get insight: do not forget, nor turn away from the words of my mouth. Do not forsake her, and she will keep you; love her, and she will guard you. The beginning of wisdom is this: Get wisdom, and whatever else you get, get insight. Prize her highly, and she will exalt you; she will honor you if you embrace her” (Prov. 4:5–8). Moreover, in the book of Ecclesiastes it is written, “Applied my mind to seek and to search out by wisdom all that is done under heaven; it is an unhappy business that God has given to human beings to be busy with” (Eccl. 1:13).

Thus, atheists have no monopoly on common sense. In Christianity and Islam a lot is said about the search for truth and wisdom. Therefore, as much as Krauss would like, in this respect atheism is not something unique. In fact, science was born and grew up in the religious tradition.

[00:38:51] Krauss: If you force reality conformed to your beliefs, you make irrational actions. So, you could do things, based on your beliefs, on your a priori beliefs ...For example, your a priori belief could be that if you

pray to Allah, then you can jumping out of the fourth storey from window of this building and you will land safely. Okay? That could be a priori belief ...And, in fact, you could deduce based on all your beliefs and all of the evidence that you are a good person, and Allah would takes care of you, or whatever you call it, and you will be fine. I would take the elevator down. And only one of us could be walking at the end. That is not deductive. It is based on empirical evidence. Ok.

16 COMMENT

Neither Tzortzis, nor any other Muslim, jump out of windows, but ride down the elevator. The example is not relevant. Moreover, this is stupidity and slander. In addition, it is he, Krauss, who tries to deduce facts from his beliefs, a priori beliefs. Krauss did not have any mystical experience, and therefore his a priori conviction is the belief that there is no God. Nevertheless, Krauss's empirical data is completely insufficient to draw any conclusions by the method of induction.

[00:39:35] Krauss: So, arguing that something does not makes sense to you, is based on the fact, the assumption that you know what is sensible in advance. But we do not know what is sensible in advance until we explore the world around us. Our common sense arise, in the fact, on the savanna in Africa to avoid lions, not to understand quantum mechanics, for example.

17 COMMENT

Krauss never ceases to amaze. I would like to believe that he is sincerely mistaken, and not maliciously.

However, it is difficult to imagine how a person in their right mind could say that. According to Krauss and other atheists, the universe, and all of its contents, arose from random processes. However, at no stage in the chain of random processes can a purpose appear. Randomness and purpose are two opposites. Atheistic evolution, because of a chain of random processes, is blind and meaningless, and it cannot lead to the emergence of purpose and meaning. It is impossible to reasonably explain how hydrogen atoms were able to accidentally self-organize into living creatures that have desires, purposes (for example, not to be caught by a lion) and some “common sense”.

In addition, if common sense, as we understand it, originated in the African savannas, then antelopes and gazelles would succeed in it more than humans would, because lions hunt mainly antelopes. However, we do not know of a single animal that, at least in an embryonic form, had an interest in the study of the surrounding world, in science, art, creativity. Evolution has not bequeathed us to understand anything, because it is blind and meaningless. There is not a single rational explanation of how evolutionary self-consciousness of a person, his thirst for knowledge, and all types of creativity could arise. From the point of view of evolution, all this is superfluous and unnecessary,

and therefore there is nothing like this in the animal world.

[00:39:59] Krauss: As I often said, common sense our deductions might suggest that you cannot be in two places at once. That is crazy. But, of course, an electron can do it. It is does not make sense because we did not evolve to know about it, we have learned about it ...We force our common sense to change. And it is called learning.

18 COMMENT

Christian theologians have had to solve paradoxes that are far more surprising. How can God be in all places at the same time? How can the Trinity be absolute Oneness? How can the Uncreated God, existing outside of time and outside the material world, at some point in history unite with material human flesh? How can the Immortal die? How can God be separated from God (from Himself) on the Cross? This and much more simply does not fit in the head, and it seems impossible. Theologians have to study this, and Christians make their common sense change.

Therefore, the example from quantum mechanics does not explain anything. This is not the difference between atheism and religion. Religious people have also studied and are engaged in quantum mechanics and strive for learning.

[00:40:21] Krauss: Some people would rather read an ancient book than learn. And we have a very good evidence of that. [Krauss points at Tzortzis]

19 COMMENT

Here Krauss publicly humiliates his opponent, and unreasonably. A good scientist is not at all one who keeps a lot of information in his memory, but one who “knows how to think” and analyze information. Moreover, the texts of the great thinkers of antiquity are often the best means of developing thinking.

Both in science and in any other field, before solving any problem, it makes sense to get acquainted with the experience of mankind on this problem. This experience consists of empirical data and ideas (theories). Empirical data, of course, we must take the most modern. No one will look for empirical data in ancient books. Nobody will draw information on the description of animals and plants from the books of Charles Darwin. Moreover, books even fifty years old are considered outdated for this purpose.

However, this cannot be said about ideas (theory). In the field of ideas, often everything new is just well forgotten old. Almost all lines of thought have already been made and described by ancient philosophers. It is very difficult to come up with some completely new ideas. The proof of the Pythagorean Theorem in ancient books is the same as in the most modern textbooks. Diamond does not tarnish or rust over time. Wisdom does not cease to be wisdom, even if it was written thousands of years ago. Conversely, stupidity will be stupidity

even if the modern professor Lawrence Krauss expressed it.

Tzortzis referred precisely to the ideas from the medieval book. There is nothing to make fun of. In addition, the fact that he also knows ancient Arabic speaks of his good philological education. Reading ancient books (as well as knowing ancient languages) only enriches the intellect; they are full of amazing poetry and deep thoughts. The ancient rhetoricians, the speeches of the great teachers, could easily speak in poetry for hours.

Ancient languages are much more complex and richer than modern ones, and technogenic civilization follows the path of devolution, degradation of language and thoughts. Short paragraphs of news, tweets, and short posts on social networks — all this forms “clip” thinking. It is difficult for a modern person to keep attention for a long time on a long text or other type of information. Therefore, Krauss is recording videos of “5 Minutes of Physics”. However, unlike physics, in 5 minutes it is impossible to form an adequate idea of any religion. Krauss and his followers of ancient books, of course, do not read and are blindly ignorant of religions.

[00:40:28] Krauss: For example, to say something is inconceivable, just means you cannot conceive it. But the great thing about universe, and the reason why I do science, is that the universe has a much richer

imagination than we do. In fact, there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in your philosophy. And that is wonderful about the universe. Things are inconceivable happen all the time. That expands of our mind ...

20 COMMENT

To attribute imagination to the universe (and even richer than ours) means to animate it and endow it with the properties of a subject, a personality. This once again suggests that atheists, willy-nilly, ascribe the attributes of God to the universe, that is, atheism is latent pantheism.

Krauss goes on to quote from memory a well-known expression from William Shakespeare's play *Hamlet* (1600–1601), "There are more things in Heaven and Earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy."¹ That is for sure! There is a lot in the universe that all sages, all philosophers, all scientists, all human wisdom never dreamed of! Therefore, physics can never refute metaphysics. Therefore, atheism can never refute the existence of immaterial spiritual entities.

Krauss has just ridiculed his opponent for quoting an ancient book, and immediately quotes an ancient book himself! What an irony! Therefore, Krauss is, firstly, inconsistent, and, secondly, it uses double standards. Besides, Shakespeare was a religious

1. W. Shakespeare, *The Tragical Historie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke*.

person. Then against whom does Krauss quote these words?

[00:41:02] Krauss: — And what you call atheism that just saying, “I am going to accept the evidence of reality. And if something seems like it contradicts the evidence of reality or is irrational, I should question it.”

21 COMMENT

Both Christians and Muslims would say, “This is what we do: we establish a correspondence between beliefs and reality and accept what is observed in reality.” In nature, you can see many hints of the existence of the Creator. “Ever since the creation of the world his eternal power and divine nature, invisible though they are, have been understood and seen through the things he has made” (Rom. 1:20). M. S. Tenney said, “The assertion that such a complex world as ours arose by chance out of chaos is as senseless as the supposition that Shakespeare’s plays were created by wild apes in the printing house.” In addition, many said about the same thing. It is from the point of view of logic and common sense that atheism seems unreasonable. Moreover, the disbelief of atheists is not at all a logical consequence of the observed reality.

The renowned physicist prof. Alfred Kastler (1902–1984), winner of the 1966 Nobel Prize for his research in the field of optics, honestly admitted that his disbelief was not based on scientific knowledge. On the contrary, he said that “for the modern

physicist, the idea of the accidental origin of the world is excluded: a strange consistency and an inexplicable orientation towards an unknown goal appears in it too clearly”¹. Thus, he did not believe, contrary to his scientific conclusions, and the reason for atheism is quite different.

[00:41:21] Krauss: Now, there are a lot of ideas which are by Mr. Shordtz ...Tzortzis ...I’m trying to learn Turkish, but I do not ...

[00:42:15] Krauss: You know what, there is a real language that you don’t speak is called the language of mathematics. So let us talk about that. Let us stopped with this nonsense about infinity. Let us take something physical. Let us draw a circle and draw a diameter. What is the ratio of the circumference of a circle to the diameter? Do you know? Do you know? ...Have you heard about Pi (π)?

Tzortzis: Yes, of course.

Krauss: And you know what it is?

Tzortzis: 3.14 and so on

Krauss: How many decimal it has?

Tzortzis: I do not remember ...

Krauss: An infinite number!

Tzortzis: Yes, yes.

Krauss: Okay. So, the physical distance of the ratio of the diameter of a circle to its circumference is an infinite number.

Tzortzis: Yes, yes.

1. This he said in a conversation with the French philosopher Christian Chabanis. Look: Chabanis C. Dieu: existe-t-il? “Non” respondent P. Anquetil, R. Aron, Ch. Boule... Paris: Fayard, 1973.

22 COMMENT

Well, this is a dishonest technique — to divert the conversation into the field of mathematics, which the opponent knows very little and does not need to know at all. Then Krauss commits a forgery. An infinite number of decimal places is one thing, and an infinite number (modulo) is completely different. Krauss said that the physical length ratio of a circle's circumference to its diameter is an "infinite number"! At first, I thought Krauss was just making a slip, but he repeated the same thing three times at different points in the debate. In fact, there are no "infinite numbers"! This is absurd! Krauss demonstrates some monstrous misunderstanding of basic mathematical concepts. Any number is limited in absolute value. Pi (π) is less than 3.2 in absolute value. The fact that Pi has an infinite number of decimal places is a mathematical problem that has nothing to do with physics. Infinity in mathematics is not a number, but a special concept, an abstraction. An opponent said that there is no infinity in physics, and Krauss gives an example of infinity in mathematics. However, physics belongs to the class of natural sciences, and mathematics belongs to the class of formal sciences. The methodology of mathematics differs significantly from the methodology of natural sciences. Mathematicians have come up with many

abstractions that do not exist in reality (for example, a point and a straight line).

[00:42:58] Krauss: Now, we talk about that amazing, you quoted Aristotle as the basis of science. Of course, Aristotle is a one that told us the objects fall in proportion to their weight, because he did not do the experiment. He deduced it based on what he wants it. Galileo, of course, did the experiment ...

[00:43:41] Krauss: Aristotle also claimed that infinity is impossible, because he believed, as you point out, that the distance from you to me can be divided into a half, then into quarters, then into eighths, and then into sixteenths ... And that is makes infinity impossible.

Tzortzis: Yes.

Krauss: Well, the thing what Aristotle did not know, and what you do not know, is how to sum an infinite series. One, plus a half, plus a quarter, plus an eighth, plus a sixteenth ... etc. equals two.

Tzortzis: Yes.

23 COMMENT

Krauss uses demagogic techniques such as the argument to ignorance (*argumentum ad ignorantiam*), the transition to personalities, concentration on particulars, and the transition from discussing the subject of a dispute to discussing something completely foreign. What Aristotle knew or did not know is irrelevant to the debate about Islam and Atheism. In addition, he should have been talking not about science, but about Atheism. Krauss takes advantage of the fact that

Tzortzis did not study higher mathematics and puts psychological pressure on his opponent.

In fact, Aristotle said everything correctly. The exact sum of an infinite sequence of numbers cannot be determined. Since there is no last term in the sum, the summation process is never completed. Therefore, the sum of all the members of an infinite series is out of the question — infinite addition is, in principle, impossible.

However, mathematicians have found a way to get around this difficulty. In the theory of series, the conditional “sum of a series” is found not by infinite summation, but by passing to the limit. Mathematicians construct a sequence of sums of the first (n) terms of the series, and then watch how it behaves as (n) grows. In addition, if it tends to a certain limit, then this limit is called “the sum of the series”. However, this is a completely different definition of the amount. There is no summation here, the resulting conditional “sum of the series” is not at all the sum of all its members, and it has nothing to do with the mathematical addition operation at all!

In fact, the conditional “series sum” obtained in this way is an approximate value of the sum, but it is never accurate. In other words, in Krauss’s example, sum of the series $1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{16} \dots$ etc. will never be exactly two, but it will approach two the more accurately the more terms in the sum of the

series we sum up. Therefore, Krauss is wrong himself and misleads people.

[00:44:02] Krauss: Okay. So, that kind of argument that infinity is impossible is just does not make sense mathematically. Infinities do occur ...

24 COMMENT

Yes, but what does mathematics (formal abstract science) has to do with it? The conversation was about physics.

[00:44:10] Krauss: No, it is true, in my book I that said, infinite density or infinite energy is a concept that appears to be in contradiction with the evidence of physics. But that is not apply all infinities impossible. In fact, space could be infinite large. There is no presumption that space is not infinitely large. It could be. That we now know about physics suggests that it probably is not. But there is no law of physics says that space cannot be infinite in large. So this notion that you deduced that infinities impossible because you do not like it ...It is just not the way the world works. Because infinity is happen all the time, whether you like it or not. And not only that. It does not lead to rational actions.

25 COMMENT

If Krauss had been consistent and honest, he would have argued about God in the same terms. At least something like this, “There is no law that would assert that the existence of God is impossible. Atheists deduce the impossibility of the existence of God only because they do not like God ... But we

will never be able to know with absolute certainty how the world works. Therefore, an honest approach requires considering the existence of God at least as a hypothesis. Whether someone likes it or not. In addition, this is not the only point. The existence of God does not interfere with rational action.” However, Krauss does not say that. Everywhere he has double standards.

[00:44:51] Krauss: Mathematicians have a way of dealing of infinities. We can add infinity, we can take infinite series.

26 COMMENT

Again, confusion of different concepts of “infinity” and “infinite series”. Mathematical operations are possible only with numbers (for example, with members of an infinite series), and infinity is not a number. If you add any number to infinity (or perform any other mathematical operation), you get the same infinity.

[00:44:57] Krauss: For example, the series $1+2+3+4+5+6+7 \dots$ to infinity. In mathematic can have a finite sum. It is minus, if you are wonder it to know. Okay? It may not seem logical to you, it may seem inconceivable to you that the sum of a series of positive terms, each of which is bigger than one-twelfths, can be equal to minus one-twelfths!

27 COMMENT

Then Krauss pulls the “rabbit out of the hat”. Bravo! Spectacular focus! It would also be necessary to pay

him the salary according to his own method! One day Krauss will come to the bank to receive the fees for the year, and the bank employee will say, “We added a series of positive numbers here, and we got a negative number. Therefore, you also owe us. It may not seem logical to you, it may seem inconceivable to you, but everything is according to your science ...”

In fact, nothing close to minus one-twelfths can be obtained by addition. According to all the rules of mathematical analysis within the first semester, the series of natural numbers is infinite: $1 + 2 + 3 + \dots =$ and so on ad infinitum. Krauss’s assertion that the arithmetic sum of an infinite series of natural numbers can be a negative finite number is absolutely false. You can add as many first members of the series as you like — the sum will always be whole and positive. Moreover, all the members of the series cannot be summed up, because infinite addition is in principle impossible. The sequence of partial sums of this series also grows indefinitely and does not tend to any limit. This series diverges (that is, it is not equal to any certain number).

Mathematicians have come up with many different “summation” procedures that allow “summing up”, for example, conditionally converging series. However, do not forget that this is already a “different” mathematics (with additional postulates). The limits in it are understood in a

different sense and various kinds of approximations and simplifications are used, which leads to funny paradoxes. By Riemann's conditional convergence theorem, you can rearrange the terms so that the series converges to any predetermined number, and not just to minus one-twelfths. From the fact that the Riemann zeta function with argument 1 coincides with the natural series and is equal to minus one-twelfths, it does not at all follow that the sum of this series is minus one-twelfths. Moreover, any formal operations with this series are incorrect, since it is divergent.

Yes, in a number of problems in theoretical physics this “other” mathematics is used for calculations. However, it is not at all a fact that mathematical abstractions correctly reflect reality. For example, the value of the vacuum energy density, calculated on the basis of quantum field theory, differs from astrophysical observations by more than 120 orders of magnitude (i. e., 10 to 120 power times)!

In addition, since we are talking about the Riemann zeta function, it would be nice to remember that the great German mathematician Riemann¹ was born into the family of a Lutheran pastor was a deeply religious person and intended to become a priest. He became interested in mathematics only under the influence of the lectures of the “king of mathematics” K. Gauss. Riemann

1. Riemann, Georg Friedrich Bernhard, 1826–1866.

became famous for his works on the theory of functions of a complex variable and the creation of the so-called “Riemannian geometry”. All of this lies at the heart of modern theoretical physics. Krauss makes fun of religious people as stupid and ignorant, but he enjoys the fruits of their intellectual labors! He is playing dishonestly again! Moreover, this is generally a characteristic feature of deceitful atheistic propaganda, in which religion is necessarily identified with ignorance. However, believers are by no means stupid, and among them, there are many brilliant scientists.

It seems that Krauss, like a professional cheater, quickly shuffles marked cards and shows tricks. In an audience where there are no mathematicians, he mixes up different concepts of a sum, abuses terminology and juggles the formulas of higher mathematics, not giving the audiences time to comprehend all this. In the same way, you can “prove” that $2 + 2 = 7$, or that the weight of a mosquito is equal to the weight of an elephant. One of two things: either Krauss is deliberately misleading the audience, or it is delusional itself. In the first case, he is a dishonest person, and you should not listen to him. In the second case, he should be disqualified and his academic degree in mathematics annulled, since he does not know mathematical analysis during the first semester of the institute.

[00:45:18] Krauss: But the fact that it is inconceivable to you just means you ignorant.

Tzortzis: Thank you.

Krauss: Okay!

28 COMMENT

Interestingly, prof. Krauss being jeered over at his students the same way. Is this called “education”? No, in fact this is arrogance and rudeness.

Quite often, Krauss makes fun of his opponent, ridiculing his ignorance of physics and mathematics, although the topic of debate does not apply to these sciences. This technique is called “argument to a person” (Lat. *argumentum ad hominem*) — this is an attempt to refute the opponent’s arguments by indicating a character, motive, or other an attribute of the person giving the argument, or the person associated with the argument, instead of indicating the inconsistency of the argument itself, objective facts or logical reasoning. In essence, it is an appeal to the emotions, beliefs, and prejudices of the audience. The use of *argumentum ad hominem* in a scientific discussion is incorrect, since such a discussion, as a rule, presupposes the striving of the parties to objective truth, and not an attempt to be a winner in the eyes of the audience. Such a technique is a sign of incompetence, and this has long been known.

[00:45:24] Krauss: Now, this idea that “Occam’s razor” suggests ...First of all, Occam’s Razor is not a principle of

science. Okay. It is a nice idea that you should try for the simplest answer of any question. And physicists trying use that. Sometimes the simplest answer does not work ...

[00:46:04] Krauss: But in fact, do you know that is simpler than number one? The number zero! Zero is a much simpler reason — there is no cause. Okay. So, if you really want apply Occam’s razor, in fact, you have to accept no cause.

29 COMMENT

One of the greatest logicians of the Middle Ages, a Franciscan monk, William of Ockham (1285–1349) proposed the principle of methodological reductionism, later called “Occam’s razor”¹. There are many similar formulations of this principle. For example: “When you come up with an explanation that works, don’t add more assumptions.” If the “simple” explanation is complete and exhaustive, then the introduction of additional components is unreasonable and unnecessary. On the other hand, if the “simple” explanation is not complete and exhaustive, then the conditions for using Occam’s razor are not met. Tzortzis quite rightly answered that “zero” does not provide an exhaustive explanation of the origin of the universe.

1. More about Occam’s Razor look in the book: К.Г. Волкодав. Эволюция: тёмная сторона самого грандиозного шоу на Земле. Т. 1/Серпухов, 2016. С. 62.

[00:46:50] Krauss: Do you know what causality means? You used the term ...You should know what it means.

Tzortzis: Yes. I have my definition.

Krauss: Okay. I will define. You know, cause precedes effects. Does sound good?

Tzortzis: No, I that is a wrong definition ...

[00:49:55] Krauss: Our visible universe did have a beginning, because we can measure it. Whether we like it or not, whether we think it is sensible or not, it actually did have a beginning. Of cause, that is a fact and not a dispute. Our universe had a beginning. Now. However, the laws of physics tell us right now extrapolate back to the beginning ...That it is quite that the time did not existed before $T=0$. So, if time does not exist at all, then the sense of cause does not even make sense. And this is the key point. In science, if to realize that our common sense notion sometimes not true. Then we observe facts, they has causes. But, at the beginning of time, when time itself may of coming to existence, then a question becomes a bad question. Philosophers can debate it, people can write it down, but it does not matter.

30 COMMENT

At the very beginning, Tzortzis kind of “played giveaway”, complimenting Krauss. However, from that moment on, he could no longer stand the boorish tone of Krauss and began to object rather sharply to him.

The emergence of the universe from non-being (nothingness) can only be discussed in philosophical

categories, since any natural-scientific concepts also did not exist before its appearance, that is, there were no laws, no “physics” in a broad sense. Krauss states that philosophers’ opinions “mean nothing”. Why? Again, he has no reasoning, no arguments, and no proof. “Doesn’t mean anything” just because Krauss does not like it? In fact, Krauss turns everything upside down here. At the singularity point, at $T=0$, there was no time, no “physics” in general, even in part. Physicists can discuss the singularity, someone can write about it, but that means nothing — all this is outside the domain of physicists. Therefore, with all due respect to physicists, you need to indicate their place: for $T>0$, please conduct research, calculations, but not where physics has not yet existed! Only philosophers and theologians have the right to speculate about the initial moment of the origin of the universe. Some of them may be wrong (like any scientist), but at least this is their area of expertise.

However, Krauss does not want to reckon with the opinion of philosophers, even though the ancient philosophers laid the foundations of physics and mathematics. Physics up until the 18th century was usually called “natural philosophy”¹. A PhD literally means, “Doctor of philosophy” (in Latin “doctor philosophiae”), even if it is a physics degree. Therefore, neither a physicist nor a mathematician

1. Lat. Philosophiae Naturalis, Germ. Naturwissenschaften.

can neglect philosophy; it is the same as spitting against the wind.

Krauss connects the principle of causality with time simply to fit the solution to the answer he wants. If in textbooks or elsewhere it is formulated as Krauss says, “cause precedes (in time) the effect”, or something like that, then we disagree with this definition. Therefore, we will give two other definitions, in which there is no connection between the cause and time, and the cause-effect relationships do not depend on time.

General Principle of Causality

The general principle of causality: everything that has arisen has arisen for some reason. In classical mechanics (the first integral scientific theory), all phenomena had causes and were associated with their causes by certain laws. Talking about the causelessness (accident) of something meant talking only about ignorance of the real laws and the reasons why it happened.

However, studies of nature on very large scales (galaxies) and very small (subatomic particles) presented physicists with many paradoxes and mysteries. Quantum mechanics often contradicted logic and common sense. Therefore, physicists used a simple but effective trick: if you do not know how to explain a phenomenon, then call it a strange and incomprehensible “abstruse” word. This is how the

words “singularity”¹, “fluctuation”², “spontaneous”³ and etc. appeared.

The time instant of spontaneous emission by quantum systems (atoms) or spontaneous fission of heavy atomic nuclei cannot be predicted due to the randomness of quantum processes. This is why Krauss likes to refer to quantum mechanics. However, randomness strictly obeys the corresponding distribution function. Many theories⁴ try to explain the physical meaning of the wave function. However, the best specialists in quantum mechanics have not yet come to a consensus on its physical interpretation.

In any case, the mysterious phenomena of the microworld are due to the very existence of matter. Obviously, there can be no question of spontaneous fission of nuclei if there are no nuclei themselves. And there will be no scalar field fluctuations if there is no field.

Another example. Pi is an infinite non-periodic fraction. Mathematicians cannot find any regularity

1. Singularity (from Lat. Singularis — unique, special) is something that took place only once.

2. Fluctuation (from Lat. Fluctuatio — fluctuation, instability) fluctuation, instability, any random deviation of any value from the most probable value.

3. Spontaneous (Lat. Spontaneus) — spontaneous, arising without external influence due to internal causes.

4. Currently, there are about seven theories that explain the physical meaning of the wave function. The main ones are many-worlds, pilot wave theory and hidden parameter theory.

in the arrangement of decimal places for this number. However, you cannot say that they are located without a reason, because this number is uniquely determined as the ratio of the circumference of a circle to its diameter. Likewise, a series of primes is still an unsolved mystery. We do not know if there is a pattern in their location, but this does not mean that they are located for no reason.

*The Particular Principle of Causality
(the Phenomenon of Creativity)*

The particular principle of causality: everything that has arisen from non-being has arisen due to the creative act of a person who has free will. A distinctive feature of this principle is the concepts of non-being and personality, which go beyond physics. Thus, this principle applies only to metaphysics. Therefore, we named it “Particular”. In addition, this principle can be called “The Phenomenon of Creativity”. Not anything that has arisen from non-being can be connected with its cause by any law, since in non-being, there are no laws at all, and there can be no connections with anything. The creative act takes place at the free will of the creator, who calls something out of non-being.

*The Particular Principle of Causality
in the Book of Genesis*

It is safe to say that in the entire history of humankind, no literary monument has attracted as much attention as the Bible, and especially the first chapter of the Bible (Torah) — the Six Days of Moses. For example, at the end of the 19th century, all the commentaries on the first word of the Bible “at the beginning” (Heb. **אֶתְּחִלָּה** — Strong’s lexicon number 07225) were collected, and there were 70 volumes of interpretations per one word!

On the etymology of the second word “created” (Heb. **בָּרָא** “bara”, Strong’s lexicon number 01254, Gen. 1:1) there is also a lot of literature. Therefore, we will not consider here all the shades of its meaning. Let’s just note some meanings of the verb “bara”: create something new, conceive (as a thought), cut¹, carve, throw something out, create out of nothing.

It should be noted that in addition to this verb, to describe the creation of the world and man by God, the other two are used, with different semantic meanings. This is the verb “create” (Heb. **עָשָׂה** “asah”, Strong’s lexicon number 06213, Gen. 1:7), which means to create from a ready-made material, and the verb “to form” (Heb. **יָצַר** “yatsar”, Strong’s lexicon number 03335, Gen. 2:7), which means changing the

1. Strong’s Hebrew Lexicon. Bob Jones University.

shape (like sculpting clay or forging metal). The prophet Isaiah uses all three verbs in one sentence, “I form [yatsar] light and create [bara] darkness, I make [asah] weal and create [bara] woe; I the LORD do [asah] all these things” (Is. 45:7).

When describing Six-Day, the verb “bara” is used three times. First, when it speaks of the initial creative impulse for the emergence of the universe, “In the beginning when God created the heavens and the earth” (Gen. 1:1). The etymology of the verb seems to suggest that the universe was conceived by God (as a thought), and then immediately arose out of non-being.

Second, when creating animals, “So God created the great sea monsters and every living creature that moves, of every kind, with which the waters swarm, and every winged bird of every kind” (Gen. 1:21). Despite the fact that in this case there is already preceding matter and living plants, all the same, for this matter, something fundamentally new is created from nonexistence — the souls of animals.

Thirdly, when it is reported about the creation of man, “So God created humankind in his image, in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them” (Gen. 1:27). In this verb, the verb “bara” is repeated three times, which indicates a very special “constitution” of a person.

The creation of animals and humans was preceded by the stage of creation of matter and its preparation,

formation. However, at the very moment of creation, something new appears that did not previously exist. The verb “bara” can be applied to the work of a sculptor who beats away everything unnecessary from a block of marble and thus creates a beautiful statue. However, for this he must first create in his mind out of non-being the image for the sake of which the pieces are cut off from the block. In addition, matter is not just formed in a special way, but new entities created from non-being can be introduced into it. Thus, the first chapters of the Bible tell about three levels of creation from nothing: the universe, animals and man.

The Particular Principle of Causality in Cosmogony

The universe arose out of non-being. Nowadays, this fact has been proven by scientific methods¹. The universe was not preceded by anything material, that is, there were neither the laws of physics themselves, nor time. Time arose together with the universe and, like the universe, has a Cause (Gen. 1:1; Ps. 146:6; John 1:3; Col. 1:1617; 1 Cor. 8:6; Rom. 11:36 and etc.). Therefore, the origin of the universe cannot be explained by any quantum tricks. The only logical explanation remains — its creation by

¹. In 2003, cosmologists Arvin Borde, Alan Guth, and Alexander Vilenkin proved the singularity theorem. It says that the expanding space and time does not continue infinitely into the past, but has a beginning, that is, the universe has a beginning. Look: Borde A., Guth A. and Vilenkin A. Inflationary space-times are not past-complete. Phys. Rev. Lett., 90151301, 2003.

the transcendent Beginningless Creator, Reasonable Person — God.

On this occasion, atheists often say, “What about God? He, too, must have a cause, and it in turn must have another, and so on ad infinitum. Alternatively, if God could exist without a cause, then why at least some part of the universe cannot exist without a cause?” For example, Krauss, in his book *A Universe from Nothing*, writes directly, “The declaration of a First Cause still leaves open the question, ‘Who created the creator?’ After all, what is the difference between arguing in favor of an eternally existing creator versus an eternally existing universe without one?”¹ The answer is simple. The universe (and any part of it) arose out of non-being. In nonexistence, there is no inner potency, any possibility of anything arising. Therefore, an external (transcendental) Cause is necessary for the origin of the universe. In addition, God did not arise, had no beginning. He is Being Himself, that is, He has being and life in Himself (comp. John 5:26). Therefore, He exists for no cause. In addition, the principle of causality is a fundamental law of nature, but God is not a part of nature, but it’s Creator. He is transcendental to the material world. Therefore, He surpasses any laws, any philosophical and scientific principles. Krauss and other atheists cannot understand why no one created the Creator, since they think in line with the

1. Lawrence M. Krauss. *A Universe from Nothing*. Preface. 2012).

paradigms of the natural sciences, which are not applicable in this matter.

*The Particular Principle of Causality
in Human Creativity*

Despite the fact that humans are very similar to animals in their bodily nature, they have the potential to become “created by God” (comp.: John 10:34). One of the manifestations of this potential is human creativity, the ability to create from nothing. Despite the fact that a person uses material things to express his creativity, the very creative idea, the very image of the future creation, arise from non-being. They are not preceded by anything material, neither in the neurons of the brain, nor anywhere else.

“If God is the Creator, and the Creator out of nothing, then we, created in the image of the Creator, are also creators of objects and images that did not exist before,” writes Archimandrite Cyprian (Kern). A brilliant artist, sculptor, musician or poet themselves do not know exactly how the idea of a future creation arises in their minds. She may come unexpectedly, or she may suddenly leave. That is why Leonardo Da Vinci left many unfinished works. He often began to paint in a creative impulse and quit if this impulse passed. This inspiration does not obey any orders, any compulsion.

This means that something immaterial, metaphysical is embodied in the material. As an

illustrative example, let us say about the statue David. It is made by the brilliant sculptor Michelangelo¹ in 1501–1504. The five-meter statue is made of a solid block of marble that has lain in the sun and rain for several decades. The sculptor, cutting off all unnecessary, managed to create this amazing image out of non-being. Michelangelo's first biographer, Jojo Vasari, wrote that David took away the glory of all statues, modern and ancient, Greek and Roman. Next to this statue, there is a feeling that David is about to come to life and boldly step towards the giant Goliath. Over time, this amazing image began to be perceived not only as a symbol of Florence and one of the peaks of Renaissance art, but also as the pinnacle of human genius in general.

The same can be said for other masterpieces of art. Whatever they are expressed (in material, word or sound), they contain a certain image or idea, created by their creators from nothing. Moreover, when a connoisseur of art examines this secret of creativity somewhere in a museum, even without knowing the name of the author, it is obvious to him that the creator of the masterpiece is a creative person, and not something impersonal.

1. Michelangelo Buonarroti (1475–1564) — Italian sculptor, painter, architect, poet and thinker, one of the greatest masters of the Renaissance.

On the other hand, thanks to advances in technology, modern artificial intelligence can write small texts. Nevertheless, they are “mechanical” in nature; no one will admire them and will not put them on a par with classical literature. Even the most advanced computers will never be able to create something creatively from nothing. Artificial intelligence only processes information according to specified algorithms or, conversely, uses a random number generator. However, creativity is neither one nor the other — neither a strict law, nor the embodiment of chance.

Problems of Nurturing Creativity

A creative person needs materials for his work. For example, an artist needs canvas, paints, brushes, etc. Nevertheless, no amount of materials and no best conditions and even years of study guarantee that a person will become a brilliant artist, a creator, that is, he will be able to create masterpieces from non-being that will delight people for centuries. Having mastered the technique, he is guaranteed to become a good imitator, masterfully copy something in different variations, and draw at a high artistic level. Still, his paintings will not have that metaphysical spirit, ideas that distinguish a masterpiece from “ordinary” work.

The problem is that the creative potential cannot be transferred through the training of the intellect,

because it is necessary to transfer not knowledge, but a certain spiritual state. In addition, since this state is difficult to formalize, to write down in textbooks, no formal methodologies for teaching creativity have been invented.

This is especially evident in the field of education. A child is taught from childhood that the criterion of success is a formal assessment given by the teacher. Therefore, 99% of schoolchildren and students study for grades and a diploma! This approach has become generally accepted in the sciences, art, and religions. It is quite easy to teach a person to know, but no amount of knowledge will make him a genius and a creator. Only a performer and an imitator can be trained from textbooks. However, sciences, arts, and religions all develop thanks to creative ideas, not formal methodologies.

General Principles of Proving the Existence of God

Many centuries before the disputes between Christians and Muslims with atheists, theologians tried to write various proofs of the existence of God, the Creator of the universe. What should such evidence be based on? First of all, it should be noted that, according to the theology of the Abrahamic religions, God is transcendental to the universe and is not subject to any laws, any necessity. Therefore, proofs of the existence of God should not use

arguments from the field of physics, they should be purely metaphysical.

This is why Kalam's cosmological argument for the existence of God is not very convincing to atheists. This argument appeals to the General Principle of Causality, which also includes the field of physics. Atheists, on the other hand, refer to quantum mechanics and talk about spontaneity and fluctuations.

Purely metaphysical and therefore the most suitable for proving the existence of God the Creator is the Particular Principle of causality (The Phenomenon of Creativity). With regard to human creativity, this principle should be obvious to everyone. The existence of an artist, poet, musician, architect, designer, etc. is obvious, if his works exist. For example, a block of marble under the influence of sunlight, rain, sandstorms, and other factors over millions of years can accidentally acquire some form. However, this image will not contain an idea, a meaning, it will not inspire. On the contrary, everyone, having looked at the sculpture of David, even knowing nothing about Michelangelo, will confidently say that this is the creation of a great master, an intelligent person. The same can be said about any other cultural masterpiece. No one in their right mind would argue that a masterpiece arose by chance, spontaneously, under the influence of impersonal forces of nature. Thus, in relation to

the results of human creativity, the particular principle of causality cannot be disputed, one can be confident in it no less than in the second law of thermodynamics.

Nevertheless, if there is a certain result of creativity, something that arose out of nothing, but at the same time, it certainly did not come from a human, then another Reasonable Person is the Creator. Following this logic, human comes to the concept of God. When we talked about the Particular principle of causality in the book of Genesis, we gave three examples of this principle (with the verb “bara”). This is the initial impulse for the emergence of the universe from non-being, the animal world and the special constitution of a person endowed with spiritual aspirations and creative potential.

These three phenomena could not arise under the influence of impersonal forces of nature, therefore, from time immemorial, thinking about them, people came to the concept of God the Creator (comp.: Rom. 1:19–20). We can say that cosmology, the mystery of life on Earth, and anthropology are three sources and three components of religions.

Atheists like Marx or Freud tried to impose the belief that religions arose out of fear of the forces of nature or out of social relationships. This opinion of atheists is absolutely false and only testifies to their complete lack of understanding of the essence of religions. The forces of nature have long been

explained, but believing scientists have always been and are now. In the communist USSR, four generations of people were brought up by anti-religious propaganda, but as soon as the opportunity arose, many people voluntarily turned to religion.

Proofs of the existence of God the Creator use the Particular Principle of Causality with examples in cosmology, biology, and anthropology. However, why are they not convincing for everyone? Why does it often happen that the proof is valid, but does not work for someone? On the one hand, a person needs to understand that either something arose out of non-being or a certain idea that arose out of non-being is embedded in it. Thus, a certain level of understanding is required. On the other hand, there must be a desire to recognize the presence in the considered phenomenon or idea of some value — value precisely as creation. These two factors (understanding and desire) determine the validity of all evidence.

To illustrate the above, we will give examples from art. For an adequate understanding of the picture, you need to be about the level of the artist. This is one of the axioms of aesthetics: the contemplation and understanding of objects of art is also a kind of art. Often, contemporaries could not appreciate the work of brilliant masters, because they did not “mature” to understand them. For example, the paintings of Van Gogh or Camille Pissarro during

their lifetime were of no interest to anyone, no one bought them. Only a century later, their work was estimated at millions of dollars. On the other hand, some people may not accept the very idea and meaning that the creator put into his creation. For this reason, acts of vandalism occur when works of art are deliberately destroyed.

Something similar happens with regard to the evidence for the existence of a Creator God. For example, the wonderful moral proof formulated by Immanuel Kant requires an understanding of the spiritual moral nature of man and the recognition of the value of moral laws. However, some people cannot understand this and say that all morality is the result of chance, blind evolution. Others, having a “burnt conscience”, like vandals, categorically reject moral principles and would like to delete morality from social foundations in general, to replace it with some kind of “benefit”.

We emphasize once again that the effectiveness of the evidence of the existence of God the Creator depends on the spiritual state of the audience. From the level of his understanding and from his inner “vector of the soul”, the recognition of certain metaphysical values.

Is Krauss Needed to Create a 'Book out of Nothing'?

Krauss's book *A Universe from Nothing* in Russian translation has a continuation of the title: "A Universe from Nothing: Why Is Not Needed God to Create the Universe from Nothing." It was written with the intention of striking at the doctrine of the Supreme Intelligence. However, it did not achieve this goal, since the author could not convincingly explain where the physical characteristics of the original "nothing" could have come from. It is noteworthy that the book begins with the words, "To Thomas, Patty, Nancy, and Robin, for helping inspire me to create something from nothing ..."¹

Thus, the author himself speaks about the phenomenon of creativity (The Particular Principle of Causality): something can arise from non-being only because of its creation by an intelligent creator. If the universe did not require a Creator, then books (and all masterpieces of art in general) could arise from nothing by chance, without the participation of an intelligent creator. Is it possible?

Suppose that a man like Krauss, with the same surname and a writer, woke up one day and went to a publishing house to arrange the publication of his book. There the head of publishing house say to him, "We have already received an offer to publish a book from your computer by e-mail. In addition, we

1. Lawrence M. Krauss. *A Universe from Nothing: why there is something rather than nothing*. NY, 2012.

liked it more than yours. Moreover, the computer does not ask for any royalties. Therefore, we will print it. By the way, your computer's book is called "Is Krauss Needed to Create a Book out of Nothing?"

Of course, a sufficiently powerful computer, in a sufficiently long time, simply by accidentally combining words, will be able to write all the books that Krauss wrote and even more. However, for one reasonable proposal, there will be billions of meaningless ones. Who will "filter" one from the other? In principle, no artificial intelligence is capable of this. A person who could write a similar book himself can only do this. In other words, the selection must be reasonable. Only an intelligent person, a kind of "co-creator", is capable of this. Scientists of about the same level as the author review scientific works. Moreover, in the collection of museums, people who are well versed in art select art objects. Adequately assessing someone's work is possible only by approaching the level of the creator in every sense. Some text, of course, may appear accidentally on the computer. Nevertheless, in any case, it is necessary that a reasonable person read it and appreciate it.

[00:51:11] Krauss: Now ...I actually input in a computer a lot of Arabic words and ask to output them random. And it produce two sentences in Arabic from the Quran

in 11.6 seconds. My computer speaks not Arabic nor is Arab, but produced that incredibly “divine” words.

31 COMMENT

This Krauss experiment is completely unreasonable, illogical, and irrational. Likewise, one could instruct a computer to output words at random from an English dictionary. A sufficiently powerful computer would write an unimaginable amount of texts in a sufficiently long time. Among them would be all of Krauss’s books, even those not yet written by him, and many more unwritten books on physics by other authors, with future brilliant discoveries. The only question is how to separate intelligent texts from the overwhelming multitude of meaningless texts? Krauss compared the two sentences, compiled by the computer, with the already available Quran, and if there is nothing to compare with? The computer itself will not tell, or even give a hint, what makes sense.

In addition, sometimes two sentences are just two sentences. It is pointless to draw any meaningful conclusions from them. For example, the same bricks can be used to construct a unique building, a masterpiece of architecture, and an unremarkable “box”. In the same way, very, very different texts can be made from the same sentences.

Continuing with Krauss’s thought, the computer can also produce incredibly “scientific” words.

Maybe artificial intelligence will write books better, smarter than Krauss does. Then why would Krauss be paid a salary when a computer can do exactly what he does, only much faster and free?

[00:51:31] Krauss: Now. The other question, of course, I would have to ask, and this is a common sense question. Why did God choose Arabic, or Aramaic, or Greek? I mean, you know, doesn't He speak English? The Americans always think He does. Which is why we invented the Mormon Revelation.

32 COMMENT

Why is this question? God speaks the language that the audience understands. Moreover, sometimes God speaks directly to a person's heart on a non-verbal level.

[00:51:51] Krauss: So, the question I wanted to ask is, "What makes sense?" Not the details of the Quran, which I do not want to dwell on. Because it is just one of thousands of religions. All of which make the same claims. And all which, if you look at them a priori, are equally ridiculous from the a priori common sense notion.

33 COMMENT

Here Krauss begins to pour out simply streams of slander against religion (without specifying which one). Therefore, it is necessary to make one impartial remark. The hippopotamus marks its territory in a very funny way. During bowel movements, he twists his little tail like a propeller, and in this way scatters his manure on bushes and tree branches. The

speeches of preachers of Atheism, such as L. Krauss, K. Hitchens, R. Dawkins, J. Fresco, and others, are associated with just such a picture. They completely do not know the essence of religions and their preconceived conjectures, and someone's gossip is thrown at the fan. They give no evidence or justification. Moreover, the opponent does not have enough time to answer. Therefore, they leave the debate satisfied, as if they have proved something.

In fact, all the questions they ask have been answered in detail long ago. Christian theology is already 20 centuries, Islamic — 14 centuries. The number of research monographs, Bible interpretations, and periodicals (with different opinions) on Christian topics alone exceeds the number of all scientific publications in the same time. For example, if you walk along the street along the entire library of the theological faculty in Tübingen, you can see endless shelves of books through the windows on the wall. In this colossal amount of Christian literature (in other libraries there may be even more books), almost all issues are explained in detail. “Almost all” because there are a small number of difficult questions, some of which no one can give a definite answer. However, atheists do not ask hard questions. They just do not have the intelligence to come up with them.

Below we will try to briefly comment on common myths about religions propagated by atheists. To

begin with, let us say with regard to Krauss's words about the Islam, "It is just one of thousands of religions. All of which make the same claims." If this were so, then for a long time all religions would have united into one, since like strives for like. However, the fusion of religions never happened. On the contrary, only divisions took place (Buddhism separated from Hinduism, Christianity from Judaism). Even within one religion, disagreements constantly arise and, as a consequence, division into different branches (schisms). Yes, religious scholars group religions based on some similar characteristics. For example, the three Abrahamic religions. Nevertheless, there are very significant differences between the religions of even one group. Therefore, the statement that "Islam, along with a thousand other religions, makes almost identical statements" is completely wrong. It is also incorrect to talk about religion "in general", one must always point to a specific religion. By default (unless otherwise stated) we will use examples from Christianity.

[00:52:09] Krauss: For example, I got this from my friend, the late friend, Christopher Hitchens. Is it sensible to assume that humans who evolved to the present form somewhere between 250 thousand to a million years ago ...So, you have God, Who creates a universe, and has 4.5 billion years of life evolving, and then homosapiens evolved and lived in incredibly awful conditions for 250 thousand years. And suddenly, in the middle of the desert, in a cave where no one can see it,

it takes some poor man and says, “I will tell you the truth. And, not only that. I will let allow you the save humanity. And, in fact, if people don’t believe you, they will go to hell for eternity, and we will sit, look at these sadomasochistic about torture they have and we enjoy it ...

[00:53:06] Krauss: Now, what about all those unfortunate people who lived 250 thousand years before? Real people who were struggling to exist and survive. Those poor people who existed before that God decided to give his revelation to Muhammad. Why that? Why has an sensible God wait that long?

34 COMMENT

Several myths are mixed here at once. First that “homosapiens evolved and lived in incredibly awful conditions for 250 thousand years”. This is just a hypothesis of atheists. The fact that the earliest people did not have computers and did not use mobile phones does not mean that they lived only in caves.

Many artifacts testify to the existence of a highly developed culture in an era separated from us by millennia. For example, in different parts of the world there are megalithic structures built in prehistoric times. Methods for sawing hard rocks, fitting with high precision and transporting boulders weighing hundreds of tons remain a mystery. Modern technology is not capable of this. In addition, a mystery is the reason why people have lost this knowledge. Later cultures (for example,

Egyptian) adapted these structures to their needs, but they could not build anything of the kind. Another mystery is a group of giant geoglyphs on the Nazca plateau in southern Peru. Modern devices do not allow drawing a straight line up to 8 kilometers long on rough terrain so that the deviation does not exceed 0.1 degrees. In addition, on the Nazca plateau, perfectly flat strips go beyond the horizon, crossing riverbeds, climbing hills and at the same time, without deviating from a straight line. These facts and many more archaeological finds indicate the existence of ancient civilizations unknown to us, possessing technologies that are not inferior to modern ones. This calls into question the hypothesis of the evolution of man from ape-like ancestors.

Second, in ancient cultures, the right to be a religious teacher did not arise automatically for anyone. Even if a person said that he had a revelation in the middle of the desert, no one would listen to him with his mouth open. The authority of the teacher had to be earned and confirmed. Moses performed great miracles in front of thousands of people, but even after that some did not believe him and contradicted him (Num. 16:12–15). For more than three years Jesus Christ preached and in front of thousands of people healed every incurable disease, raised the dead (Luke 7:21–22) and

performed miracles that no one else performed (John 3:2). Still, some doubted.

Thirdly, it would be deeply wrong to regard revelation as some kind of information perceived rationally, logically. It was always intended to “return the hearts of fathers to children, and to the rebellious minds of the righteous, in order to present to the Lord a prepared people” (Luke 1:17). In the same context, the so-called “salvation” should also be considered — as an appeal of the heart to God, and not at all as some “correct” information.

Fourthly, at the Last Judgment of human souls, not faith will be assessed at all, but desires, aspirations, and deeds. It will be held according to completely different criteria. It does not matter when and in what culture a person lived. In the very nature of man, in his conscience, the basic truths are already laid (look: Rom. 2:2–16). Fifthly, “it is not the will of your Father in heaven that one of these little ones should be lost” (Matt. 18:14). God never enjoys, as Krauss puts it, “sodomasochism”. This is heinous slander. On the contrary, God does everything possible to save people, up to self-sacrifice (Matt. 18:11).

These are very brief remarks. However, we would like to consider some fundamental things in more detail.

Believers Disbelief
Doubt and Critical Thinking as an
Attribute of Christianity

Atheists often reproach religious people for blindly believing in the unsubstantiated claims of their religion. R. Dawkins and his comrades call religious people a mocking nickname “faithful”. On the one hand, this is true, but less than half. Therefore, this is more than half a lie. Yes, often some religious people simply believe in the power of belonging to a certain cultural tradition. It is easier, calmer, and psychologically more comfortable to adhere to the faith of the ancestors than to doubt and ask questions. By the way, the same can be said about atheists. After all, they also believe in many unsubstantiated statements.

On the other hand, the Bible and various other Christian literatures describe many episodes when a saint and righteous person temporarily lost faith and doubted. For example, Moses and Aaron at the waters of Meribah (Num. 20:6–13), the priest Zechariah (Luke 1:18), even the “stone of faith” the Apostle Peter (Matt. 14:30–31), the Apostle Thomas (John 20:25) and others. Jesus said to the chosen apostles, “Because of your little faith ...” (Matt. 17:20). In addition, another time he rebuked them for their unbelief (Mark 16:14). They themselves felt the lack of their faith and said to Him: “Increase our

faith!” (Luke 17:5). Moreover, the whole multitude of Christian literature from ancient times to this day clearly shows that many Christians constantly feel a lack of their faith, are constantly in search, research, asking questions about faith to themselves and to each other. Elder Silouan, an Athos saint who grew up in a family of deeply religious people, for some time doubted the existence of God. Something similar happened with Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh. In addition, there are many of such examples. Thus, in this respect, atheism is not at all unique. Disbelief and critical thinking are not exclusive attributes of Atheism.

An amazing paradox: the more a person believes the closer to his heart he perceives what he believes in, the more honest he is with himself and therefore sometimes his faith can be doubted and questioned. In addition, sometimes, somehow inexplicably, a kind of metaphysical pit of unbelief opens up before him. Then he exclaims with tears, “I believe; help my unbelief!” (Mark 9:24) Perhaps this phrase best describes a Christian: he grieves for a lack of faith, sometimes loses it, but wants to find it again.

Therefore, belief or disbelief is not adequate characteristics of a person’s state of mind. There is something more fundamental (which neither atheists nor religious scholars know), certain deep forces of the soul that direct the “vector” of desires and will.

This state of mind was very well described by the poet Yevgeny Baratynsky in the poem “Prayer” (1844):

King of Heaven! Calm down
 My sick spirit!
 Delusions of the Earth
 Send me oblivion
 And for Your strict Paradise
 Bring forces to the heart!

[00:53:28] Krauss: And, of course, another question is, “Why the revelations always done when no one else can see them?” If you ask yourself, wouldn’t it just make sense ...Why do not once call down from the sky so everyone can hear it? Why does this always given to people in private who then claims to have a revelation?”

35 COMMENT

The conversion from heaven in the presence of many people was at least three times in New Testament history (Matt. 3:17; John 12:28–30; Acts 26:13–19). Everything was already as Krauss wanted. Even then, some did not believe. Faith or disbelief does not depend on the amount of evidence or miracles and not on their persuasiveness, but on the direction of the will. When people do not want to believe, then a voice from heaven will not convince them, and “even if one were raised from the dead, they would not believe” (Luke 16:31).

[00:53:52] Krauss: Now. Why should I believe Muhammad's revelations are any more than anyone else's is?

[00:53:58] Krauss: In fact, there is a young woman in the United States, in my country, who as you know had a revelation. You may know this. He had a revelation. "God" told her to drown her four children in the bathtub. She did. Because "God" tell her, she heard it. She heard it, she had a revelation. It was real, she heard a voice, and incredible harmony and beauty that she had never experienced before in her life, and she drowned her four children. Okay. Now, she is now in a mental hospital for good reason. Because there is no evidence. There is no sensible person would believe to suggest that God was telling her to drown her four children.

36 COMMENT

This is what the "zeroing" of metaphysics leads to! Atheists simply do not have a conceptual apparatus to describe some real phenomena. Therefore, they simply ignore them. When such tragic incidents occur, atheists incorrectly characterize them as mental¹ diseases.

Different nations and cultures, independently of each other, for millennia testify to the existence of a metaphysical angelic world. Angels are not gods, they are creatures created, but not from gross matter, therefore they are called "spirits". The Abrahamic religions speak of divisions that took place in the

1. More precisely, somatic (bodily) diseases, because atheists do not believe in the existence of a soul either.

angelic world long before the creation of man (Is. 14:12–15; Luke 10:18). One of the highest angels became the adversary of God, the bearer of absolute evil, and carried away some of the angels with him. Therefore, he is called Satan (adversary), the devil (slanderer), the great dragon that deceives the entire universe, and the ancient serpent (Rev. 12:7). In addition, his angels are called evil spirits or demons.

It is noteworthy that in the most different cultures, completely different from each other, demons are surprisingly similarly depicted in the form of terrible horned monsters. However, in such a frightening form, they are far from always. In order to seduce, they can take any form, even light angels. In Christian literature, many cases are described when “Even Satan disguises himself as an angel of light” (2Cor. 11:14), and “his ministers also disguise themselves as ministers of righteousness” (2Cor. 11:15). “Do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits to see whether they are from God,” warns the apostle (1John 4:1). In this matter, Christianity has accumulated many empirical data, and a whole science of discerning spirits has been developed.

Believe it or not, ignoring millions of independent testimonies will not help solve problems when they arise. A good illustration of this is the film “The

Exorcist”, 1973¹. Although this is a feature film, it was preceded by real events. In 1949, two Catholic priests from St. Louis (USA, Missouri) performed an exorcism rite in the town of Mt. Rainier, Maryland. They exorcised a demon from a 14-year-old boy (born circa 1935) known by the pseudonym “Roland Doe”.

An episode of this film, in which Fr. Karras, a Jesuit priest and at the same time professor of psychiatry at Jesuit Georgetown University, speaks with Chris, the mother of a demoniac 12-year-old girl Regan. A Jesuit priest with a modern medical education is inclined to attribute Regan’s strange behavior to mental pathology and recommends treatment in a good clinic. Moreover, her mother has already turned to many doctors and was convinced that in this case, medicine is powerless to help.

You can relate to this film in different ways, but there are a great many such cases, reliably recorded².

1. There are many other similar films, inspired by real events. For example, the 2011 film “The Rite”, based on Matt Bagleo’s book “The Rite: The Making of a Modern Exorcist”, 2009.

2. In the XX century, in addition to the already mentioned Roland Doe, cases of obsession with the following people are reliably described and documented: 1) Clara Herman Celle. In 1906, a demon possessed a 16-year-old Christian student at the Saint Michael Mission in the KwaZulu Natal province of South Africa. More than 170 people witnessed the levitation of the possessed girl at a height of one and a half meters. When sprinkled with holy water, she fell; 2) German girl Anna Elisabeth (Anneliese) Michelle, in 1973; 3) Michael Taylor, in 1974; 4) a girl with the pseudonym “Julia”, a patient of Dr. Richard E. Gallagher, a renowned psychiatrist and professor of clinical psychiatry at

There are even audio and video recordings. Cases of demonic possession are incorrect to call pathologies such as schizophrenia, since another demonic personality also enters the human body¹.

Krauss mistakenly thinks that the woman he mentioned is mentally ill. This is just a typical example of the influence of evil spirits (which can also appear in the form of bright angels). The fact is that the modern judicial system does not know how to distinguish mental illness from insanity (there are no legal criteria, no relevant articles of the law). Therefore, everyone possessed by demons, as a rule, is recorded as mentally ill. True, in 1981 in the United States there was still an exceptional case when the court removed the guilt for the murder from Arne Cheyenne Johnson, recognizing him as possessed.

There are also known other murderers who confessed that they committed a crime on the orders of Satan. For example, Nikolai Averin, who killed hieromonk Vasily (Roslyakov), monks Trofim (Tatarnikov) and Ferapont (Pushkarev) on Easter night on April 18, 1993 in the Optina Monastery².

~~~~~  
New York College of Medicine. The case was attested in 2008: Julia levitated in the air, rising above her bed, spoke many languages, and talked about the past and future of friends of the psychiatrist, whom she simply could not know.

**1.** More about this look in the book: К.Г. Волкодав. Эволюция: тёмная сторона самого грандиозного шоу на Земле. Т. 1/Серпухов, 2016. С. 66–70.

**2.** There is a book about this: Павлова Н.А. Пасха Красная. О трёх Оптинских новомучениках, убиенных на Пасху

The background to this tragedy is as follows. In 1980 he was drafted into the army and sent to Afghanistan. He was a mortarman in reconnaissance. In Afghanistan, he was on the verge of death several times, but always remained unharmed. Unfortunately, in Afghanistan, Soviet soldiers (like American ones) gave more than just candy to local residents. They took part in brutal unjust killings, which were not even justified by military necessity. Perhaps this is where Nikolai Averin began his path to evil. Returning from Afghanistan, he began to read books on the occult and black magic. At that time, Soviet censorship was abolished, and books on Satanism appeared in the public domain. In addition, after the screening of the film "Omen" (a 1970s thriller about the coming of the Antichrist) on TV, a fashion for satanic symbolism arose. His fascination with occult mysticism led to the fact that he began to hear a voice that dictated what to do. This voice sometimes really helped him, saved him from trouble. Gradually, the spirit of evil subjugated him and did not allow him to rest, scolded and humiliated he in every possible way forced him to do something. Day and night for several years, Averin heard a voice that simply mocked him. Sometimes he heard hum and rumbling, which caused terrible headaches. The voice especially hated everything related to Christianity, and

1993 года/Изд. Адрес-Пресс, М., 2003.

inspired Averin that God was taking revenge on him and wishing him harm, and therefore help should be sought from Satan. Averin was fully aware that this voice belongs to Satan, and he himself wanted to serve him. He began to worship Satan as the enemy of God, began to write blasphemous verses. He said that if God appeared before him in the form of a man, he would discharge the entire clip of the machine gun into him. At the command of the voice, Averin banged his head against the wall, raped women, swore uncontrollably in public places, etc. Several times the man threw himself out of the windows and opened his veins. Once he ran naked through the village and blasphemed, chopped the Gospel with an ax. Finally, the moment came when the demon ordered Averin to kill the monks in order to take revenge on God.

In a collective farm workshop he made a short roman sword from an automobile spring and engraved the word “Satan” on it and the number of the beast — three sixes. It was with this weapon that he pierced through three people in the liver area. He also had another knife, such as a dagger, on which three sixes were also knocked out.

The early Passover Liturgy ended at six o'clock in the morning, and everyone dispersed. After the meal, the monks Trofim and Ferapont ascended the platform of the belfry to announce the Risen Christ to everyone with joyful ringing. Ten minutes later,

the Easter chime ended. Averin stabbed the bell ringers when they stood with their backs to each other. Then he rushed to the monastery wall and he met Hieromonk Vasily on the way. Piercing with his sword, the killer ran on, dropped his weapon, and jumped over the fence. Later, Averin confessed to reporters: "I was disgusted with it, but I did it."

I was there just a few minutes before the tragedy. In the pre-dawn twilight, a feeling of horror and anxiety suddenly surged inexplicably. The air became electrified. On such a big holiday, you need to rejoice, but I could not squeeze a smile out of myself. As if propelled by electric shocks, I hurried away from the belfry to the Skete for the late Liturgy. Reading the memoirs of eyewitnesses, I was surprised to learn that many had the same feeling. Even singers on two kliros were often confused in the most ordinary chants, which they knew well. Some pilgrims said that they made themselves rejoice.

Atheists say that everything is described by physics and mathematics, chemistry and biology, formulas and equations. However, they do not provide any evidence that the metaphysical spirit world does not exist. On the other hand, the multitudes of independent testimonies from different people about the existence of the spiritual world make it impossible to admit thoughts of a conspiracy of deceivers. You can, of course, stubbornly deny

everything, as does Krauss, but will it help make your personal and social life happy.

In an interview with the film crew of Vakhtang Mikeladze, who was filming the series of programs “Sentenced for Life”, Averin explained, “I could not get God, because you cannot get Him ... I had no evil against them, these guys. I didn’t kill someone for selfish purposes, I didn’t take the money, you understand.”<sup>1</sup> In a conversation with the film crew, Averin was calm and confident. He said that he did not repent in the least and that he would hardly ever repent. “There is a war between God and Satan, I can say I was one of his best disciples. I am against God, yes, and I am glad with Satan. Because I am good,” he said smiling.

Outwardly, he looked like a completely normal citizen. According to the interviewed witnesses, in everyday life the killer gave the impression of a calm, polite, harmless person, only with some oddities that mean nothing from the point of view of atheists. He was well versed in everyday life, and in business, he showed common sense. As a child, Averin graduated from music school, accordion class, played the guitar well, loved to joke, he had many friends.

---

1. Vakhtang Mikeladze’s documentary “Murder in a Monastery” from the “Documentary Detective” series. The program of Vakhtang Mikeladze, aired by DTV in 2009, was the last mention of this murder in the media.

A forensic psychiatric examination found Averin insane, diagnosed with schizophrenia, and he was sent to a psychiatric hospital. Of course, there are mental illnesses. However, the influence of evil spirits can also be added to them, which cannot be cured by pills. If Averin suffered only from schizophrenia, then he would not read occult books and would not use satanic symbols. Moreover, while there is free access to books on black magic, while satanic symbols are advertised, while atheists promote this, assuring that not all this means anything, the number of such tragedies will only increase. In the United States, serial killer Dammer built a temple to Satan, in which he folded an altar from the skulls of murdered people. There is a childhood photograph of him, which shows that he wore a T-shirt depicting Satan when he was still a child. Exactly from such “little things” everything starts. However, atheism is deaf and blind to all this. Maybe atheists deliberately cover their ears and close their eyes?

[00:56:35] Tzortzis: No, no, no ...There is a difference, do not misinterpret my positions! You misinterpret my positions!

Krauss: Okay. Let us take a more clearly example. Let us say you are homosexual man and you have sex with another homosexual man. Should that be subject to punishment?

Tzortzis: In a private home is outside of Sharia law. If they did it in public, which does not happen even where you from, that is a different story.

[00:57:01] Krauss: Where am I from? Where am I from?

Tzortzis: You are from the United States of America.

Krauss: I see. It does not even happen in where I am from. That is rude. But in any case ...

Tzortzis: How the rude? I thought you were an empiricist!

Krauss: In any case, we have it. This is happens even where I am from. So, two people in Arizona in the desert having sex. Because they really get turn on, and they are both men and they have sex together. Okay? Is that punishable?

Tzortzis: If there is no one in the desert, no, it is no.

Krauss: Okay. May I ask you another question? Is homosexuality wrong?

Tzortzis: In the Islamic tradition, it is a sin.

[00:57:35] Krauss: Okay. Now, here is an idea why common sense should tell you that Islam, like many other religions, is not common sense. Because homosexuality is perfectly natural.

### 37 COMMENT

**T**hat is why it should be recognized that atheism poses a great danger to human civilization, because it equates a person with an animal, thereby justifying any vices. Predictably, Krauss began to say, “Homosexuality is perfectly natural.” In general, all the theomachists try to justify homosexuality. It is like their signature and seal. In addition, this topic is

directly related to the previous one. Demons know very well that the best way to “stain the soul” and turn it away from God is sexual perversion, especially homosexuality. Therefore, the spread of homosexuality in society is always interconnected with the spread of satanic cults or atheism.

Of course, the devil will not be able to deceive many if he appears in his natural, terrifying form. Therefore, demons often take the form of “light angels” (or space aliens, as the case may be) or act through their human puppets, who are dressed in expensive suits and seem to people to be respectable scientists.

[00:57:46] Krauss: In all animals species almost it is natural. It occurs for the 10% frequency. Okay? In fact, there are good evolution reasons for homosexuality. So, in that sense, there is no reason, why were God, who thought it is a sin, make it natural among all species. I do not think the sheep (by the way, 10% of sheep are in long-term homosexual relationships) ...Why were God, who thought it is a sin, create sheep (who do not have a soul, who cannot think about it), be homosexual? That is a kind of nonsense. And we have to ask.

### 38 COMMENT

On one point, Krauss is right. Both the Quran and the Bible call homosexuality a grave sin. Nothing can justify it. No verbiage can cover up the words of condemnation addressed to it.

However, as always, Krauss, not knowing the topic and not understanding the issue, begins to slander

God. Animals have a soul, but another animal soul. They do not have the spirit, image, and likeness of God. Therefore, moral categories do not apply to animals. However, this does not mean that homosexuality is the norm for them. It is not natural for the primordial world, but has become “natural” for the world fallen into sin. Sin has entered into all nature. The whole world is poisoned by sin. Moreover, God is not the culprit for the existence of pathogenic viruses, bacteria, all kinds of parasites, harmful creatures, and all kinds of evil, including homosexuality in the animal world.

Atheists claim that man is just one of the animal species and nothing more. Therefore, they say that “natural and normal” for animals should be considered “natural and normal” for humans. It is easy to see what catastrophic consequences for humanity this thought can lead to. At the very beginning of the debate, the presenter said that words could be more dangerous than nuclear weapons. This is exactly the case. At one time, Hitler promoted social Darwinism and eugenics. In addition, many thought it was “objective, normal and scientific”. Soon social Darwinism led to the genocide of entire nations. Therefore, it is now. If the idea of the “natural and normal” behavior of animals begins to dominate in society, then its consequences may be worse than a nuclear war.

For animals, “natural and normal” (in a fallen world) is cannibalism and many other things. Storks, when they see that there is not enough food, throw the “extra” chicks out of the nest. Few animals mate for life. In addition, most animals are not monogamous at all. If for Krauss homosexuality is absolutely “normal” only because it occurs in 10% of animals, then all the more, he should consider the abolition of the institution of marriage “normal”, since 99% of animals do not have long-term marital relations. However, it is obvious that this will destroy civilization quickly. Homosexuality destroys her too, only a little more slowly and not so clearly.

To draw analogies with the animal world, as Krauss does, is incorrect for many reasons. For example, rabbits eat their own excrement balls, and for them it is normal and even beneficial for seeding the intestinal tract with the necessary bacteria. However, no sane person would do this; it is a sign of insanity. However, madness is treated as a disease, and no religion calls sickness a sin. Nevertheless, homosexuality is, first of all, a sin, a demonic and God-fighting principle, and not just a disease or deviation. However, atheists say that homosexuality is precisely a predisposition, and not a demonic influence and not acquired (through deception, seduction, suggestion, substitution) ugliness. In addition, society often agrees with this, because

otherwise it will have to admit that society itself is to blame for the spread of homosexuality.

Summing up the above, let us emphasize once again that in this issue double standards of atheists are manifested. If, for Krauss, homosexuality is “absolutely normal” because it occurs in animals, then in the same way he must admit that it is “absolutely normal” to kill children, eat excrement, and do many other things that animals do. Then Krauss would not have to condemn a woman who drowned her children. However, Krauss condemns her. On what basis? This can only be done based on metaphysical moral truths that stand above animal nature.

If homosexuality is “absolutely normal” for Krauss and his supporters, then cannibalism, cutting off the head of an opponent, and many other things have to be considered “normal”. In general, then the Nuremberg Tribunal should be disavowed and all convicted Nazis should be acquitted. They, after all, just like Krauss, referred to nature, the laws of Darwinism, logic and common sense. Why, then, did the tribunal condemn not only the ideologues of Nazism, but also ordinary performers? They failed to justify themselves by referring to the fact that they were forced to obey the laws and follow orders. The Tribunal found these explanations insufficient. There is certain “humanity” in man, which is “written” in the heart (Rom. 2:15). She

stands above animal nature and above the transient laws of society. However, a person has free will, and can drown out the voice of this humanity in him. The German philosopher Immanuel Kant analyzed this issue in some detail in his moral proof of the existence of God<sup>1</sup>.

[00:58:22] Krauss: And only way to discover to this nonsense is by looking at the world around us! Not by deducing it! Not by listening to the words of ignorant individuals and Iron Age peasants, who did not even know that the Earth moves around the sun! Wisdom and learning comes from observing the world around you! And we shouldn't take our wisdom from people who did not even understand the way of the world worked! Thank you.

### 39 COMMENT

This is another portion of demagoguery and sophistry from Krauss. He uses a well-known technique of demagoguery: if there is no way to refute a proof, you need to discredit the one who cites this proof. What have the “ignorant individuals and Iron Age peasants” to do with? Who listened to them and when? Tzortzis always refers to reputable scientists, philosophers, theologians. They were not only the smartest people for their time, but for our time, many of their views remain relevant.

---

1. Immanuel Kant. Criticism of Pure Reason/Иммануил Кант. Критика чистого разума//Пер. с нем.Н. Лосского. Изд. Мысль. М., 1994. С. 466–515.

Did atheists only begin to look at the world around them, and before them, no one looked at the world for thousands of years? In ancient times, fellow scientists did not know that the Earth moves around the sun. Let Krauss laugh at scientists! Krauss imposes his subjective, incorrect, and biased views on religion on everyone else. Religions do not deal with the material world, physics, they are engaged in metaphysics. Moreover, religious texts draw information about the material world from the works of scientists. Before the advent of atheism (just 200 years ago), often the same person was engaged in both science and theology. For example, the physicist and mathematician Isaac Newton wrote interpretations of the Bible. Of course, if he was wrong as a scientist, then these mistakes were reflected in religious texts.

On the other hand, Krauss's argument can be reversed, and then it will be directed against atheism. Why listen to materialistic physicists if they did not even understand how the non-material world works within us. Explaining the appearance of sense, goodness, love, and beauty with the help of physical and chemical processes (which supposedly arose by chance) is even more ridiculous than talking about a flat Earth or the movement of the Sun around the Earth.

[00:59:34] Tzortzis: Thank you very much, prof. Krauss, audience. First of all, I think most of what he

said, was a “red herring”. A red herring is a very smell fish. You put it across the path of running dogs. The reason of the red herring because ...He said I spoke about science. I specifically said he knows better than I do! I specifically did not use as a key argument for the finiteness of the universe. And you would to correct me in something that I have not even mentioned myself! This is called no rhetoric, nor intellectual arguments, this is called sophistry! It is rhetoric with crap, frankly. Now, I am not saying to be rude (because this is a typical Krauss fashion) ...Is that tolerance? ...This is another trick!

[1:00:58] Tzortzis: Now, the first point I want to make, you used the word “a priori” more than three times, but you rejected deductive thinking. I mean, is not “a priori” deductive? I mean, you are going to sit on two chairs!

Krauss: I am trying to talk at your level.

#### 40 COMMENT

**N**o, Krauss did not try to talk on the same level with the interlocutor. At 00:42:23 minute, he deliberately began to speak the language of mathematics from above in order to humiliate and ridicule an opponent who does not speak this language.

[1:01:14] Tzortzis: That is the first point. The second point I would like to make ... is that we no rejecting inductive arguments. Of course, not ...The inductive method and the scientific method do you know where came from, sir? Do you know where they came from?

[1:01:34] Krauss: I know. In fact, there is a markable scientific and mathematical tradition in the Arab world if that is what you are talks about.

Tzortzis: I want to talk about Ibn al-Haytham (Alhazen) and his book on optics ...

Krauss: Yeah.

Tzortzis: Read the work of David Hilbert and others ... History of philosophy and science ... And this all came from Islam. Do you know, why? Because Islam does not reject ...

Krauss: No, they came from the Arab world, not from Islam ...

[1:02:09] Tzortzis: As Muslims, we go where science takes us, but we are not stupid.

Deductive arguments — they are necessary, necessarily true. If you want to discuss my argument, you had to break down the premises, which you did not. You just are talking about the infinite, and the circle, and the circles ... I knew you would do this. Because it is all mathematics.

#### 41 COMMENT

Once again, it is worth noting a widespread misconception. It is impossible to prove (or disprove) metaphysics with physics! All attempts, by both supporters and opponents of religions, to use scientific methodology for evidence (or refutation) are counterproductive. Scientific methods in the field of religions do not work! For thousands of years, not a single attempt to scientifically prove something (or disprove) in the field of metaphysics has had the power of absolute convincing. No evidence leads to love, for example. You cannot, guided by logic and common sense, force yourself to love. You cannot feel something

beautiful based on formulas and equations. The real choice takes place deep down at the metaphysical level. In essence, all these proofs (or refutations) act only on those who have already decided everything for themselves without them. Believers, losing faith, want to strengthen themselves in it with the help of evidence. Likewise, unbelievers, deep in their hearts, have secret doubts about their faith (in Atheism) and seek their proof.

[1:02:30] Krauss: But it is a physical circle.

Tzortzis: Yes, but let me make a point. I said, "The quantifiable infinite. The quantifiable infinite cannot be actualize in the physical world, as you agreed with ..." And I said, "There is nothing no with a quality infinite." And quality infinities can exist. For example, mathematicians discussed ...

[1:02:52] Krauss: [draws a circle and diameter on a piece of paper] This is the length. Do you think length is a physical quantity? Length is a physical quantity.

Tzortzis: That, it is.

Krauss: Okay. The length of this and the length of that. Okay. The ratio of those two lengths is an infinite number.

Tzortzis: Yes, of course it is. But what is that length?

Krauss: One. This is a length one [diameter]. It is one Krauss. And this one [circle] is Pi Krauss.

## 42 COMMENT

**K**rauss starts playing with thimbles again. As they say, watch your hands (his words). Yes, length is a physical quantity. Nevertheless, the ratio of two physical lengths gives a mathematical value. The fact

that Pi has an infinite number of decimal places is a problem in mathematics. The number it is modulo bounded. It is less than 3.2. Infinity is not a number at all, but a special mathematical concept.

[1:03:17] Tzortzis: Can you measure, wait. Can you measure the straight line and can you measure the circumference? Yes or no?

Krauss: I can measure it.

Tzortzis: Thus, they are quantifiable. What you are talking about is the realm of mathematical discourse, which has axioms, rules, and those make sense. I am not disagreeing with that. I am agree with your own book, where you write that from a quantifiable discrete perspective, cannot have an infinite. That is the point I am trying to make ...

[1:04:06] Tzortzis: Then you spoke about, for example, "Zero is simple as Occam's razor." Again, you misconstrued that Occam's razor is. Occam's Razor is not only the simplest explanation, but also has to have great explanatory scope and explanatory power. Zero has no explanatory scope or power concerning of the origins of the universe from that perspective.

The other point, I like to make, is you spoke about, for example, hell and Justice, "Look at all these people they're going to hell." Again another huge trick. You have misrepresented Islamic theology! We have a very fine theology, sir. I think the best thing to do if you were just said, "You know, Hamza, I don't get this I haven't read this before I'm just making my own mind up because I watch videos of Christopher Hitchens in he is authority to me. I do not know much. Can you tell me what Islam says about this issue?" That would be better, wouldn't it?

[1:04:56] But again, this is huge trick, you are once again substituting concepts. When we come to things like hell, we believe God is just and merciful. Okay. No one disagrees with the concept the punishment. Okay. You will not disagree with the concept the punishment, are you? So when it comes to people who have never heard of Islam, as a whole array of theologians, like Ibn Taymiyyah or al-Ghazali, said that there is going to be another form of justice for them. They may be test on the Day of Judgment basement of the prophetic Traditions. Is not a simple as that? Okay.

### 43 COMMENT

**L**ikewise, Christians believe that God is just and merciful. The Last Judgment is written in commentary 52, in the chapter “The Last Judgment is not about Faith, but about Humanity”.

[1:05:21] Tzortzis: Okay. Homosexuality is a sin. Again, you try to put words in my mouth and that is not nice.

Krauss: I asked you questions. I did not.

Tzortzis: You did, but then you answered yourself, which is quite interesting. We don't believe homosexual tendencies “per se” are sinful. The manifestation of the homosexual act in public is sinful ...

[1:07:32] Krauss: — You said, “Infinity does not exist.” Yes, it does. Okay.

Tzortzis: You did not. I said, “The quantifiable infinity doesn't exist.” I agree the infinity exist. Do not again misinterpret my words. We have a deductive argument, that the universe is finite. If it is finite, it began to exist. If it began to exist ...

[1:09:18] Tzortzis: Okay. Let me ask prof. Krauss a question. Why is incest wrong?

[1:09:29] Krauss: It's not clear to me that is wrong. Listen to me ...Okay. The point is most societies had a ban on incest. And it's an empirical one. Generally incest produces genetic defects. Okay. And so in general there's a physical logical reason and a social one, why incest is wrong. Okay. But, if you ask me the question ... This is an interesting question. By the way, it's an ingrained incest taboo at almost all societies for that reason. Because societies want to prosper. So it works. But, if you ask me a priori, for example, the question, if a brother and a sister love each other and use contraception. Is there something absolutely morally wrong about that? I am, by the way, and it will ones and then went off, but it did not affect anything else. I have to think about it. Because I do not think, there is any absolute condemnation bad fact if they love each other, care for each other, and they go off, and it does not to affect anything else. Would I recommend it? No ...But wouldn't be willing to listen theirs arguments? If they are rational. Maybe.

[1:11:03] Tzortzis: Okay. Good. So, this is precisely the point what I wanted to make, prof. Krauss, is that, I find it quite interesting. How can a someone, adhering to atheistic position, were have strong moral judgments about religious tradition? Your moral judgments, at best, are relative and subjective.

#### **44 COMMENT**

**O**f course, Krauss's personal morality is relative and subjective, but it is worth paying attention to the more important thing. Atheism cannot have any objective grounds for ethics and morality. In an atheistic society, some morality is still preserved

simply by the “inertia” of culture, but in essence, atheists simply take morality from religions, that is, they plagiarize. If the universe arose by chance, if some impersonal hydrogen atoms accidentally organized into matter, which then accidentally transformed into complex forms of life, if a person also accidentally arose in the course of blind evolution, then there can be no question of any morality.

[1:11:22] Tzortzis: You see, if you look about moral theory, from the Islamic perspective or religious perspective, you see, that objective morals ...That your finest thing is saying, “You know, you are wrong, you are nonsense, Sharia law is back-way!” This is quite strong emotive things ...I think, we can afford from an objective sense if we have God as grounding of objective moral values. Because if this is not the case, then there is no enduring force that transcends above human subjectivity. Social pressure, you know, that doesn’t work ...You know, for example, Evolution in this sense provides extremely vague explanations. Think of philosopher of science Michael Ruse. He said, “You think, loving your neighbor as yourself is like overcoming egoism. But essentially it has no true meaning. Just conditions for survival and reproduction.” So, from this perspective, you do not have ontological grounding for objective moral truths. The best ... if we believe in moral realism. Which is: moral truths are just moral truths because they are ...The prophet Muhammad just is, Quran just is ...

## 45 COMMENT

### *Moral Values are Based on Metaphysics*

**Q**uite right! Moral values are based on metaphysics. They cannot be explained by impersonal evolution, either biological or social. If there is no God, if there is no posthumous reward for earthly affairs, then everything is allowed<sup>1</sup>, and there is no basis for ethics, morality, or human rights. Then whoever has the power and authority dictates his own rules and does what he wants. Nazi Germany is an example of this. They did everything there as Krauss would like, guided by logic and common sense, in accordance with the impersonal laws of social Darwinism. In this case, morality and religious commandments such as love for one's neighbor lose their ontological objectivity and are declared a social illusion. The metaphysical concept of truth is also taken out of the brackets. Instead, priority is given to the benefits of society, the state.

**H**owever, who will decide what the benefit is? A narrow circle of people in power always decides for the whole society. Naturally, they will present their interests as “public benefit”. The opinion of the

---

1. Comp., “There is no immortality of the soul, so there is no virtue, so everything is allowed” (Dostoevsky F.M. The Brothers Karamazov)/«Нет бессмертия души, так нет и добродетели, значит, всё позволено» (Достоевский Ф.М. Братья Карамазовы. Ч. 1. Кн. 2. Гл. 7//Полн. собр. соч. в 30 т.Л.: Наука. Т. 14. С. 76).

absolute majority will simply be ignored, and all talk about “democracy” will be just empty rhetoric.

Of course, in the past the tsars (and the ruling class in general) treated the people cruelly. However, there is a big difference. The tsars openly declared: “This is our will, we want it so.” Therefore, presumptuous kings and dictators were sometimes overthrown. The current rulers seem to have nothing to overthrow, they say, “We have nothing to do with it, and we have nothing to do with it ... To deprive you of some rights require public benefit and common sense.”

*Jurisprudence and Metaphysics*

*Foundations for Human Rights*

**A**theistic evolution knows only one law — whoever is stronger or more cunning gets the advantage. Jurisprudence in human societies from time immemorial has been based on other principles, on metaphysical concepts of truth and justice. Deeply religious Christians created the most important US government documents, such as the Declaration of Independence (1776), the Constitution (1787) and the Bill of Rights (1791), based on the biblical concept of man. During the years of struggle for independence, the American Congress repeatedly turned to God in the process of preparing statements and legislation. The commander of the American armies, George Washington, encouraged them to

pray often and set a personal example in this. The Declaration of Independence ends with the words of an appeal by the representatives of the Congress to the “Supreme Judge of the World” and “firm trust in the protection of Divine Providence”. After signing it, Samuel Adams summed up, “... We have this day restored the Sovereign to Whom alone all men ought to be obedient. He reigns in Heaven, and with a propitious eye beholds his subjects assuming that freedom of thought, and dignity of self-direction which He bestowed on them. From the rising to the setting sun, may His kingdom come.”<sup>1</sup> The sixth president of the United States, John Quincy Adams, said, “The highest glory of the American Revolution was this: it connected in one indissoluble bond the principles of civil government with the principles of Christianity.” The US Supreme Court has repeatedly declared roughly the same thing. For example, on February 29, 1892, the Supreme Court declared, “Our laws and our entire system must necessarily be based on the teachings of the Redeemer of humanity and embody them. It cannot be any other way; in this sense and to such an extent, our civilization and our system are definitely Christian ... it is a Christian nation.”

**The** Founding Fathers of the United States were all Christians and sought to create a new state based on

---

1. Speech given in Philadelphia (1776) day before signing of Declaration of Independence on the steps of Independence Hall.

Christian principles. Therefore, it was the biblical ideas about a person that were incorporated into the Constitution, which is noted in its Preamble. The fundamental idea behind the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights was the biblical notion that any person (unlike animals) has special, inalienable rights simply by virtue of the fact that he is a human being, a bearer of the image and likeness of God. Therefore, human rights (such as the right to life, freedom, property, etc.) are an inalienable gift of the Creator, and not privileges received from the government. It is only the government's job to uphold, protect, and defend these rights. In other words, all people have natural rights, are equal and free, and delegate to state power only the powers enshrined in the Constitution, and only to protect their rights and freedoms. This is a very important and powerful idea. Therefore, the US Constitution has become a model for the constitutions of many countries around the world.

**J**ust as calcium gives strength to bones (although not visible to the naked eye), the idea of inalienable human rights gave strength to the legal acts of the young US state. Although it was not explicitly prescribed every time, it was always implied. Similar ideas inspired lawmakers in other countries and not only in Christians.

What has changed with the emergence of atheism and the penetration of atheistic ideas into state structures? Of course, not everything collapsed overnight. There is certain “inertia” of culture and social paradigms. However, in our metaphor, “calcium began to gradually wash out of the bones, and they began to become fragile.” Preachers of Atheism, such as L. Krauss, K. Hitchens, R. Dawkins, J. Fresco and others (their name is Legion) began to say that one should not believe in the ancient inventions of humankind. Science allegedly proved (although it did not prove anything) that dust and dirt flying in space accidentally formed the planet Earth, on which complex life forms also accidentally arose, among which man is just one of the links in the evolutionary chain. Because of this, ontologically, a person is not fundamentally different from other links in the evolutionary chain, from animals, from the original dust and dirt. However, dust and dirt have no rights, and therefore a man too. Only the development of social institutions (also evolutionary) allegedly led to the emergence of certain concepts of rights and freedoms. These rights and freedoms are given to a citizen by the state, and it can take them away at any time.

This is the “common sense” of atheism. Social Darwinism follows directly from it: whoever has power has money, whoever has money has power,

and they write laws for everyone else. Of course, there were abuses of power and unjust laws before Atheism, but then it was obvious to everyone that this was a violation of the laws of God. Atheism, however, justifies any violation, because if there is no absolute metaphysical foundation, then everything becomes relative.

*What did not Know the Founding  
Fathers of the United States?*

**D**espite the fact that all the founding fathers of the United States were sincere Christians, they did not want to establish a state religion and declared complete freedom of religion. According to the first amendment to the Constitution, the government should not interfere in religious affairs, and no religion should interfere in the affairs of the state.

**N**ow it may seem rather strange that Christians want to isolate themselves from the Church. However, this paradox can be easily explained if we remember that shortly before the formation of the United States, the Jesuit republic in Paraguay (1610–1768) was destroyed. In many ways, it was an exemplary Christian state. However, the world that courageous and selfless missionaries-Jesuits built for 150 years was brutally destroyed by the troops of Spain and Portugal with the consent and connivance of the Catholic Church. Pope Clement XIV, who banned the Jesuit order in 1773, struck the final blow

to the mission. Just a few years after this tragedy, before the creation of the American Constitution (1787), memories of this were still fresh. In addition, the Thirty Years War in Europe (1618–1648), in which religious institutions were involved, was not forgotten. The founding fathers of the United States had all these terrible events in front of their eyes, and they feared that the Christian Church could greatly damage the Christian state (paradoxical as it may sound). Therefore, it was decided at the constitutional level to separate the state from the influence of any religious organization.

In addition, mainly Protestants formed the young US State, and the desire to protect the state from the influence of any church institutions was natural for them. Missionaries-Jesuits, on the contrary, regulated all public life by church rules. Also, note that in Paraguay, the ownership of private property for the Indians was not relevant, because they did not know how to handle it. For thousands of years, the Indians lived without private property and without any money. And the founding fathers of the United States, on the contrary, considered property rights to be the most important biblical good (Bill of Rights).

It is amazing what people who read the same Bible created different states! Based on one Holy Scripture, people form completely different (sometimes opposite) social models. The reason for

this is, of course, not the Bible, but many social and anthropological factors. First, these can be human passions or, on the contrary, virtues.

The founding fathers of the United States tried to exclude the influence of church institutions on the state, since they were Protestants and were well aware of negative cases of such influence. However, religion itself has nothing to do with it. Often, all the blame is the lust for power and wealth, which can operate even through church institutions. For example, in Paraguay, this is what killed the Jesuit republic.

Therefore, the founding fathers should have prohibited interference in the affairs of the state, not only of religious institutions, but in general of any, especially those related to finance. Unfortunately, this has not been done. Therefore, over time, large corporations, either explicitly or secretly, began to lobby for their interests in the government. For example, all the wars that the United States has fought over the past hundred years have been fought in the interests of big business.

In general, there has long been a tendency in the world in which national states, as subjects of world politics, experience a strong influence of corporate and supranational organizations. In the long term, this will lead to the fact that either somewhere the state will become an appendage of corporations, or somewhere the state itself will turn into a

corporation, leaving state structures with only insignificant social functions.

Therefore, policies are increasingly being pursued in the interests of financial corporations. The real struggle is between corporations for financial flows, and only talks and promises are made about improving the lives of ordinary people. Thus, modern democracy creates only the illusion of choice. Voters in any case are forced to vote for one of the proteges of big business. Moreover, no matter what candidate wins the elections, in reality the country is ruled by “big money”, that is, one of the oldest and strongest passions of humankind. The apostle Paul said, “The love of money is a root of all kinds of evil” (1Tim. 6:10). This root is so strong that it sprouts not only in religious institutions, but also everywhere. The founding fathers of the United States protected the state from the influence of church institutions, but the root of evil sprouted from the other side.

*“Autoimmune Diseases” of States*

*Class Struggle and Human Rights*

Since the late 30s of the XX century, tendencies of state regulation of the economy, encouraging demand, and subsidies to industry began to appear in many countries. After World War II, this policy continued, because the ruling class was tired of wars

and revolutions. He wanted to mitigate conflicts between employees and capital.

This led to the rapid growth (both quantitatively and qualitatively) of the highly skilled “working class”. In a broad sense, it includes all workers in non-managerial positions, that is, including engineers and other specialists, teachers, doctors, etc. At the same time, technologies were improved; wages and social benefits were increased. In a word, the standard of living was rising.

By the 1960s, a kind of social consensus had formed in the capitalist world between the unionized working class, big business and the state. Capital developed industry, trade unions defended the interests of employees, and the state monitored the implementation of laws. As a rule, utilities, transport, energy and much more were nationalized, as it was required to provide the population with cheap services. Large funds were invested in education and health care.

Nevertheless, this consensus proved to be fragile and short-lived. Large corporations began not only to lobby their interests in governments, but also to bring their people to power, which would pass laws in their interests. Gradually, capital gained control over law enforcement agencies, finance and the media. As a result, corporations began to implicitly dictate their will to governments. If you look closely at the essence of military conflicts over the past

70 years, it turns out that 99% of them were fought for the interests of big business. The media can talk about politics and national interests as much as they want, but this is all paid propaganda. The main thing in these wars is the income of private capital.

The immune system sometimes fails and begins to fight with the body itself. These conditions are called autoimmune diseases. Something similar can happen in the “organism” of the state. The laws and the police are supposedly designed to protect society (the majority of citizens) from any harm, the army — to protect from external threats. Metaphorically, one can speak of an “autoimmune disease” of the state, when the laws, the police, and even the army act in the interests of a small number of oligarchs, by force suppressing the protests of the absolute majority of citizens. This is exactly what happened in many countries in the last quarter of the 20th century.

The profits of the largest corporations were often paid for by massive unemployment and unprecedented social polarization. A small percentage of the wealthy grew rich quickly while everyone else became impoverished. Whole states have become servants of bankers and oligarchs at the cost of cuts in social spending, tax hikes, and incurring debt at the expense of future generations. Moreover, the impoverishment of the working class was not “collateral damage”, but a purposeful policy.

The fact is that well-educated, skilled, and financially secure workers very bravely and competently defend their rights. They pose a far greater threat to the oligarchs than the desperate poor, who only occasionally rise to radical but often useless riots. The poor thing can be quickly soothed with small handouts, and then “tighten the screws” again. Skilled workers who know their own worth will have to be broken for a long time or pay them significant sums.

Here are three examples of the above.

### 1. *Chile under Pinochet*

**I**n September 1973, in Santiago, the capital of the democratic socialist state of Chile, there was a bloody military coup by General Augusto Pinochet, who overthrew the legitimate president, Salvador Allende. The terror of the new authorities against the population began. There were street fights and shootings in the streets without trial or investigation. In the first month after the putsch, at least 30 thousand citizens were killed, and more than 12 thousand were killed or died under torture later. The national stadium in Santiago, with a capacity of 80,000 people, was turned into a concentration camp. Entire neighborhoods were fired upon from machine guns, regardless of the political views of their inhabitants. Nazi war criminals fleeing from justice gathered in Chile. They have served as

counselors, experts, and sometimes as concentration camp managers. General Gustavo Lee Guzman frankly told West German journalists that the junta takes its example not from the Latin American conservatives, but from the European fascists of the 30s<sup>1</sup>. However, there is still one difference. German Nazis pursued a policy of genocide of other peoples in their favor. Pinochet committed terror and genocide within his country.

**W**hat was the real reason for this war? American companies were doing business in Chile, and the socialist president Salvador Allende decided to nationalize them. Of course, he offered to pay compensation, but this was not enough for them, they wanted to return the enterprises to themselves in full. In the United States, they could not come to terms with the revolution in Cuba, and then another Latin American country took a course towards independence. Pinochet's coup d'état was carried out with the support of the CIA and was carefully planned.

**A** group of children of the Chilean elite studied economics in graduate school at the University of Chicago. There they were inspired to the depths of their wallets by the ideas of economic reforms of the future Nobel laureate Milton Friedman. Within a year after Pinochet's coup, they all took control positions in the economic departments of the

1. Stern magazine, 1973, № 42.

military junta. The country announced “shock therapy”, carried out total privatization, and abolished trade unions, state pensions and medicine. It is interesting that it was the people who were in power who became the owners of the privatized assets. The rest got a donut hole. In less than 10 years, Chile’s economy collapsed. Unemployment alone has grown 10 times compared to the Allende era. After 15 years, more than 40% of the population lived below the poverty line, and a third were simply in a desperate situation. The oligarchic economy under Pinochet was focused on the export of natural resources or low-value products. The military “economic miracle” at the instigation of the Chicago School of Economics made a few rich people even richer, and the rest plunged into hopeless poverty. The “middle class” was eliminated, a third of the population lost their jobs, and a quarter received the status of a homeless person.

Pinochet called himself a supporter of democracy, but added, “Sometimes democracy must be bathed in blood ... Not a leaf moves in this country if I’m not moving it.” This is what he did. Tens of thousands of people have died or gone missing. The bodies of those killed were often thrown into the sea to be eaten by sharks or dumped into the craters of volcanoes. Nevertheless, the US, of course, never accused Pinochet of violating human rights. On the contrary, they helped him a lot both before and after

the coup, while denying any connection with the putschists.

## 2. *Russia in Modern Times*

**I**n the new Russia, there were no mass shootings and concentration camps, as in Chile. However, in the 1990s, the slogan was launched: “We need a Russian Pinochet!” In addition, this is not surprising, because the scheme of reforms in Russia was almost the same as under Pinochet. It is called “neoliberalism” for short.

Just like in Chile (and at the same time of the Chilean experiment), a team of reformers was trained abroad. Only this time not at the University of Chicago, but at the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis specially created for this (IIASA)<sup>1</sup> in Laxenburg near Vienna.

In the same way as in Chile, “shock therapy” was declared and the mass privatization of the most profitable enterprises was carried out. The reformers declared that the “invisible hand of the market” had to be allowed to roam, and then all problems would be solved by itself! As a result, many people were left without money and on the street, their purchasing power plummeted. The economy was

---

**1.** International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA). It was created in 1972 in Laxenburg, near Vienna, as the ideological headquarters for the collapse of the USSR. In 1991 Shokhin, Aven, Kagalovsky, Ulyukaev, Chubais, Mashits and Glazyev went there for training.

completely reoriented towards the export of natural resources or products of low value added abroad.

In addition, of course, the main goal was achieved: the names of Russian oligarchs firmly established themselves in the top lines of the lists of Forbes magazine. True, millions of people began to drag out a miserable beggarly existence. However, who cares? In 1995, V.P. Polevanov told how the reformers treated the people, “Why are you worried about these people? Well, thirty million will die out. They did not fit into the market. Don’t think about it — new ones will grow”<sup>2</sup>.

That was the kind of war going on. Economic weapons can be as destructive as artillery and bombs. During the years of reforms, Russia’s human and material losses exceeded those in World War II. Only then, an external enemy, and now its own government destroyed the country. Moreover, we are told that we should not even pay attention to it. The whole fault of the affected people is that “they did not fit into the market”. Just think about it! However, why are people forced to live by the rules

---

2. V.P. Polevanov stayed as chairman of the State Property Committee for only 70 days due to the fact that he tried to stop the plunder of state property and refused the services of 35 American advisers sent in 1992 to the State Property Committee from Harvard University to help A. Chubais. He managed to temporarily slow down the American predatory privatization program in Russia. Therefore, US Secretary of State Warren Christopher summoned his assistant in Russia, Andrei Kozyrev (who then served as Russian Foreign Minister), and demanded that Polevanov be removed from office.

of a market economy? In fact, it is not an absolute value.

3. *War with the Miners in Britain*  
1984–1985, “Thatcherism”

**B**y 1984, thanks to the development of new technologies, Britain no longer needed as much coal and as many coal workers as before. Many enterprises received state subsidies, and 20 state-owned mines decided to close altogether. To begin with, it was announced a one-time reduction of 20 thousand jobs. This is approximately 10% of the total employed in the industry. In addition, together with their families, the number of people dependent on the coal industry was at least half a million. The National Union of Miners has announced a nationwide miners’ strike since April 4. In the summer, workers in transport and metallurgy joined them. The strike swept across Scotland, Wales, and Kent, lasted about a year and affected many sectors of the economy. About 150 thousand people attended it. Not only mines were closed, but also shipbuilding and steel works.

Subsequently, this major strike was called “civil war without weapons”. Indeed, the government assessed this conflict with workers precisely as a war and prepared for it in advance. Treasury Secretary Nigel Lawson said openly that the government was preparing to fight the miners in the same way as it

once was preparing to “repel the invasion of Hitler in the late 1930s”. Laws were passed in advance that ensured the legitimacy of the repression. The rallies were brutally suppressed by the police and thousands of workers were “lawfully” arrested. They even planned to involve an army, but it did not come to that.

British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher pursued an economic policy in the interests of large monopolies; a policy tested in Chile by her other dictator Pinochet. The general principles of this policy are well known: the privatization of state enterprises, utilities, transport and medicine, the rise in prices for services for the population, tax cuts for large companies, cuts in social benefits, massive unemployment. Thatcher eliminated high-wage jobs in the manufacturing sector and replaced them with low-wage jobs in the service sector. In addition, large companies have located their production in East Asia, where labor is much cheaper.

As a result, North East England was transformed from an industrial center into the poorest region, and unemployment reached levels higher than during the Great Depression. Tens of thousands of families were dramatically impoverished, but the rich quickly became rich even more. As they said then, one death is a tragedy, and the destruction of tens of thousands of jobs is statistics.

A year later, the National Union of Miners was forced to retreat. True, the miners still achieved some concessions. The government paid compensation to the laid-off workers. Yet, South Wales has not recovered from the social devastation after the mine closure many years later.

*The Problem of Overpopulation of the Planet*

The history knows a great many examples similar to the above. Something similar has happened and is happening in different countries. Governments in the interests of large financial corporations (national or international) are waging a real war against their own citizens, a war in the literal sense, without metaphors and allegories. The laws, the police, and the army are on their side. The most cannibalistic laws can be written and many people can be “legally” condemned just for the fact that they fought for life. Elections are not an instrument of checks and balances. Mark Twain noticed this a long time ago: “If anything depended on the elections, we would not be allowed to participate in them.”

It would be naive to believe that the examples given will become a thing of the past, and everything will end there. On the contrary, everything is just beginning. One way or another, it will affect everyone. The “invisible hand of the market” turned out to be a very convenient tool with the help of which those in power can relieve themselves of

personal responsibility and keep in economic slavery not individual classes and social classes of people, but entire peoples, countries and even the whole world.

The story of British miners is a miniature example of global problems. Technology is advancing rapidly. Entire industries are becoming outdated. Moreover, in those industries that are still in demand, robots controlled by artificial intelligence and other equipment are replacing many people. Therefore, governments together with financial corporations are faced with the problem of “extra” people.

Figuratively speaking, one modern technology replaces millions of hands. Moreover, the technique does not require daily nutrition, health insurance and many other things. Over the past centuries, the exploiters have learned to successfully keep hundreds of millions of people in slavery (physical or economic). They could continue to do this without difficulty, but they simply do not need so many hands. Of course, it is possible to pay benefits to all unemployed people and even to pay an unconditional basic income to everyone. However, all these people will have low purchasing power, that is, they will not be able to “squeeze” any profit. In addition, there is a possibility that they will begin to fight for some rights and create problems for those in power.

In the atheistic paradigm of thinking, man is considered just one of the animal species. Therefore, cold calculating “common sense” prompts atheists “the right decision”: if the size of the population has increased excessively and creates problems, then it must simply be reduced. The desired number of people on the planet has already been named: one billion or even half a billion<sup>1</sup>. This means that 9 out of 10 people living today should disappear. Maybe not as fast as in a war, but the sooner the better. Pseudo-independent media and various kinds of paid experts in every way explain what terrible danger overpopulation poses, and that in order to save civilization it is necessary to drastically reduce the birth rate, and even those who are now living do not really linger in this world. In other words, people are offered to voluntarily and with songs “self-abridge”, that is, in fact, to wage war against themselves and their descendants. Moreover, for those who do not want to voluntarily, there are many “civilized” methods of coercion. For example, in the countries of Latin America, Africa, India, because of vaccination, millions of people became infertile.

---

1. One modern monument, called the Georgia Tablets, has the new 10 Commandments to Humanity written on it. One of them says that the population of the Earth should not exceed half a billion people. Look: <http://www.sun-expo.ru/skrizhali-dzhordzhii-desyat-zapovedey-novogo-mirovogo-poryadka>

Yes, humanity has fought wars throughout its history. However, no matter how they tried to justify the war by the need to destroy enemies, war has always been considered evil. Now the situation is fundamentally different. There are essentially no enemies. They plan to destroy people simply because they are “superfluous”.

As an example, we will cite A.B. Chubais’s Presentation at the opening of the IV International Forum on Nanotechnology in 2011: “... On the backswing, according to the today’s discussion, we decided for themselves what to say seriously, in a big, on a large scale, capturing a truly global scale. Coming from such a global scale, not just a country scale, but a global scale, it seems right to us to try to understand where this very demand for innovation can come from ...

What can and should be expected in the 21st century already? This cannot be simply because physical limits exist for all types of resources on our planet Earth. This means that the scenario of continued growth is excluded. Such a scenario, in the same dynamics that has developed and are known to us (in this dynamics we have spent our whole life), this dynamics no longer exists, and cannot be. Moreover, it is well known that there is a very serious and very influential group of scientists who sees the picture much more pessimistic, or rather, almost catastrophically. These people say

that we are facing not only stagnation, but we are facing a qualitatively new situation with a radical change in trend from an upward movement to a downward movement. Moreover, these are very serious people, they are not at all marginalized. In fact, I am talking about a well-known group of experts who, in the 70s of the last century, created the Club of Rome (Aurelio Peccei<sup>1</sup>, Denise Meadows). This is a team of people who continue to work further, and they, with serious calculations and with their arguments, say that the only scenario that we face is a scenario close to a catastrophic one. Well, imagine, the curve here is so arbitrary, but, in fact, we are talking about the fact that the population of the Globe, from the very seven billion (which will be reached this week), by the end of the century should decrease to two and a half, two or even one and a half billion people. This is a three-to-fourfold decline in numbers; this is a trend that neither humanity nor the Earth has ever experienced in their history. Such a scenario is catastrophic, with consequences, the scale of which is still little understood.

To be honest, it seems to me that regardless of whether you are a supporter of such an approach or an opponent, but it is clear that we must all do our best to prevent this from happening. There are

---

1. Aurelio Peccei is an Italian industrialist who founded the Club of Rome.

children, there are grandchildren. One hundred years is not a thousand years, it is a quite foreseeable period of time. Moreover, it would be simply unthinkable to create a trend with a threefold decline in the population. Although this is exactly thing serious scientists are talking about. In our understanding, this trend is unacceptable!

Nevertheless, if this is so, then what actually remains? Even just at the level of common sense, and not big analytics? It is obvious that there is only one trend left. This is a trend of balanced, sustainable development ...

In fact, the preservation of the existence of humankind is possible only with a radical change, in the existing technological order. It is possible only if the new materials and the new technosphere are radically less material-intensive, radically more energy efficient, and if the new medicine is able to solve the problem of maintaining human life for the same duration, and even extending human life. However, in each case one has to use the word “new”. And in this sense, it seems to me that our country should also respond to the scale of such a challenge ...”<sup>2</sup>

---

2. Anatoly Chubais, chairman of the board of RUSNANO. “Global Challenges and the Russian Search for Answers”. Presentation at the opening of the IV International Forum on Nanotechnology (Rusnanotech 2011). Moscow, October 26, 2011 Look video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Is6drzhxIK8>  
<https://www.rusnano.com/about/press-centre/first-person/76230>

This presentation illustrates the problem pretty well and shows where the “wind is blowing” from. At the very beginning, A. Chubais declares that it will be about problems on the scale of not one country, but the whole planet. Then he shows graphs of what is happening on the globe as a whole with the production of metals, with the development of industry, with the consumption of energy and with the population. All of these charts are very similar and show a sharp increase in the second half of the 20th century. Presentation slides look very impressive and create a “scientific” environment. However, in fact, all this is a dishonest game and outright cheating.

Imagine that some doctor starts talking about health problems on a planetary scale and begins to show graphs with the temperature of patients averaged over hospitals around the world, and to make an “average” diagnosis for all patients who are there and offer pills for the treatment of the “average” Diseases of all humanity. In any audience he would, of course, be ridiculed. However, A. Chubais, oddly enough, everyone listened with serious faces. Maybe all the talk about resources is a “smoke screen” to hide the true motives, which are unsightly.

The cunning lies in the fact that the graphs supposedly reflect the situation around the world.

https://www.slideshare.net/nanojournal/rusnano-tech2011-9884824

Nevertheless, making such averaging is just as incorrect as calculating the average temperature for hospitals around the world. Only a relatively small number of countries dramatically increased their energy consumption and industrial production in the second half of the 20th century. On the contrary, in many regions of Southeast Asia, Africa, Latin America, there is no industrial growth. In addition, people live there in the same way as they did a hundred and two hundred and three hundred years ago, obtaining food for themselves with primitive tools and building dwellings from scrap materials. They do not extract or consume any non-renewable resources.

Fertility trends are also very different. In the so-called “developed” countries, with a high level of income among the population, the birth rate is falling. If a hundred years ago in Europe it was the norm to have 5–6 children, now in most families there is one child, and even childlessness is advertised and encouraged everywhere. In Russia, after the collapse of the USSR, the indigenous population began to decline, that is, to die out. However, the reason for this is not a selfish desire to live for oneself, as in rich countries, but on the contrary, in mass impoverishment, in uncertainty about the future. Many are afraid that they will not be able to provide a decent life for their children. Moreover, somewhere in Bangladesh, Yemen or in

African countries, despite the terrible poverty, the birth rate, on the contrary, is traditionally high. Obviously, they live in very different ways, “our brothers in mind”. For example, in Russia and Germany, indigenous populations are dying out, and governments are encouraging the arrival of migrants from Asia. In the United States, the birth rate fell sharply in the second half of the 20th century. In 1960, the average American family had about four children, and in 2017, there are already fewer than two children. This is not enough for simple population reproduction. Thus, in a number of large regions of the world, people are gradually dying out. Moreover, this needs to be talked about.

The real problem of overpopulation concerns mainly the countries of Southeast Asia. Therefore, there it should be solved first. Therefore, it is completely incorrect to talk about the situation on the entire planet in general. We only need to talk about specific countries and regions.

However “a very serious and very influential group of scientists”, to which A. Chubais refers, undertakes to decide at once for the whole world. Who are these people? These are members of the Club of Rome, famous for having developed a plan for the collapse of the USSR, having staged the greatest humanitarian catastrophe of the second half of the

20th century on 1/6 of the land<sup>1</sup>. This seemed to them not enough, and now a humanitarian catastrophe is being started for the entire planet. By the way, A. Chubais had the opportunity to know them personally, because in 1991 he was on an internship at the institute IIASA<sup>2</sup>, one of the founders of which is the Club of Rome. They talked about a 3–4-fold reduction in the population in 2011, now their appetites are growing, and more and more often the final goal is a reduction to 500 million, that is, 10–15 times!

From the Presentation, it is completely incomprehensible how nanotechnology, “new materials, and a new technosphere” will radically change the mentioned catastrophic trends? For example, it is very good that OJSC RUSNANO has invented basalt plastic, which makes it possible to replace classical steel reinforcement with basalt fiber reinforcement, as well as new lithium-ion batteries for electric vehicles. Nevertheless, over the past 10 years, neither one nor the other has become massively applied even in Russia, not to mention the whole world. In fact, nothing has changed over a long period. This means that the formulation of the

---

1. More about this look in the book: M. Poltoranin. *Power in TNT equivalent. The legacy of Tsar Boris*. And in his interview “June 12 for Russia is not just a ‘rainy day’ ...” <https://www.business-gazeta.ru/article/313611>

2. International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis. It was created in 1972 in Laxenburg, near Vienna.

problem and the ways of its solution are set completely incorrectly.

Of course, new technologies can drastically reduce the consumption of traditional resources, greatly reducing the anthropogenic factor and pressure on ecological systems. However, first of all, it is necessary to designate a certain “coordinate system”, a system of priorities. What is the highest value nature or man? In the ideology promoted by the members of the Club of Rome, B. Gates, A. Chubais, all kinds of “eco-activists” and the like, nature has the highest value, and man is secondary. Thus, the Earth’s population is viewed as a harmful and even dangerous factor, the impact of which on nature must be reduced. This is where programs emerge, the purpose of which is to reduce anthropogenic pressure, and, frankly, to eliminate the “excess” number of people.

Ultimately, the “problem of overpopulation” is closely related to the “problem of God”. This is why we mention it in the context of the debate about atheism and religion. The essence of the problem is as follows: if there is no God, then there is no man as a person, but there is only impersonal “humanity”. The ideology of atheism first says that it is necessary to take care of the material (animal) well-being of the “masses”, “classes”, “collectives”, etc. Thus, a simple serial number replaces a living unique personality, and a person becomes only a cog in a

huge machine. In addition, at the second step, humanity is declared less significant than nature. All this is terrible. It is worth thinking about it before it is too late.

### *Possible Solutions to the Problem of Overpopulation*

#### *Population Density*

Since serious scientists from the Club of Rome undertook to draw global trends, it would be nice to start by calculating the average population density on a global scale. To do this, you just need to divide the surface area by the number of people. Depending on the implied surface area, the following values are obtained:

15 people per square kilometer (the area of all continents and the world's oceans is 510,072,000 km<sup>2</sup>);

51 persons per km<sup>2</sup> (land area only, including islands and Antarctica 150,461,685 km<sup>2</sup>);

57 people per km<sup>2</sup> (the area of land and sea territories of all states is 136,120,354 km<sup>2</sup>).

However, in many countries the population density is 20–370 times higher! For example, Bangladesh 1251, Bermuda 1275, Maldives 1359, Malta 1432, Bahrain 1753, Vatican 1914, Gibraltar 4290, Hong Kong 6480, Singapore 7389, Monaco 18679 people per square kilometer. In addition, in large cities the density is almost a thousand times higher! For example, Dhaka has 44.5 thousand

people per km<sup>2</sup>, while in Moscow, in the most densely populated area of Pechatniki, 43 thousand people per km<sup>2</sup> live.

Therefore, if humanity increases even 100 times, up to a trillion, it will still be able to accommodate on the planet no more densely than people now live in many areas. However, this is unlikely to ever happen. Therefore, there is no reason to panic.

Yes, such places as Antarctica, high rocky mountains, volcanoes, hot deserts, areas of the oceans where strong waves often occur, etc. are practically unsuitable for human life. But among them there are not so many extreme places, and the concept for life” is rather relative. British scientist Stephen Hawking, whom everyone cites, called for the colonization of other planets (primarily the Moon and Mars). However, obviously he did not understand what he was talking about. Simply by definition, colonization is a mass invasion, and a flight to other planets will always be the lot of only a few. Moreover, why go there? On Earth, even the most “unsuitable for life” places have much better conditions than any other planet. Other space objects will always have a big problem of protection from radiation and the problem of obtaining a sufficient amount of water in the liquid phase. In addition, there is no need to fly so far to any part of the Earth and large loads can be delivered relatively easily. Along the way, we note that the colonization

of other planets is not a plan to save humanity, but only a small number of the “chosen ones” who have developed paranoia, and they want to create a refuge for themselves at the expense of taxpayers in case of a global catastrophe. Nevertheless, in the Arctic and Antarctic, for example, even with global warming, it will not get hot, and no viruses spread there. In addition, in underground cities, you can wait out the nuclear winter and any other catastrophe. Moreover, such cities have already been built during the Cold War. So colonizing other planets is a dead end and a waste of resources from any point of view. But if modern civilization undertakes to set even such daring goals, then all the more it is capable of solving simpler problems of arranging life almost anywhere on Earth.

### *About Resources*

“Physical limits exist for all types of resources on our planet Earth,” says A. Chubais, referring to the protocols of the Roman sages. In theory this is so, but in practice, no catastrophe due to lack of resources threatens humanity. Here, too, “the integrals must be taken in parts”, that is, to consider separately renewable and non-renewable resources.

With renewable resources, everything is pretty simple and straightforward. With a careful (and not predatory) attitude to nature, she is able to

reproduce again everything that a person took from her. In addition, there are still many undiscovered sources. For example, there are many resources hidden in the oceans. Until now, people have been fishing only at shallow depths. However, in the so-called “twilight zone”, deeper than 100 meters, you can get a huge amount of food.

The situation with non-renewable resources is a little more complicated, but also far from catastrophic. For example, in the 1970s, experts predicted that in a few decades, oil and gas reserves would be completely depleted. The United States even imposed a strict ban on the export of its hydrocarbons, importing them at a rather high price. Later, more and more oil and gas deposits on the planet began to be found, and the demand for them is becoming less and less. For example, soon, almost all transport will be switched to electric motors, and household electricity will be mainly generated by “green” technologies. So now, the US is trying to catch up and is waging trade wars to sell its hydrocarbons at a fraction of the cost. Nevertheless, even if coal, oil and gas were really completely consumed all over the world, this would lead to some local inconvenience, but not to a global catastrophe. After all, people have lived without hydrocarbons for thousands of years.

The situation is similar with other resources. Other materials, for example, are increasingly replacing

metals. A. Chubais gave a good example of replacing steel reinforcement with basalt fiber reinforcement. Well, if something is really missing, it will only mean that some part of the people will live, perhaps, less comfortable. However, this is not a catastrophe, because people did without these materials before, and even now, many people use only renewable resources.

### *Development of New Territories*

**I**f you look at the population density map, it is easy to see that there are only a few really overpopulated places. Overpopulation is mainly caused by urbanization, the concentration of people in large cities. Huge territories, even with good conditions, are still not inhabited at all.

**M**oreover, about a third of the land is occupied by deserts: Antarctic, Arctic, Sahara, Arabian, Gobi desert, and others. The Sahara Desert alone is only slightly smaller than the United States. Despite the harsh conditions, a small number of indigenous peoples inhabit the Sahara and other hot deserts. In many deserts, there are traces of dried up rivers and lakes, and at a depth, there are still large reserves of water<sup>1</sup>.

**M**odern technology could help transform many areas of desert into habitable places. China set a

---

**1.** There are vast horizons of groundwater in the Sahara, and in the Taklamakan Desert in western China, there is just a huge underground storage of water of excellent quality.

good example by building a well-maintained highway about 500 km long through the Taklamakan Desert<sup>1</sup>. The original goal was purely utilitarian — to link the oil-producing provinces with the interior of China. However, along the way, it had to solve the problem of transforming the desert, because in local conditions, sand can fill any route in a couple of months. Therefore, the Chinese planted strips of several types of trees, shrubs, and grasses along the road. The width of the strips is more than 70 meters in each direction. To irrigate them, artesian wells were drilled every 4–5 km and a pipeline was laid. Every 10 km, there are small cabins in which drivers can rest and hide from sandstorms. Comfortable refueling and hotel complexes were built every 100 km. This example clearly shows that, if desired, even the “Sea of Death” can be turned into an oasis of life, into a green garden, quite suitable for life.

Even without the help of modern technology, people have lived for centuries in very harsh conditions and hot deserts, and rocky mountains, and the cold Far North. Then there are the so-called “non-contact” tribes, which consider meeting a white man the biggest disaster for themselves and therefore shower any missionary with arrows. For example, there are tribes in the Amazon jungle or the Indian Sentinele tribe. They live in complete self-isolation and harmony with nature, and the

1. The Taklamakan desert is called the “Sea of Death”.

resources for them will never run out, since all their resources are renewable. Moreover, these people do not feel at all deprived of fate, although they do not use electricity, mobile communications, and bankcards.

### *Life on Water*

**I**t would be more correct to call our planet not the Earth, but the Ocean, since about 71% of its surface is covered with water. It contains incommensurably more water than any other planet of the terrestrial group. By the way, this fact hints at the anthropic principle, it cannot be explained from the point of view of atheistic cosmology.

**C**an humans live on the surface of water? It turns out that they can and have been living for a long time. For example, in the Nile basin, there is the Sudd swamp, which even in drought has an area of 30 thousand square kilometers, and in the rainy season, it quadruples, reaching the size of Great Britain. In the very center of this huge swamp, a tribe of Nilots has lived for thousands of years. Nobody told them the research results of great scientists from the Club of Rome, and therefore they live in peace, without fear of any disasters and depletion of resources. They know about our civilization, but they are in no hurry to join it. If missionaries ask them, “How can we help you?” They will answer, “You just do not bother us, and

thus you will help us.” They somehow underestimate the capabilities of artificial intelligence and nanotechnology. Maybe we should learn something from them. Nevertheless, so far this huge region has hardly been explored.

However, almost everything is known about floating villages in Cambodia<sup>1</sup>. In those places, the tradition of life on the water has existed for thousands of years, but in large numbers people settled on Tonle Sap Lake in the middle of the 20th century. When war broke out in neighboring Vietnam, many Vietnamese fled to Cambodia. According to local laws, only those who were born here could live on earth. However, the laws said nothing about the water surface, and the refugees settled on the lake. This largest reservoir of Indochina, very rich in fish, is also called the Cambodian Sea. Its size changes from 2,700 km<sup>2</sup> during the dry season (winter) to 16,000 km<sup>2</sup> during the rainy season (summer).

The third generation of Vietnamese has grown up on the lake. Since they live without documents and citizenship, and no one has conducted the census, their exact number is unknown. It is estimated that

---

1. A visit to the floating village on Lake Tonle Sap is part of the excursion tours, because in any case, tourists go past those places to the Angkor temple complex, the main tourist center of Cambodia. Many tourists are interested in seeing the “Cambodian Venice”, or rather, how a person adapts to life circumstances. By the way, the tourism business belongs to the Chinese, and the villagers get from tourists at best only alms from hand to hand.

about one hundred thousand people live in floating villages. This is almost three times more than in the densely populated state of Monaco.

The Vietnamese use the simplest cheap materials to build houses, and even floating vegetable gardens and mini-farms. They not only catch fish, but also breed it on their own water farms. They also breed clams, ducks, chickens, and even crocodiles. After the water drops, many grow rice in the fertile muddy soil of the surrounding area. The Vietnamese sell their products in the market and buy manufactured goods. Each house has autonomous electricity, TV, and cellular communication. The villages have floating shops, schools, hospitals, workshops, sports fields, and churches (Catholic or Buddhist).

Despite the fact that the authorities have long allowed all Vietnamese to live on the coast, they are in no hurry to leave their floating villages. They quite enjoy living on the lake. Here they have complete freedom, they are confident in the future, breathe clean air, eat environmentally friendly products, do not waste time in traffic jams, do not fill out tax returns, are not interested in the exchange rate and the price of oil. No one will come to vaccinate them or put chips against their will. Even if life is not rich, no one is starving, and parents are calm for their children. There is no crime, drug mafia and other troubles of civilized countries.

Similar villages<sup>1</sup>, built on piles or pontoons, there are in different parts of the world. There are especially many of them in Asia (China, Vietnam, Thailand, Cambodia, Burma), as well as in Africa (Benin) and South America (Peru and Bolivia). People there live off renewable resources, and with respect for nature, these resources will never be exhausted.

### *Colonization of Seas and Oceans*

The villages mentioned above were built in an artisanal way from the simplest materials at hand, like thousands of years ago. Therefore, people settled only on the lakes. Nevertheless, with the help of modern science and technology, incomparably more advanced floating colonies on water can be built, which will allow colonizing seas and oceans. Such villages are already appearing in the Pacific Ocean. For example, Singapore-based startup Blue Frontiers will build a floating village for 300 residents off the coast of French Polynesia. In the future, the developers plan to build entire floating cities in neutral waters<sup>2</sup>.

A colossal amount of money is spent from the budget of developed countries on an arms race and various useless projects such as the unrealizable

---

1. In terms of population, some of these villages outnumber cities.

2. <https://agriculture.by/news/mirovye-novo-sti/plavuchie-derevni-pojavjatsja-vtihom-okeane>

colonization of the Moon and Mars. If governments spent at least part of this money not for destruction, but for the creation of life, it would be possible to create comfortable floating cities in the seas and oceans, turn deserts into places suitable for life, and at the same time employ many people.

### *Floating States*

**S**ome floating colonies in terms of population are already larger than small states (such as the Vatican, Monaco). If large floating colonies were built in neutral waters, they could be declared sovereign states. There are enough precedents in history. Only if earlier the colonialists mastered new territories, and then declared them independent states, now it is possible to create the territory itself from scratch by building a floating island.

Such states could fully provide themselves with food, carry out the extraction and processing of seafood and minerals from the bottom, and trade all this with other countries.

Many corporations have the technical capabilities and means for this. And not just corporations. There are 2208 billionaires in the world now. Each of them will have enough funds to create their own state.

*No Problem for a Thousand Years*

**A**s shown above, the planet has a large reserve of resources, and even a hundredfold increase in population will not lead to a global catastrophe. If you pursue a policy of restraining the birth rate where it is too high, then for the next thousand years you can completely forget about the problem of overpopulation. Why then do highly influential people from Rome and other clubs continue to scare people with disastrous scenarios? Probably, the real reason for this is still different, but it is very inconvenient to say about it directly and therefore it is hidden behind the “smokescreen” of the problem of overpopulation. Mahatma Gandhi said that the Earth has the ability to satisfy the needs of every person, but there is no means to satisfy greed, because it is unlimited. It is worth noting that not only greed is limitless, but any passion in general. German philosopher Immanuel Kant wrote, “Give a person everything that he desires, and at the same moment he will feel that this ‘everything’ is not everything.”

**M**uch has been written about the passion of acquisitiveness and the influence of big money on politics. Nevertheless, here are a few typical quotes from US presidents:

“The money power preys on the nation in times of peace, and conspires against it in times of adversity.

It is more despotic than monarchy, more insolent than autocracy, more selfish than bureaucracy. It denounces, as public enemies, all who question its methods or throw light upon its crimes,” Abraham Lincoln (assassinated on April 14, 1865, 41 days after this speech);

“Whoever controls the volume of money in our country is absolute master of all industry and commerce ... when you realize that the entire system is very easily controlled, one way or another, by a few powerful men at the top, you will not have to be told how periods of inflation and depression originate,” James A. Garfield (died as a result of an assassination attempt on July 2, 1881, 2 weeks after this statement);

“Concept privacy contradicts free and open society. We, by the nature and historically, the people resisting to confidential societies, secret orders and the closed meetings. Worldwide we are resisted by monolithic, ruthless plot which expands with secret means the sphere of influence, filtering into the place of invasion, overthrowing the power instead of the choice and intimidating instead of freedom. And this system, having mobilized many material and human resources, constructed strong, highly effective car which carries out military, diplomatic, prospecting, economic, scientific and political operations. Their preparation keeps unknown to public, their mistakes disappear, but

are not disclosed. It silently comes. Without reckoning with expenses and rumors, without disclosing secrets. Therefore in ancient Athens there was a law which forbade citizens to avoid public dispute. I ask for your help in an important issue informing and preventions of the people of America. It is sure that with your help, people will become such by what they are given birth — free and independent,” John F. Kennedy (assassinated in Dallas on November 22, 1963, a few days after this speech).

Therefore, the reduction of natural resources is only a minor detail of a broader problem — the problem of dislike and passions in human society. Thomas Malthus wrote, “Those who were born after the division of property would come into a world already possessed. If their parents, from having too large a family, could not give them sufficient for their support, what are they to do in a world where everything is appropriated? We have seen the fatal effects that would result to a society, if every man had a valid claim to an equal share of the produce of the Earth.”<sup>1</sup> In disease, exhausting labor, hunger, and wars, he saw a natural means of exterminating the “extra” population. For example, T. Malthus wrote, “We must be consistent and contribute to the actions of nature that cause mortality; and if we are

---

1. Thomas Robert Malthus (1766–1834). *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. London, 1798.

afraid of too frequent repetitions of hunger in its terrible forms, then we must diligently encourage other destructive forces of nature, which we ourselves bring to life. Instead of preaching cleanliness to the poor, we should encourage just the opposite. It is necessary to make narrower streets in cities, overpopulate houses, and facilitate a recurrence of the plague epidemic. It is necessary to build villages near stagnant water bodies and especially to promote the settlement of marshy and unhealthy places. But first of all, we should condemn the use of special medicines for the treatment of deadly diseases, as well as condemn those kind but deluded people who, by inventing ways to eradicate certain evils, think that they are rendering a service to humanity.” In general, Malthus, back in 1798, sowed the seeds of social Darwinism, racism, and eugenics.

Adolf Hitler was carried away by the ideas of Malthus and Darwin. In 1929, he said at the Nazi Party Conference in Nuremberg, “That an average annual removal of 700,000–800,000 of the weakest of a million babies meant an increase in the power of the nation and not a weakening”. The Fuehrer’s office developed a euthanasia program codenamed “T 4”<sup>2</sup>. Since August 18, 1939, midwives in maternity

---

2. The Imperial Committee carried out the euthanasia program for the Scientific Research of Hereditary and Acquired Diseases. The address of this committee was Berlin, Tiergartenstrasse 4.

hospitals were required to report the birth of crippled children. Later, the mandatory registration age was raised to 17 years. Until 1945, about 100 thousand children were registered, of which about 8 thousand were killed. In October 1939, euthanasia was extended to adults, and more than 70,000 Germans were killed in just a year. During the war, there were rumors that seriously wounded German soldiers were being euthanized, and that pensioners would be euthanized to save money. The “T 4” killing program was based not only on racial but also purely economic motives. All disabled persons were considered “superfluous people” and were subject to destruction.

The peculiarity of our era is that the economy does not even need healthy and able-bodied people in large numbers. Due to technological progress, there is a sharp, sometimes avalanche-like reduction of jobs. What if within 3–5 years a billion unemployed appear in the world? The simplest solution is to pay everyone benefits. However, in fact, for the unemployed, this will mean a decrease in living standards and a loss of rights. They are not stupider or lazier than those who will stay to work and earn money and live much richer. It is just that the circumstances were unfavorable for them, their specialty suddenly turned out to be unclaimed. Of

---

Hence the code name of the euthanasia program “Killing Program T 4” (Ger. Aktion Tiergartenstraße 4).

course, many will be unhappy with this unfair state of affairs.

Therefore, those in power would very much like to reduce the world's population. This makes it easier to solve the problem of unemployment, and much easier to manage the population when it is smaller. The goal has already been announced — to reduce the population to one billion or even half a billion.

Technically, this can be done. However, a number of moral questions immediately arise. For example, what about the numerous tribes living in isolation from our civilization? In addition, most importantly, who will decide where, what nationality and in what quantity is it “permissible” for people to live? Is this a “world government”? Nevertheless, who chose them and empowered them? Who are they, saints?

Thus, a serious obstacle to population decline is morality, some religious or intuitive notions about humanity, about good and evil. Atheism erodes the foundation of morality. If a person is considered as a product of a random combination of cosmic dust, then ontologically he is no different from dirt and dust, and over billions of years of evolution, he will not have any special human rights. Then any crime against humanity can be justified with the help of logic and “common sense”. Therefore, “serious and very influential” people who want to reduce the population openly sponsor the propaganda of atheism throughout the world.

In the movie “In Search of Captain Grant”<sup>1</sup> there is a remarkable dialogue of the writer Jules Verne<sup>2</sup> and a journalist:

— What is the future of your books?

— I think they will soon be forgotten.

— How’s that? Why?

— People strive to live for their own pleasure.

Unfortunately, they are less and less interested in literature based on moral principles.

— Formulate the main task of your creativity.

— Transforming the world, if you like!

— Wow!

— Yes, Yes!

— I will paint a picture of the world in which we live, and let the reader think, is it perfect? There are 1.5 billion people on the globe! Only in China, 300 million live! Three hundred! However, half of the population of our planet lives from hand to mouth. Nevertheless, our planet can feed a hundred billion! Humanity is obliged to improve and rebuild the world in which we live by common forces!

---

1. “In Search of Captain Grant” «В поисках капитана Гранта» (Bulg. По следите на капитан Грант) is a Soviet-Bulgarian seven-serial film based on the novel by Jules Verne “Children of Captain Grant”. Writer and director — Stanislav Govorukhin. The film was shot at the Odessa film studio (USSR) and the Boyana studio (Bulgaria) in 1985.

2. Jules Gabriel Verne (Fr. Jules Gabriel Verne; 1828–1905) — French writer, classic of adventure literature, one of the founders of the science fiction genre.

— You write a lot about science. What is her future? Will we become witnesses of great discoveries during our lifetime?

— The time is not far off when the achievements of science will surpass the power of imagination. Soon people will build heavier-than-air flying machines, submarines powered by electricity, but scientific advances are indifferent to good and evil! Maybe very soon they will find means to destroy entire armies, regardless of distance. Therefore, the successes of science should not in any way outstrip the improvement of morals! Otherwise, science will become very dangerous!

We do not know if Jules Verne actually spoke these words, or if the scriptwriter invented them. In any case, it is said very correctly! This dialogue, hypothetically taking place in the middle of the 19th century, accurately characterizes the social trends of the modern global world. Scientific advances have received the highest priority and pushed morality far to the periphery of public life. This has caused many troubles.

Our planet can easily feed tens of times more people than it currently lives. Back in the middle of the 20th century, there were technologies that could provide food for the entire population of the Earth without using GMOs. But at the same time, millions of people are chronically hungry. The problem is not in the resources, and not in the technical capabilities,

they just exist. The problem is moral. No scientific achievement can add love, altruism, compassion, and mercy to society. On the contrary, technical means can become a very powerful tool in the hands of those people whose will is directed towards evil.

*War Between the Poor and the Rich?*

Quite often, they try to explain social tension by the conflict of class interests, the conflict between the rich and the poor, the conflict of “labor and capital”. This is partly true. Large corporations often have their own lobbies in the government and even force the state to wage wars (internal and external) in their own interests.

Thomas Joseph Dunning wrote in a pamphlet<sup>1</sup>, “With adequate profit, capital is very bold. A certain 10% will ensure its employment anywhere; 20% certain will produce eagerness; 50% positive audacity; 100% will make it ready to trample on all human laws; 300% and there is not a crime at which it will scruple, nor a risk it will not run, even to the chance of its owner being hanged.” K. Marx in *Capital* quoted these words, and since then everyone who wants to expose the “depravity of the capitalist system” has been repeating this after Marx.

However, the willingness to transcend the law and morality in order to achieve benefits is not at all an

---

1. Trades’ unions and strikes: their philosophy and intention, pp. 35–36.

attribute of either the capitalist or any other socio-economic system. This is always the vice of specific people, the sin of greed, selfishness. In the criminal chronicles of different countries, eras and peoples, there are many examples of the fact that a person of any social status can take an inhuman action, everything depends only on his moral level.

And here are other words, already concerning groups of people, corporations and states, expressed as early as the 5th century by Aurelius Augustine, "So, in the absence of justice, what are states but big robber bands; since the robber bands themselves are nothing more than states in miniature. In addition, they represent societies of people, governed by the authority of a superior, bound by mutual agreement, and divide the spoils according to a voluntarily established law. When such a gang of lost people grows to such a size that it seizes regions, establishes settled dwellings, takes possession of cities, subjugates peoples to its power, then it openly accepts the name of the state, which is already completely attributed to it not by suppressed greed, but by acquired impunity. One captured pirate answered Alexander the Great beautifully and correctly. When the king asked him what right he has to plunder at sea, he boldly replied, "The same as you: but since I do this in a small ship,

they call me a robber; you have a huge fleet, and therefore you are called emperor.”<sup>1</sup>

This quote should also not be attributed to any particular socio-economic system. It all depends on the mentality and moral principles prevailing in a particular society at a particular time. For example, the communists in Russia formulated their program in the revolutionary anthem (Internationale) as follows: “We will destroy the whole world of violence, to the ground, and then, we will build ours, we will build a new world ...” Literally realizing these words, both V.I. Lenin and J.V. Stalin gave orders for the physical destruction of a huge number of people. Even more people were imprisoned in concentration camps and became slaves to the state. As a result, people from the lowest social classes, ostensibly to defeat exploitation and violence, created a system of even greater exploitation and even greater violence.

Thus, to explain social conflicts only by the conflict of class interests of the rich and the poor would be too oversimplification and incorrect in essence. Both the rich and the poor can be equally good and bad. These are the depths of the human soul; they do not depend on class. At the heart of all conflicts are always the spiritual diseases of society, passions,

---

1. Aurelius Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, philosopher, Christian theologian and politician (354–430). *About the city of God*. Ch. 4, book 4.

and vices, which, one way or another, prevail in a particular society.

*What will Happen after the Arrival  
of the “New World Order”?*

“The lives and expectations of millions of people are largely determined by their circumstances at birth,” said UN Secretary General Mr. Antonio Guterres<sup>2</sup>. According to Oxfam International, an international coalition of anti-poverty organizations, the eight richest people on the planet have as much money as the 3.6 billion people who make up the world’s poorest population<sup>3</sup>. Since 2015, the richest 1% of people in the world has more wealth than the rest of the world’s population. According to researchers, the current economy contributes to the concentration of wealth in the hands of oligarchs who enrich themselves at the expense of the poorest inhabitants of the planet<sup>4</sup>. In the United States, the wealthy 1% own 42% of the total wealth. In Russia, social polarization is almost twice as large. According to 2018 data, 89% of all financial assets, 92% of all time deposits, and 89% of all cash savings are

---

2. From his lecture in New York on the anniversary of the birth of former South African President Nelson Mandela.

3. Katie Hope, BBC News, Davos, 22 January 2018. This data was provided in a report by Oxfam, made on January 16 at the Forum in Davos (the annual World Economic Forum), which called for an end to the enrichment of the richest.

4. Report: The 1% of the wealthy own half of the world’s wealth. Source: BBC Russian Service, 18 January 2016, 08:17.

concentrated in the hands of 3% of the richest population of the country<sup>1</sup>.

In general, we can say that the oligarchs have a “good life” they simply physically will never be able to spend as much money as they have. Some outrage in society about social inequality still poses no threat to the rich: puppet governments, police, army, media, everything works for them. Providing everyone with an unconditional basic income necessary for life is also real, it would be a desire. Then why do they so want to get rid of the “excess” in their opinion of the population? Friedrich Nietzsche answered this question a long time ago, “Beggars should be entirely abolished! Truly, it is annoying to give to them and annoying not to give to them.”<sup>2</sup> In other words, the desire to reduce the population is because the poor, by their very existence, awaken unpleasant movements of conscience among the rich. It is like stepping over someone who is lying in need of help. The existence of the poor, although not a hindrance, is a silent reproach living in luxury.

If the population decline is accompanied by a violation of the principles of morality and justice, then with a high degree of probability we can say what will happen later when the population is

1. Based on the analysis of experts from the Higher School of Economics and the Institute for Research and Expertise of Vnesheconombank.

2. Friedrich Nietzsche. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*.

reduced. As noted above, Aurelius Augustine said that in the absence of justice, states turn into big robber bands. All criminal communities are subject to one law: evil begets only evil. Immoral people can associate, collaborate, and even be friends. But after a while, having achieved common goals, they begin to fight with each other. This can be said for sure; it has always been and will always be so!

Therefore, with the inevitability of the second law of thermodynamics, serious and very influential groups of “population reduction” will begin to “reduce” each other. Some 300 of the most influential families, left on the planet with several hundred thousand attendants, simply cannot stop there. A war of all against all will begin, since evil is metaphysical and can never be saturated. It always acts destructively, including on its carriers.

*A Child's Teardrop and a "Ticket to Paradise": Aspects of Theodicy*

Since time immemorial, people have contemplated the problem of evil in the world<sup>3</sup>. In our time, very often unbelievers say to believers, “If God existed, would He allow so much suffering, so much injustice? If God, as you say, is Love, then how can this constant triumph of evil and desecration of good are explained? In addition, why is the presence

---

<sup>3</sup>. One of the earliest literary records on this topic is the Book of Job in the Bible.

of the forces of evil so much more obvious than the presence of the power of God? If there is a God, how does He allow all this?” On this occasion, Archpriest Alexander Schmemmann wrote, “Let’s say right away that these questions cannot get an easy answer. On the other hand, even more clearly there is no answer to them at all, if by the answer we mean a rational, reasonable, so-called “objective” explanation. All attempts of the so-called ‘theodicy’, that is, a rational explanation of the existence of evil in the world in the presence of an omnipotent God, were unsuccessful and unconvincing; against these explanations, the famous answer of Ivan Karamazov in Dostoevsky’s child, I respectfully return the ticket for such happiness.”<sup>1</sup>

Christians ask about the same questions as atheists. Why do people innocently suffer, get sick and ultimately die, if God (who wishes people well) can easily deliver them from all this? Christians answer, “We do not know, but we hope and believe in God.” Atheists say, “If there is no rational answer, then there is no God either.” However, at the same time, atheists do not reject quantum mechanics, for example, in which there are also contradictions and

---

1. Comp.: “... I completely reject the highest harmony. She is not worth a tear of at least one tortured child ... And therefore I hasten to return my ticket to the entrance ... I do not accept God ... I just return the ticket to Him respectfully” (Dostoevsky F. M. Brothers Karamazov/Достоевский Ф. М. Братья Карамазовы. Ч. 2. Кн. 5. Гл. 4//Полн. собр. соч. в 30 т. Т. 14. С. 262).

paradoxes. Therefore, their approach is inconsistent. Religious faith (like hope) gives priority not to reason, but to the voice of the heart.

This approach is shown in the book Job and in the gospel story of Lazarus and his sisters. Moreover, Martha and Mary spoke to Jesus, “Lord, if you had been here, my brother would not have died” (John 11:21 и John 11:32). In addition, their friends said, “Could not he who opened the eyes of the blind man have kept this man from dying?” (John 11:37)

This question suggests himself are everyone. He could, but He did not. Why? Better to say honestly, “We do not know.” Any attempts to explain that after temporary suffering eternal bliss will come, somehow does not comfort. In addition, all these explanations are refuted by the answer of Ivan Karamazov. Observing someone’s suffering from the outside while being able to help is quite immoral.

Exactly at this aspect, atheists often pay attention. However, despite the fact that Christ does not answer this question, He weeps over the tomb of Lazarus. He does not speak like people, “But Lazarus is now in Paradise, he feels good.” He is crying. Moreover, in this cry is the whole theodicy. God is not an indifferent experimenter on a “colony of ants”, as Krauss imagines Him, but He is full of sympathy for everything that happens to humans.

In connection with the above, it is appropriate to recall another Gospel episode when Christ sailed with the disciples on a boat. “A great windstorm arose, and the waves beat into the boat, so that the boat was already being swamped. But He was in the stern, asleep on the cushion; and they woke Him up and said to Him, ‘Teacher, do You not care that we are perishing?’ He woke up and rebuked the wind, and said to the sea, ‘Peace! Be still!’ Then the wind ceased, and there was a dead calm.” (Mark 4:37–39; comp. Matt. 8:24–26; Luke 8:23–25).

Human’s natural desire is to get rid of suffering, calamity, and death. In both religions and atheism, this desire is equally strong. The only difference is that in religions, the main attention is paid to metaphysical aspects, and in atheism only material ones. Religions are determined to “control” God with the help of sacrifices, prayers, ceremonies, and sacraments, to force Him to fulfill human requests. In atheism, they try to achieve the same by controlling material processes, nature. However, even in nature, many phenomena are inexplicable from an atheistic point of view.

On the other hand, God cannot be forced to do anything by anything. Therefore, in religions there is no guaranteed “repeatability of results”. God can easily heal any disease, give food to the hungry, raise the dead, and command the elements. However, in reality there were only isolated cases of all this.

Theodicy problem is a religion problem. Christ did not create religion and never spoke about it.

That is why Christ is silent at the trial of Pilate and does not answer the religious challenges of the Jews “Let the Messiah, the King of Israel, come down from the cross now, so that we may see and believe” (Mark 15:30–32; comp. Matt. 27:40,42). Atheists make similar demands. For example, Krauss wants God to explicitly speak to people from heaven so that everyone can hear it (see comment 35).

God is asked, accused, demanded, but He is silent. Only occasionally does God interfere in the course of history and the personal life of individuals. In the vast majority of cases, everything happens according to the laws of this world, which lies in evil. This is an incomprehensible secret. For two thousand years, theologians have not been able to write unambiguous and convincing interpretations on this topic. However, the faith of religious people is faith-hope. It is the belief that God is good no matter what. For example, the apostles experienced a lot of suffering in their personal lives, but this could not shake their faith.

There is no answer to the problem of theodicy, not only because of the rational approach, but also because they look only in one direction, at God, and present various “claims” to Him. First, you need to look the other way, at yourself, ask yourself a question, “What have I done to the best of my ability

so that the evil in the world becomes at least a little less? Did you feed the hungry or at least say a word of consolation to the despondent?" It is by this criterion that God evaluates the meaning of human life. (comp.: Matt. 25:34-45).

Attempts to explain by theodicy also come to a standstill because man usually projects his logic onto God, that is, mentally "creates" God in his own image and likeness. But God does not act as Ivan Karamazov thinks, He does not want a child's tears, on the contrary, He gives Himself for the life of the world (John 6:51), belittles Himself to the end, to the Cross. In addition, a person would not have such compassion for all living things if this feeling had not been put into him by God. Evolution has not taught a single living creature to think about charity, about environmental problems, about protecting endangered species, etc.

God puts a person into question, "What are you ready to do for the sake of Paradise? Can you limit yourself in something for the sake of your neighbor, sacrifice something? Or will you build your happiness on the tears of a child, on the misfortunes of other people?" In other words, is evil permissible for the sake of future good, and is it possible to achieve good by the methods of evil?

For example, today we would not have such advanced medicine if the Nazis did not put inhuman experiments on prisoners in concentration camps.

How much happiness has brought modern people the misfortune tortured by the Nazis? This is a big question. If the beginning was inhumane, then the continuation will be the same. There is an obvious tendency to turn medicine into a business that is directly interested in the constant presence of the largest possible number of unhealthy people. If they are cured, then the business will simply collapse. Therefore, in most cases, they will be prescribed a constant intake of expensive drugs that do not lead to complete healing.

The situation is approximately the same in other spheres of public life. Figuratively, this tendency in the formation of an egoistic consumer society was described by F. M. Dostoevsky, “Will the world fail or should I not drink tea? No, I would rather say, ‘Let the whole world fail, but for me to always drink tea’”. The myopia of this approach is obvious: everyone will “fail” together. In addition, the desire for predation and parasitism turns into self-destruction (for a person or society). In addition, vice versa, whoever gives finds and acquires. Love for one’s neighbor, accompanied by self-giving, surprisingly leads to spiritual joy and harmony. However, all this is impossible to understand within the framework of the atheistic paradigm of thinking.

[1:12:25] Tzortzis: I asked you that question, sir. How on Earth from an intellectual perspective can we point

the finger at religions from a moral perspective, especially today has been the irony is, most of your articulation against Islam were moral, not rational one. After all, you decided not to refute my arguments.

#### 46 COMMENT

**E**xactly so, and nothing else! Atheists have no reason to condemn religion from a moral point of view. After all, morality has a metaphysical source. And no matter how powerful and strong atheism may seem, it is like the ancient Goliath or the Colossus on feet of clay, and is crushed by this little “stone” by reference to the metaphysics of morality.

Krauss: I did.

Tzortzis: No, you did not. You talked about infinity and

...

Krauss: I talked about causality, infinity, and the words you were throwing out.

Tzortzis: Yes? And what you say about causality?

Krauss: I said, in fact, it is quite likely that beginning the universe causality is not the good question. But, if you want ...I understand that completely ...

Tzortzis: Your presupposition of causality ...

Krauss: No, is not my presupposition.

Tzortzis: It is.

Krauss: Time does not exist. Space does not exist ...

Tzortzis: Okay. Think about the statement: “Something produces an effect.” Where is the time as a definition there?

Krauss: Produces.

Tzortzis: No. It could be atemporal.

Krauss: What do you mean “atemporal”? Explain to me clearly, what you mean in a physical way. Do not just

give me English language, give me a give me a physical example.

[1:13:24] Tzortzis: Okay. Your “nothing” is a physical example. Yeah?

Krauss: Well, “nothing” describes ...Maybe you read the Preface, like as some people, and then not going far?

#### 47 COMMENT

The last sentence contains the correct solution! If, after reading the Preface, a person understands that the author of the book is mistaken and is trying to mislead the readers, then it would be reasonable and logical not to read further. Why waste time if it is already clear that the author is wrong? In the Preface to *A Universe from Nothing*, Krauss writes, “It has also been suggested by various individuals with whom I have debated the issue that, if there is the ‘potential’ to create something, then that is not a state of true nothingness. And surely having laws of nature that give such potential takes us away from the true realm of nonbeing. But then, if I argue that perhaps the laws themselves also arose spontaneously, as I shall describe might be the case, then that too is not good enough, because whatever system in which the laws may have arisen is not true nothingness. Turtles all the way down? I don’t believe so.”<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Lawrence M. Krauss. *A Universe from Nothing*. Preface. 2012.

Krauss's opponents objected to him absolutely correctly: there is no potential in non-being — this is the denial of any being, any potential. How could the laws of physics arise spontaneously if there was no matter, there was no “physics”, even in part? The very term “spontaneous” means voluntary arising from internal causes, without external influence. However, in non-being there is nothing “internal”, there are no “internal causes”, there is no potential for “spontaneity”. Non-being is that extreme limit beyond which it is impossible to cross; there are no “turtles” further there. In fact, it is Krauss who substitutes more and more “turtles” and at the same time he accuses opponents of what he is doing himself. Something can arise from nothing only if there is already something in it, at least some kind of “physics”. These are Krauss' dummy “turtles”. This is another demagoguery, juggling with terms and turning everything upside down.

[1:13:33] Tzortzis: Actually, I read the whole book. I liked it.

Krauss: What is my “nothing”? What is my “nothing”?

Tzortzis: Your “nothing” is “quantum”.

Krauss: No.

Tzortzis: It is.

Krauss: No. No space, no time, no laws, no nothing.

Tzortzis: But that is a quantum haze.

Krauss: No, no quantum. There is no universe, nothing, zero, nothing at all!

Tzortzis: So, why did you say in your own book then, that everything will reduced to quantum haze?

#### 48 COMMENT

**I**t is important to emphasize this once again: at the beginning of the emergence of the universe, there are neither laws of physics, nor anything else that would have to do with the material world. The essence of the question is the emergence of matter (and any attributes of the material world) from non-being. Therefore, the natural sciences, in principle, cannot say anything about the initial singularity. On the contrary, it is possible to speak about the metaphysical First Cause of the universe, since the particular principle of causality goes beyond physics.

**K**rauss, with the dexterity of a sharper, substitutes concepts, replacing “non-being” with “nothing”. “Non-being” (nihilō, Gr. οὐκ ὄν) is literally non-existence, nothingness, — denial of any form of existence, denial of any being, any potential. Krauss’s “nothing” is simply zero, emptiness. However, zero is already a number; mathematics can operate on it. Emptiness — it can be empty space, vacuum physics can operate with all this. Non-being does not contain any concepts, and even no laws that mathematics or physics could “catch on”.

[1:14:38] Krauss: The question, I repeat again, is what more sensible? And what is more sensible? It is what produces more rational actions. And I am sorry, if you

talk about tolerance, I get so tired hearing people talk about tolerance. But when I hear people talking about blasphemy, I should be allowed blaspheme all I want. Because, ridicule is an important part of inquiry discussion. Sometimes ridicule some, really killing something, illuminates ...And I hear about blasphemers I hate to say it, and this may be complete misapplication of Islam. Islam, as it practiced in many countries in the world, is a misapplication of Islam. But all I can see is intolerance. When I see those principles apply. Intolerance to blasphemers, intolerance to homosexual, intolerance in general ...

#### **49 COMMENT**

**I**s “rationality” the criterion of truth? The German Nazis believed that it was undoubtedly reasonable and rational to subject all persons with disabilities to forced euthanasia: in this way, the society gets rid of the “extra” burden. Why did the Nuremberg Tribunal condemn them?

If we talk about the mind, then it is reasonable to begin with studying the subject of your criticism as much as possible, as well as finding out the opinion of opponents. This is rational action, “If one gives answer before hearing, it is folly and shame” (Prov. 18:13). Isn’t it wrong to make fun of something just because it seems incomprehensible? Nevertheless, Krauss, like his fellow atheists, does not want to know the points of view of theologians, his ideas about religions are very superficial and distorted. If a person emerged by chance from cosmic dust (and

it doesn't matter how many years it would take), then at what moment and why did this "lump of dust" become interested in reason and seek meaning? No, human consciousness is a phenomenon of a spiritual, non-material order.

However, it would not be enough to limit ourselves to this remark only. There is a much more serious problem here than just an intellectual error. To explain, you have to resort to metaphor. In physics, the law of interaction of electric charges (Coulomb's law) is known: like charges are attracted to each other, and unlike charges are repelled, and the force of interaction is directly proportional to the product of the values of the charges and inversely proportional to the square of the distance between bodies. French scientist Coulomb<sup>1</sup> formulated this law by induction, generalizing experimental data. Metaphorically, you can say something similar about the metaphysical concepts of good and evil, virtue and vice, love and hate. In metaphysics, there is also the law of attraction-repulsion, only on the contrary, the carriers of the same qualities tend to each other, and the opposite ones repel. This spiritual law is also derived inductively from extensive experience. Over the millennia, a huge number of examples have confirmed it.

However, there can be no formulas in metaphysics, and there is another important factor that does not

---

1. Fr. Charles-Augustin de Coulomb.

fit into the “equations” and is of decisive importance. This is the free will of man. For example, Cain, long before he committed the murder of his brother, had a penchant for sin, something metaphorically depicted as impurity of the heart.” However, at the same time, he could resist these inclinations with willpower. This is why he was told, “If you do well, will you not be accepted? And if you do not do well, sin is lurking at the door; its desire is for you, but you must master it” (Gen. 4:7). In Christianity, this topic is one of the main: how to overcome sinful inclinations and cleanse the heart.

Moreover, another important topic about the personified metaphysical evil — the devil and his angels, which can also influence human behavior. Their characteristic feature is lies and slander against God, as well as blasphemy. That is why, in traditional religions, blasphemy has always been considered a very great evil and severely punished.

Krauss is not at all like a man impartially seeking truth and reasoning rationally. Everything divine a priori causes him rejection, denial, and almost “Coulomb” repulsion. On the contrary, homosexuality, which is an abomination to God, evokes sympathy for Krauss, he justifies and defends it. Devilish slander against God and blasphemy are also very popular with Krauss.

*Two Ideas, Two Paths*

**T**he Bible contains a very important message to the world from the following points:

1) Nature and man are “corrupted” by sin, are in the so-called state of “fall”.

2) There is sin, evil and suffering in the world, but a person is called to correct this situation, and in the process of correction to find his true “I”;

3) This problem cannot be solved by any “technical” methods, by any “most correct” knowledge and great intellect. Love is an effective “medicine”. When a person does something to reduce the suffering of other people or animals, and in general does anything to reduce the evil in the world, then by doing so (through love for his neighbor) he creates himself: giving, finding, squandering, collects;

4) Man has arisen from non-being and is in a limited material world. However, at the same time, man has the potential to become a “created god” through “deification” by grace. In addition, in the work of correcting the fallen world, man becomes a “laborer” with God (comp.: 1Cor. 3:9).

**A**ll this as a whole is a great idea, gives deep meaning to human life. On the other hand, atheists claim that the universe (and, therefore, man) arose by chance, that is, without a purpose, without meaning. In the atheistic system of values, the question of good and evil is not resolved, but

translated into a practical plane: what is useful and what is harmful? Moral issues are also devoid of real content if there is no metaphysical justice. Then there remains only an animal (evolutionary) attitude towards one's neighbor, the attitude of predation and parasitism — “die today you, and tomorrow I”. State laws only streamline the life of “civilized egoists”, but the pursuit of profit and other human passions will always find ways to circumvent the laws. At the same time, it is obvious that any achievements, wealth, fame, power and, in general, any earthly success will be “zeroed” at the moment of death. Therefore, life in this paradigm, in the final analysis, is not only meaningless, but also absurd.

Religions can contain mistakes; send a person down the wrong path. Moreover, to follow the wrong path of life is a great tragedy for a person. However, completely losing the meaning of life (not animal, but metaphysical, higher meaning) is a complete disaster.

[1:15:29] Krauss: Now, the other question, the other thing I want to say, if we ask what sensible. Why would we think, that this unproven God that is supposed to be the basis of notches Islam, but all religions different Gods, different characteristics.

### 50 COMMENT

**K**rauss seems to be talking like about a car. Well, you cannot climb into the holy of holies in dirty boots! Not everyone can reason about God.

Moreover, why does Krauss say “unproven”? Of course, God is not part of the material world, and therefore His existence cannot be proved by the methods of physics, as the existence of some Higgs boson. Nevertheless, there are other methods of proof. Thomas Aquinas back in the XIII century set forth five proofs of the existence of God based on the Logic (science) of Aristotle. Anselm of Canterbury offered other evidence. The great German philosopher Immanuel Kant gave a moral proof, referring to the universal and objective moral law (categorical imperative): it is the voice of God (not religion) that speaks in the human conscience. Hastings Reshdell, W.F. Sorley, Elton Trublad, and C.S. Lewis<sup>1</sup> have proposed their own versions of moral proof of the existence of God. In fact, there is much more evidence. Many prominent theologians and philosophers have formulated evidence for the existence of God. Both Jews and Muslims can learn all this without changes from Christianity, since we are talking about God the Creator. In addition, in both Judaism and Islam, theologians also thought about this issue, and a number of proofs were formulated.

Thus, dozens of different independent proofs of the existence of God have long been written. If Krauss has a valid objection, then let him write a book critiquing all the evidence in detail from his

1. In the book by Lewis. Mere Christianity.

point of view. It would be interesting. Although, strictly speaking, the burden of proof always lies on the side of the prosecution. However, with this atheists have big problems. There are many proofs of the existence of God, but there is not a single proof to the contrary. Neither the methods of natural science, nor the methods of philosophy can refute the existence of God.

Therefore, instead of proving, Krauss simply pulls a dull bagpipe about the “unproven” God. However, how can he prove something if he does not want to listen to anything? He could easily have read all the evidence, since it is not difficult to find them. He is simply “turned back” from them, and he does not read them. As noted above, everything divine a priori causes him a spiritual repulsion.

[1:15:48] Krauss: But Islamic God, much like the Judaism, Christian God, is a real crap ...This is a God worse than Saddam Hussein! Instead of torturing you just through your life, torturing you for infinity. Forgive me the word, but eternity, let me use that word.

## 51 COMMENT

Yes, death throes and suffering are described in both the Quran and the Bible. Krauss sees God as a torturer — a vicious and vengeful tyrant. Charles Darwin adhered to the same point of view<sup>1</sup>.

1. Дарвин Ч. Воспоминания о развитии моего ума и характера (Автобиография): Дневник работы и жизни/Пер. и коммент. проф. С. Л. Соболя. — М.: Изд-во Академии Наук СССР, 1957. С. 98.

Moreover, Christian theologians said that in God one must see a beggar asking for the alms of love on the threshold of human freedom.<sup>2</sup> Maybe Krauss is looking in the wrong direction. Neither Christians nor Muslims believe in such an evil god that Krauss describes.

God does not want to torture anyone. As it says, “So it is not the will of your Father in heaven that one of these little ones should be lost” (Matt. 18:14). Elder Siluan the Athonite said, “The Lord is sorry for all.” In addition, the elder himself, filled with the Spirit of Christ, pitied everyone. The book about the elder says, “It was unbearable for him to realize that people would languish in hell. We remember his conversation with a hermit monk, who said, ‘God will punish all atheists. They will burn in eternal fire.’ Obviously, he was satisfied that they would be punished with eternal fire. To this, Elder Siluan said with visible emotional excitement, ‘Well, tell me, please, if they put you in Paradise, and from there you will see someone burning in hellish fire, will you be at peace?’ “But what can you do, you yourself are to blame,” he says. Then the old man with a mournful face answered, “Love cannot bear this ... One must pray for everyone.’ And he really

---

2. Words by theologian Vladimir Lossky.

prayed for everyone; praying only for himself became unusual for him”<sup>1</sup>.

This is a complicated paradox: how to explain the torment of sinners in hell, taking into account the fact that God is infinite Love? In early Christianity, there was even the so-called heresy of “apocatastasis”. This is a metaphysical theory about “universal salvation”, which said that the torment of sinners in hell would only be temporary: ultimately, God will have mercy on everyone, including the devil and the fallen angels. This was the opinion of the famous Alexandrian theologians Origen, Didim and even St. Gregory of Nyssa<sup>2</sup>. However, over time, the Church rejected this teaching.

You just have to admit that there are many paradoxes in Christianity, and this is one of them. The infinite, unlimited God limits Himself to human freedom. Therefore, for people who consciously reject God, there can be no other place but hell — the place of maximum “distance” from God. They themselves made their metaphysical choice, they themselves wanted to be away from the source of all blessings, existence and happiness. The cause of suffering in hell is not God, but hatred of Him.

---

1. Look the book: Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov). *Elder Silouan the Athonite*.

2. Look the book: Prot. Georgy V. Florovsky/Прот. Георгий В. Флоровский. Восточные Отцы IV века//Св. Григорий Нисский. Судьба человека, гл. 10/Изд. Белорусского Экзархата. Минск, 2006. С. 234–238.

You can meet the divine light only in your heart. Moreover, everything external is subordinated to this goal and represents, as it were, “road signs”, hints, and tips. Krauss’s mistake is that he attaches too much importance to the external form and misses the precious essence. God speaks with humanity in human language, the language of feelings and flesh. Therefore, the image of God in our understanding is often too human, too sensual, confused, often illogical, and contradictory. Nevertheless, the image of God is only a means of seeing the true nature of Godhead — love. For didactic purposes, parents feign anger at their children in order to influence them. Maybe their parents sometimes even frighten them with revenge and retaliation, which they really do not intend to implement. All this is condescension to the concept of a child, and love is manifested in condescension.

Krauss: Eternity for not believing! The tortures are actually described in the Quran and you know it as well as I do.

[1:16:24] Krauss: The point, if you just ask yourself of common sense. If you were a divine beings, or let’s say you had an ant colony you made in your house. Would you be offended if those ants did not pray to you 50 times a day before Muhammad cut down the 30 and then 5. Would you be offended if those ants did not pay amage you five times a day? And if they did not look at you, and if they didn’t recognize your existence, would you destroy them? Now, I mean it just seems so petty.

So why should we believe in it hateful unmerciful, petty, sadomasochistic, homophobic, sexist god? It is just irrational! It is not sensible! There is nothing. And the point is ...I don't want single Islam here. And I know I'm sending some people, but the same is true for the God of Moses. Okay. If you really believe that the scriptures were literally true, why can't you see the hideous morality they are imposing on you?

[1:18:28] Krauss: The idea of punishing people for eternity, for choosing to find something unlikely is not tolerant. The idea of punishing them vicious, evil, ugly way for all eternity. It's not merciful! It is the opposite of rational common sense!

## 52 COMMENT

**H**ere Krauss demonstrates some kind of monstrous, perverted idea of the Abrahamic religions — all concepts are reversed. God does not need anything, and neither does human prayers. What should he be offended at? Prayer is needed not by God, but by man. There are prayers and hymns of thanksgiving, praise. In them, a person sings for joy, expresses his delight to God (Luke 1:46–55). There are prayers of petition. In them, a person asks for help in any need. In addition, there are prayers of repentance. They express the pain of the soul and the sorrow of the heart (Ps. 51). These prayers were not written at the office table. They burst from the mouth like blood gushing from a wounded artery. This is a record of the strongest emotional experiences. Why is Krauss making fun of this? The human spiritual world is

very complex. Sometimes a person does what he himself does not want to do (Rom. 7:19). Prayer helps in mental, spiritual struggle. Therefore, Christ told the apostles, “Stay awake and pray that you may not come into the time of trial” (Matt. 26:41; Mark 14:38; comp. Luke 21:36; 22:46).

If prayer rules have been established, then their goal is purely didactic. As you know, almost any good and kind deed needs to be taught and forced. After all, no one protests against the fact that parents teach their children to brush their teeth or do exercises. Prayer rules should be considered in the same aspect: their goal is to teach a person a good, soulful deed. However, as the saying goes, “a slave is not a worshiper”, you cannot force to pray.

Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh was a great prayer book. How did he learn to pray? Once the confessor blessed him not to pray at all for six months! What an unusual move! On the other hand, this saved him from orating and formalism in prayer.

History knows numerous examples of hermits of hesychasts who retired to desolate places to pray with concentration, to pray almost incessantly. For this, they renounced even the most innocent joys of life. Nobody forced them. Hence, they considered prayer to be a much greater blessing than anything else did. Why is Krauss so annoyed by other people’s prayers?

Moreover, where did Krauss get that God is “offended” if He is not prayed for? The main thing in prayer is sincerity. The book of the prophet Isaiah says that God, on the contrary, does not accept sacrifices, holiday services, prayers, etc., unless all this is accompanied by a righteous life. These words can generally be attributed to any prayer or religious ritual, “When you come to appear before me, who asked this from your hand? Trample my courts no more; bringing offerings is futile; incense is an abomination to me. New moon and sabbath and calling of convocation — I cannot endure solemn assemblies with iniquity. Your new moons and your appointed festivals my soul hates; they have become a burden to me, I am weary of bearing them. When you stretch out your hands, I will hide my eyes from you; even though you make many prayers, I will not listen; your hands are full of blood. Wash yourselves; make yourselves clean; remove the evil of your doings from before my eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do good; seek justice, rescue the oppressed, defend the orphan, plead for the widow. Come now, let us argue it out, says the LORD” (Is. 1:12–18).

In addition, God is not at all like a merciless despot. Krauss cannot but know about Christmas. God appears to the world in the form of a defenseless baby. A baby cannot threaten anyone, He only loves and asks for mutual love. The last book of the Bible, the Apocalypse, has such an amazing image, “I am

standing at the door, knocking; if you hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to you and eat with you, and you with me” (Rev. 3:20). God does not demand, does not order, does not break at the door of the soul, but only knocks softly, like a humble traveler asking for an overnight stay.

In addition, the feast of the Christmas is a reminder that the Lord came to Earth to die and suffer with people, so that everyone would receive eternal life. This holiday reminds of a choice: someone accepts God, and someone rejects.

Moreover, if you come up with metaphors, then, in any case, the “colony of ants” is a completely inappropriate image. Rather, then, it would be possible to imagine humanity in the form of a large “field”, divided into “squares”. At the same time, each “square” (a specific person) has free will and decides for himself whether to grow the seed thrown into it or not, and if it grows, then how big is the harvest. In the Bible, the human heart is often likened to the earth (or plant), which may (or may not) bear some spiritual fruit: (Ps. 143:6; Matt. 13:8–23; Mark 4:20; Luke 8:13; John 15:5–6; Heb. 6:7–8; Rom. 11:17).

The owner of the land looks at which site bears more fruit, and rejoices at this and pays more attention to this particular “square”. And a plot (or plant) that does not bear fruit of its own accord (despite such an opportunity), or bears evil fruit instead of good sown, on the contrary, causes the

wrath of its owner (comp.: Luke 13:7–9 and Matt. 3:10; Matt. 7:19; Luke 3:9; John 15:2).

From this point of view, the so-called “foresight” or “election” of some people by God should be considered. It is just that God foresees that they will bear spiritual fruits, but they do it on their own, this is their free response to the challenge of His love. In other words, the reason for the greater or lesser gift from God is God’s foresight of the free response of man (Rom.8:28–29; Gal. 1:15–16).

Krauss and other atheists in every possible way deny the existence of the spiritual world. However, there are even objective (measurable) examples that the spiritual can influence the material. Published the results of independent studies of Russian and American neuroscientists of the so-called phenomenon of “posthumous meditation” — “tukdam”<sup>1</sup>. Of course, meditation is not a prayer to God the Personality, as in the Abrahamic religions, but it still belongs to the realm of the human spirit. Buddhist monks can be in a state of posthumous meditation for several days or even weeks. In this state, the neurons of the brain, cells, and tissues of the body remain as if “dormant”, despite the death of a person stated by doctors. Instruments objectively establish these facts, but they are completely inexplicable by materialistic science.

---

1. <https://ria.ru/20201110/buddizm1584005588.html>  
and <https://youtube.com/watch?v=TA64OtFJwqo>

Another example is the phenomenon of an incorruptible body for almost a hundred years in a Buryat religious leader from Eastern Siberia. His full name is Pandito Khambo Lama XII Dashi-Dorzho Itigelov (1852–1927). Despite the fact that his body after death was not subjected to any special treatment (neither mummified nor embalmed), it looks the same as the body of a person who died no more than twelve hours ago<sup>2</sup>. From a natural scientific point of view, no one can explain this phenomenon. Even international conferences are organized on this occasion<sup>3</sup>. Scientists have confirmed that the protein structure of Itigelov's body corresponds to that of a living person. "According to the report of the academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences Sergei Kursakin, scientists have recorded the activity of Itigelov's hypothalamus, as well as the frequency of electromagnetic oscillations emanating from the body of the Lama. Kursakin added that "blood was also preserved in the body of the Khambo Lama, although it turned from liquid to jelly-like." Professor B. Bolshakov admitted that he does not know "a single fact of a person's life after his physical death, officially registered by a forensic medical

---

2. <https://fam-person.ru/itigelov-xambo-lama-fenomen-netlennogo-tela>

3. The first international conference "The Global Phenomenon of XII Khambo Lama Itigelov and the Problem of Immortality" was held in 2006.

examination in a state document. Not only in the history of Buddhism, but also in the history of mankind in general”<sup>1</sup>.

In Buddhism, there is no God-Personality, and no one forces people to meditate, no one threatens them with any punishment, but there are spiritual practices (analogous to prayers). In this way, Krauss demonstrated once again that he criticizes what he completely does not understand.

### *Different Meanings of the Term “Faith”*

In the Bible, the term “faith” can have several meanings depending on the context. It is very important not to confuse them, since the meaning can be very different. Krauss does not distinguish between these meanings, and therefore makes gross mistakes.

The first meaning (the most common) is the acceptance by a person as truth of some information that he himself did not personally verify and did not know from his own experience. Of course, the source of this information, in the opinion of the person who believes it, has a certain “credit” of trust.

For example, most people believe scientists who say that Mars has two natural moons (Phobos and Deimos). Not everyone has the ability and desire to check this with special telescopes. Therefore, most

---

1. <https://fam-person.ru/itigelov-xambo-lama-fenomen-netlennogo-tela>

people simply believe this information without checking it. Such faith does not affect feelings, does not force one to show one's attitude. People do not care if Mars actually has satellites or not, it is just information.

Children believe what parents say, school teachers say, what is written in textbooks, and so on. Most of what we know is taken for granted, since it is impossible to verify everything. Such faith is just a "piggy bank" of information for the mind, the action of only the intellect. This is reasonable, since a person is enriched with knowledge, without spending time and effort testing them.

In the second sense, by faith is meant the field of metaphysics in a broad sense. The word "faith" can be used synonymously with religion or something metaphysical. For example, it is said, "Even the demons believe — and shudder" (James 2:19). For demons, the entire spiritual world is "transparent", and they know much more than all the professors of theology, they know as eyewitnesses, and not as learned from someone. Therefore, their faith has no relation to the action of the mind, intellect (to faith in the first meaning). In this case, the word "faith" means a kind of metaphysical state.

In addition, the Bible speaks of some revelations, epiphanies to different people, and further in history many cases of supernatural phenomena are described (as a rule, to holy people). They had

personally experienced mystical experiences, and did not learn about it from others. However, their experience is referred to as faith. For example, the apostle Paul said about himself that he “have kept the faith” (2 Tim. 4:7). However, at first, with his mind, he categorically disagreed with everything that the Christians said, and converted to Christianity only after Christ appeared to him (Gal. 1:15–16, 23). The Apostle John speaks of faith as “we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes, what we have looked at and touched with our hands” (1 John 1:1). In other words, the apostles shared their mystical experience, not speculative philosophy, but called this experience “faith”.

In the third sense, faith means a certain spiritual choice, the choice of the “heart”. How does a little child, seeing a stranger, decide whether he is good or not good, what to expect from him, trust him or not, run towards him with open arms or hide? Adam and Eve, being in the early days of their existence still “spiritual babies”, solved the same problem: to trust God or not? Then a “wise counselor” (serpent, devil) came out of the bushes and began to slander God, presenting Him as a deceitful and envious ill-wisher, and invited them to become “like gods” through knowledge only with the mind, without turning their will and feelings towards God (comp. Gen. 3:4–5). By the way, Krauss (knowingly or unknowingly) does the same devil’s work:

slandering God, presenting Him as evil and unmerciful.

Each person in their life solves the same problem that Adam and Eve solved. This is the “central axis” of the whole story. You can relate to the Bible in different ways, but one cannot help but wonder how in its few lines, as in a drop, the entire ocean of human history can be reflected. Platonism, Gnosticism, magic, shamanism and many other religious movements, as well as Atheism, moved in the mainstream of the Fall, that is, they attempted to know the world (material and metaphysical) and control it with the help of purely intellectual knowledge.

In Christianity, the main priority is the faith of the heart, “for one believes with the heart and so is justified” (Rom. 10:10). This is not the faith of the intellect, but precisely the inversion of feelings, will, all the forces of the soul to God, that is, love to Him.

The fourth meaning of the term “faith” is close to the third (since it affects the area of relations), but a little different. It is a belief in potential, belief in the “best”. The coach or fan has faith in their athlete. Alternatively, better to say, the mother believes in her son in prison. No matter how terrible a criminal he is for all people, for a mother he will always be a beloved son, she believes in his best qualities. He believes because he loves. So God believes in man.

God believes that man, in the end, will choose the best, overcome evil inclinations in himself, and make his metaphysical choice towards good.

You can find other, more subtle definitions of the term “faith”, but in the context of the debate it is enough to distinguish the four mentioned: faith of the mind, faith as a metaphysical state, faith as the love of the heart and faith as hope for the best.

*Faith in the Heart as a Commandment to Love*

On the one hand, the Bible says, “Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness” (Gal. 3:6; James 2:23; Rom. 4:3). On the other hand, it says, “For one believes with the heart and so is justified” (Rom. 10:10), and “The one who is righteous will live by faith” (Rom. 1:17). It can be concluded that Abraham’s faith was not an act of the intellect, but faith in the heart.

Moreover, it can be notice that in the text of the Bible, faith in the heart has a connotation with the commandment of love. The lines that speak of the faith of the heart are very close in meaning to the lines that speak of the commandment of love. For example:

Because if you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved (Rom. 10:9);

You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind,

and with all your strength (Mark 12:30; Matt. 22:37).

As well as vice versa, unbelief and hardness of the heart is tantamount to dislike for God. For example:

This people honors me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me; (Matt. 15:8; Mark 7:6);

They are darkened in their understanding, alienated from the life of God because of their ignorance and hardness of heart (Eph. 4:18);

I know that you do not have the love of God in you (John 5:42).

*The Faith of Hope as the Foundation of Theodicy*

**T**zortzis said above that atheism has no reason to condemn religions from a moral point of view<sup>1</sup>. However, Krauss attacks God again and again with moral accusations. At the same time, Krauss denies His very existence. However, it is illogical and unreasonable to bring charges against someone if they do not exist.

**We** will have to repeat. Morality is inherent in a person by God, and if a person condemns something from the point of view of morality, then, all the more, God condemns it, “whenever our hearts condemn us; for God is greater than our hearts, and he knows everything (1 John 3:20; comp. Rom. 2:14).

---

1. Look comments 43–45.

**A**theists are very fond of invoking some of the awful things in the Old Testament and saying, like Krauss, that God is evil. However, religious people know all these Scriptures even better than atheists do, and they know that the world is full of suffering at all levels, but they believe that God is Love. Logic and common sense cannot solve this problem. Here the metaphysical circulation of the heart is of decisive importance. The book of Job is a good example. His suffering was very great, and his wife told him, “Do you still persist in your integrity? Curse God, and die.” Nevertheless, he said to her, “You speak as any foolish woman would speak. Shall we receive the good at the hand of God, and not receive the bad?” (Job 2:9–10)

**M**any theologians have tried to write the so-called “theodicy”, logically consistently explain why the Almighty God, Who is Love itself, allows the existence of evil and suffering. There are more or less successful theodicyes, but not even one is indisputable. Therefore, there are two points of view on this problem, two opposite beliefs.

**O**n the one hand, religious people have faith as a hope for the best, as a turn of the soul towards God, no matter what. For example, Saint Paisius Athonite (Eznepidis) said, “I would have gone mad from the injustice of this world if I did not know that the last word will remain with the Lord God.” All believers think along the same lines. They hope that in

eschatology, when the temporary “school of life” of this world is completed, evil and suffering will no longer act. Figuratively this was expressed by the prophet Isaiah, “The wolf shall live with the lamb, the leopard shall lie down with the kid, the calf and the lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them. The cow and the bear shall graze, their young shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. The nursing child shall play over the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put its hand on the adder’s den. They will not hurt or destroy on all my holy mountain; for the earth will be full of the knowledge of the LORD as the waters cover the sea” (Is. 11:6–9). In other words, it was expressed by Apostle Peter, “But, in accordance with his promise, we wait for new heavens and a new earth, where righteousness is at home” (2 Pet. 3:13; comp. Is. 65:17 and Rev. 21:1).

On the other hand, the reason for the disbelief of atheists very often lies precisely in the absence of this faith of hope, in the denial of theodicy. They believe that the existence of evil and suffering indicates the absence of a good Creator God. For example, the atheist physicist Alfred Kastler said, “If I were the Creator, I would find, it seems to me, an opportunity to create the world without the fact that its progress was based on destruction and suffering. I know only one thing, and I know this on the basis of many years of research: there is a goal in

the world, but we do not see yet what it is”<sup>1</sup>. This is how many atheists reason. All their attempts to understand the problem of theodicy based on only reason, without faith, hope, lead to its denial.

Thus, a rational discourse of controversy between atheists and Muslims or, for example, Christians is absolutely counterproductive. These disputes will never lead to an unambiguous conclusion that both parties agree. The essence of the difference between believers and non-believers is not at all the ability to think rationally, but in the metaphysical choice.

*The Last Judgment is not about  
Faith, but about Humanity*

Krauss echoes a common misconception, “Eternity for not believing”. In fact, this is not at all the case. First, the Last Judgment will be carried out according to completely different criteria. Second, purely intellectual unbelief is not severely condemned in the Bible. Let us take a closer look at this.

The image of the Last Judgment is given in the Gospel of Matthew:

“When the Son of Man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him, then he will sit on the throne of his glory. All the nations will be gathered before

1. Alfred Kastler (1902–1984), 1966 Nobel Prize winner for his research in optics. Quote from a conversation with French philosopher Christian Chabanis on the book: Chabanis C. Dieu: existe-t-il? “Non” respondent P. Anquetil, R. Aron, Ch. Boule... Paris: Fayard, 1973.

him, and he will separate people one from another as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats, and he will put the sheep at his right hand and the goats at the left. Then the king will say to those at his right hand, 'Come, you that are blessed by my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink, I was a stranger and you welcomed me, I was naked and you gave me clothing, I was sick and you took care of me, I was in prison and you visited me.' Then the righteous will answer him, 'Lord, when was it that we saw you hungry and gave you food, or thirsty and gave you something to drink? And when was it that we saw you a stranger and welcomed you, or naked and gave you clothing? And when was it that we saw you sick or in prison and visited you?' And the king will answer them, 'Truly I tell you, just as you did it to one of the least of these who are members of my family, you did it to me.' Then he will say to those at his left hand, 'You that are accursed, depart from me into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels; for I was hungry and you gave me no food, I was thirsty and you gave me nothing to drink, I was a stranger and you did not welcome me, naked and you did not give me clothing, sick and in prison and you did not visit me.' Then they also will answer, 'Lord, when was it that we saw you hungry or thirsty

or a stranger or naked or sick or in prison, and did not take care of you?’ Then he will answer them, ‘Truly I tell you, just as you did not do it to one of the least of these, you did not do it to me.’ And these will go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life” (Matt. 25:31–46).

Another Gospel says, “This is the judgment, that the light has come into the world, and people loved darkness rather than light because their deeds were evil. For all who do evil hate the light and do not come to the light, so that their deeds may not be exposed. But those who do what is true come to the light, so that it may be clearly seen that their deeds have been done in God” (John 3:19–21).

In this judgment, there is no question of faith or unbelief at all. All people who have ever lived on Earth are subject to judgment. Many of them may not have had the correct understanding of God and have never read the Bible. The court does not consider the question of what and how a person believed. The only thing that matters is how much a person is “humanized”, that is, differs for the better from animals, how far he has “advanced” in love — the main virtue. This was clearly expressed by the apostle Paul when he said, “If I have prophetic powers, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but do not have love, I am nothing” (1Cor. 13:2).

Faith only with the mind does not give any advantage at the Last Judgment. This is evident at least from the fact that both “even the demons believe — and shudder” (James 2:19) and Christ were crucified not by atheists, but by religious fundamentalists who did not doubt the Holy Scriptures at all. The saints, on the other hand, often hesitated and doubted the faith (comp. Matt. 14:31, Luke 24:25, John 20:25).

Christ is quite condescending to intellectual unbelief, saying that anyone who doubts let him investigate and test (John 5:39). He did not condemn the unbelief of the mind of the apostle Thomas (John 20:27). His apostles directly say that faith by the mind alone is completely insufficient for salvation, since “faith by itself, if it has no works, is dead” (James 2:17, 20, 26; 1 John 3:17). If God wanted to be believed in only with the mind, then He would have made His existence obvious to everyone. However, it is not at all what Krauss thinks. God wants man to make a free choice towards kindness and love.

Unbelief as a sin (John 16:9), to be condemned, means the absence of faith as the love of the heart. This is a kind of metaphysical, spiritual choice, a turn from God in the opposite direction. Jesus Christ spoke to religious Jewish leaders who formally deeply believe in Scripture, “Which of you convicts me of sin? If I tell the truth, why do you not

believe me?” (John 8:46) Moreover, He explained their unbelief precisely by metaphysical reasons, “If God were your Father, you would love me, for I came from God and now I am here. I did not come on my own, but he sent me. Why do you not understand what I say? It is because you cannot accept my word. You are from your father the devil, and you choose to do your father’s desires. He was a murderer from the beginning and does not stand in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks according to his own nature, for he is a liar and the father of lies. But because I tell the truth, you do not believe me” (John 8:42–45). Further, “Yet you refuse to come to me to have life. I do not accept glory from human beings. But I know that you do not have the love of God in you. I have come in my Father’s name, and you do not accept me; if another comes in his own name, you will accept him. How can you believe when you accept glory from one another and do not seek the glory that comes from the one who alone is God?” (John 5:40–44). From these quotes it is quite clear that the unbelief that is subject to condemnation is the absence of love for God, a metaphysical turn towards evil, the devil.

Another aspect should also be noted. “The Son of God will come again for judgment. For judgment is given to the Son. However, the Father also judges through the Son. Moreover, to Him actually

“everything that the Only Begotten does during the Last Judgment refers”. However, the Son of man judges, and, as it were, on the basis of His personal experience, measures the circumstances and difficulties of human life, “and whether for a long time each experienced many good or evil, or did he not touch the beginning of both, since he finished his life yet in an imperfect mind ...” This is the judgment of Divine love rather than God’s Truth. However, the court is just, that is, exactly proportionate to the merits of each; and Christ is the “Truth of God revealed by the gospel ...” In a certain sense, everyone will be his own judge. Having awakened in the resurrection, everyone will remember his whole life and give it a fair assessment himself — everyone will appear at the judgment with full consciousness of both merit and guilt. At the trial, as in a precise mirror, everything will be displayed ...”<sup>1</sup>

In conclusion, it will not be superfluous to emphasize once again that in the description of the Last Judgment given in Matt. 25:31–46 there is not even a word for “faith”, not a word for “religion”, not even a word for “God”. It is only about how and how a person has realized his human potential. Likewise elsewhere in the Bible it is said that in every nation

1. Georgy V. Florovsky. Eastern Fathers IV century/Прот. Георгий В. Флоровский. Восточные Отцы IV века//Св. Григорий Нисский. Судьба человека, гл. 9/Изд. Белорусского Экзархата. Минск, 2006. С. 232–233.

anyone who does what is right is acceptable to him” (comp.: Acts 10:35). Therefore, Krauss is quite mistaken (comp.: Matt. 22:29; Mark 12:27). The gospel picture of the Last Judgment is completely opposite to the caricature that Krauss and other atheists draw in their imaginations. She attracts attention with her inner truth, justice and humanity. On the other hand, it arouses the anger of the “goats” mentioned in it, who are accustomed to living selfishly and indifferently look at the suffering of others.

[1:18:47] Krauss: Now, in terms of explanatory things let me just spend a few minutes teaching a little bit a science. So, If you have an infinite, temporal (let us say time exist beyond our universe let us just allow for that. Because it is easy to describe that) ...

### 53 COMMENT

**K**rauss continues to impose his point of view with the help of demagogues, sophistry, and logical cheating. He does not have very many arguments, and the ones that are do not look very convincing. In this case, the demagogue seeks to blabber the audience, to confuse with “white noise” in which any sensible thought is buried. All of this has manifested itself before (see comment 27). The demagogic techniques used by Krauss are well known: erroneous syllogisms and sophisms; substitution of concepts; focusing on particulars; transition from discussing the subject of the dispute

to discussing the personality; vicious circle; false authority; false alternative and others. Therefore, in order to avoid confusion and not fall prey to crafty rhetoric, you should first understand the definitions of the basic concepts well.

Abrahamic religions talk about the emergence of the universe from nothing. Other religions speak either about the eternal existence of the world, or about the creation of the universe by God from the eternally existing “pra-matter” or even from Himself. Thus, many religions, one way or another, deify nature, assigning it one of the attributes of God — eternity. But modern cosmology has come to the unambiguous conclusion that the universe (i.e., matter, time, space and the laws of physics) had a beginning<sup>1</sup>. This beginning is usually called the “Big Bang Singularity”.

It is important to note that the Big Bang singularity lies at the “junction” of physics and metaphysics. Neither matter, nor “pra-matter”, not even the smallest part of matter, existed before the emergence of the universe. “Beyond” the singularity, there are no laws of physics or any other attributes of the material world. Abrahamic religions say that God

---

1. In 2003, cosmologists Arvin Borde, Alan Guth, and Alexander Vilenkin proved the singularity theorem. It says that the expanding space and time does not continue infinitely into the past, but has a beginning, that is, the universe has a beginning. Look: Borde A., Guth A. and Vilenkin A. Inflationary space-times are not past-complete. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 90151301, 2003.

created the universe out of nothing (Lat. *ex nihilo*, Gr. οὐκ ἐξ ὄντων), that is, from non-being. “Nothing”, “non-being” from which the world arose, is a philosophical concept, there are no “shades” of physics in it.

Let us once again recall the particular principle of causality (see comment 30): everything that arose from non-being arose due to the creative act of a person with free will. In this definition, the word “everything” means everything in general, including the material world with its laws, and the spiritual (non-material world), and space, and time and everything, whatever else.

However, the universe cannot have any internal reason for the spontaneous emergence (of the laws of physics or anything else), since it emerged from non-being. Therefore, the only reasonable explanation is the creation of the world by God, transcendental to the universe. Abrahamic religions say that He did not have a beginning at all, not at all as a rhetorical device, to designate the First Cause. God objectively does not need a reason for His existence, because He is Being itself, giving rise to everything (Lat. *principium*, Gr. τὴν ἀρχὴν John 8:25), that is, it has being in Itself.

[1:19:07] Krauss: And let us say our universe come into existence spontaneously ...A universe can give the laws of nature’s by spontaneously come into existence. Okay. Then it will come into existence. It will come into

existence at some time. And the fact, it came into existence of that time need not have any reason. It need not any reason, why with that time, rather some other time. Or, whatever time it happens it will come into existence, and people can say, "There's some significance to that." But, it must happen somewhere at some time and need not any significance, any purpose, any intelligence, why it happened now instead of then. It is guaranteed to happen at some point.

#### 54 COMMENT

**H**ere Krauss repeats the ideas of the ancient Greek philosopher Epicurus, who assumed that the universe arose without a reason, by itself. Interestingly, Krauss is dismissive of philosophy and behaves as he just hatched from an egg. In fact, in the field of cosmology, he cannot come up with anything fundamentally new; philosophers long before Krauss already said everything. As for the views of Epicurus, they were criticized and refuted thousands of years ago. The spontaneous emergence of the world from non-being contradicts the Principle of causality (see comment 30).

**I**n order to get around this difficulty, Krauss resorts to gross cheating. He says "Our universe come into existence spontaneously ... A universe can give the laws of nature's by spontaneously come into existence." First, it should be said, what is spontaneous? The term "spontaneous" is Latin (Lat. *spontāneus*) and etymologically derived from (*suā*)

sponte, which means “of one’s (own) free will, voluntarily”.

In modern scientific literature, this term is used to characterize the processes that arise as a result of internal causes, without external influence, controlled and directed internally, self-active, self-generated, happening without any apparent external cause, random.

Krauss denies the external (transcendental) Cause in relation to the universe and postulates (asserts without proof) that the universe come into existence spontaneously, i. e. speaks a little veiledly about the internal (natural) cause. However, the fact of the matter is that there are no internal causes in the non-being from which the universe arose. In non-being, there is nothing, no inner potential. Therefore, it makes no sense to talk about spontaneity.

In any case, this is not only a delusion, but also a logical cheating, since the concept of spontaneity is applicable exclusively to the material world, that is, to the already existing universe. If atheists are satisfied with this kind of cheating “proof” (a vicious circle), then all that remains is to shrug and shrug.

Non-being is a metaphysical concept, since “physics” has not yet emerged. In non-being, there is nothing, no potential, no chance. This means that before the emergence of the Universe there is no “world of possibilities”, no spontaneity, no

probability, no statistics, no laws, no conditions, no properties, no scalar field fluctuations and subsequent fluctuations of vacuum (space-time with curvature), no physical quantities or whatever. Therefore, there can be no question of any spontaneity in relation to the emergence of the universe, and, therefore, one cannot talk about causelessness.

As noted above, the Big Bang singularity lies at the intersection of physics and metaphysics. The universe could be called from nonexistence into being only by an act of free will of the Transcendental All-powerful Creator, Who “calls into existence the things that do not exist” (Rom. 4:17). Any other explanation does not stand up to the scrutiny of reason and common sense.

Krauss: Now, if you say, during that creation there are laws one of which Quantum laws of quantum mechanics, which can create a universe, with zero total energy, by the way.

### 55 COMMENT

**K**rauss speaks as if the laws of quantum mechanics existed prior to the emergence of the universe and it was they who “created” the universe. This is yet another trick, a crafty attempt to pull physics “out of the table” and replace metaphysics with it. The laws of matter cannot exist “by themselves”, without matter. No laws of physics could have arisen by chance, without a reason. This follows from the

same reasoning given in the previous comment. The laws of physics could be created by the Reasonable Creator from nothing, as well as the rest of the world. No physical reason could give the initial impetus for the emergence of the laws of physics.

Krauss: And by creating a universe I mean a universe that did not exist there was no space, there were no times and no laws in fact. And then you come and you say, okay if that universe is created spontaneously, it must be created at some time. So, universe must come into existence. In fact, an infinite number of universes could come into existence if time is infinite. Okay. It is certainly possible.

### 56 COMMENT

**I**t seems that Krauss wants to confuse the audience. It is completely incomprehensible how one can look at the universe, where there was no space, there were no times and no laws”? Moreover, how can be decided, “if that universe is created spontaneously, it must be created at some time” if there was no time yet? Time is inseparable from the universe and not infinite, but arose together with the universe.

[1:20:14] Krauss: Then, a universe will come into existence, and you can say, “Let me predict the properties of that universe.” Well, long behold the properties at that universe happened to be exactly the properties of the universe we live in, including the structure of the fluctuations of the cosmic microwave background. The universe and the laws underlying the processes due to which all the galaxies, and all the stars, and, as a result, we are ...The planets, and you and me.

That is explanatory. There is no explanation at that level in anyway in your book!

### 57 COMMENT

**M**oreover, why and why should all this be in the scriptures? After all, they are not books on physics, but written for completely different purposes and in a language understandable to contemporaries. If Moses wrote something about fluctuations in the photon radiation of the universe, then the shepherds would simply twist their fingers at their temples and say, “What is he talking about?”

**W**hen the universe has already arisen, and it already has the laws of physics, all questions related to it can be solved by the methods of natural sciences. However, these methods are not applicable everywhere. For example, a person as Krauss can come to the Art Academy, read a couple of books on art in its library, and then with irritation say to the artists, “Your books don’t say anything how to make a house seismically stable and warm!” They will reasonably answer him, “Of course, they were written for a completely different purpose. With their help, you can learn how to make your home beautiful.”

[1:20:41] Krauss: So the explanation of the universe that could come into existence from nothing without any purpose, without any planning, without any reason is explanatory. Now. Lest I am been misconstrued, that

is just plausible. Because we do not have a full scientific theory.

### 58 COMMENT

**N**evertheless, since there is no comprehensive scientific theory, it would be wise and logical to consider all the possible options. However, Krauss really does not want to consider the option in which the metaphysical First Cause, the Reasonable Person, gives the initial impulse for the emergence of the universe. In this, he demonstrates not a scientific approach, but his spiritual attitude. He has no rational objections and arguments against it.

[1:21:01] Krauss: But to make the claim, as I know you have often made, that because there are certain things we will never understand, is to misunderstand science! There are lots of things we don't understand today and that's reason to go to do science. It is just like Darwin said, you know, he said in *The Evolution of Species*, "I'm describing the evolution of species, I'm not describing the origin of life. We will never understand the origin of life. We will not understand the origin of life before we understand the origin of matter." Well, of course, he didn't realize that one day we would understand the origin of matter.

### 59 COMMENT

**D**id Krauss really understand the origin of matter? Descriptively the origin of both matter and life is explained in the Bible. The metaphysical First Cause, the Reasonable Creator, who "calls into existence the things that do not exist" (Rom. 4:17),

called them out of non-being. Natural sciences, in principle, cannot prove that this is not so. Physics cannot be created through physics (vicious circle), just as Krauss cannot lift itself into the air by the laces of its own shoes. Physicists can study as much as they like the emergence in strong electric fields from “nothing” of pairs of particle-antiparticle and subatomic particles in the Large Hadron Collider. However, all this will in no way be able to bring them closer to understanding the origin of matter (and not its formation)! After all, all experiments take place in the conditions of already existing “physics” — in the conditions of space, time, matter, and existing laws. In addition, it is impossible to annul these conditions in principle, so that no experiments with “emergence from nothing” will ever be staged by physicists. Therefore, to assert (which Krauss does) that there are no things that we will never understand is not to understand the essence of science! Natural sciences have a known field of application, and a real scientist will never try to explain physics that is outside its field of application.

**T**he only experience with the emergence of something from non-being is given to us in the field of metaphysics, in the field of human creativity. The person-creator embodies a certain image or idea in material, music, or word. Nevertheless, he creates them out of absolute non-being. No computer or

artificial intelligence that mimics the work of the human brain, in principle, can have creative abilities. This is a sign of an intelligent person. Therefore, simply by analogy, outside the context of any religion, it will be reasonable and logical to assume that the universe was caused from non-being by the Creator, an Intelligent Person.

[1:21:34] Krauss: Just as I expecting in your lifetime and in my lifetime will understand the origin of Life. We will understand how chemistry turns into biology by doing experiments testing and forcing our predilection that it is impossible. I have a debate, and an opponent said, "It is impossible for non-life to turn in the live!"

### 60 COMMENT

**W**hat is Krauss's hope based on? Probably, again, only on the unwillingness to talk about metaphysics, about God. The atheist communists in the XX century also promised a lot and confidently said that just about, very soon, science will explain all the secrets. However, none of their ambitious promises came true.

**T**herefore, all the promises to see the clue to the origin of matter and life are only the creation of a "smoke screen", an impenetrable atmosphere in which it is not clear what kind of passes scientists like Krauss do with their hands: either they conjure or rummage through our pockets. Huge sums of taxpayer money are wasted on pipe projects of atheists.

Many experiments have also been carried out in the hope of transforming chemistry into biology. However, in a hundred years, not a single attempt has been successful. In any case, experimenters already know what they want to get — this is not an analogue of blind chance in nature. Nevertheless, they cannot even simulate this process.

[1:21:34] Krauss: Well, that is a nice statement! It is a nice believe. And it is a belief you can have, but it's a belief that can be wrong. And that's the great thing about science, which you can call Atheism, if you wish. It is your willing to change your believes. You are not assuming the answers before you ask the question you assuming you know divinely right just because you interpret a certain book to mean a certain thing. And someone else may it interpreted to mean something else. You will agree there different interpretations of every book including the Bible and the Quran. And so you to presume that you know divine truth before you ask the universe. It is not sensible.

### 61 COMMENT

At least the same can be said for Krauss and other atheists. If they were honest with themselves, they might assume that their opinion may well be wrong. However, they have no desire to change their mind, despite the many facts in nature that indirectly point to the Creator (comp.: Rom. 1:20). Likewise, they ignore the obvious fact that historically science developed in religious societies, and believers have made tremendous contributions to science.

However, Krauss stubbornly wants to identify science only with Atheism. This is an example of a bias.

In Christianity, for example, it is not at all necessary to assume that you know the holy truth just because you have interpreted a particular book in some concrete way. This is the path of spiritual search, where doubts and a kind of disbelief occur. Unbelief, like faith, is different (see comment 34). The writer F. M. Dostoevsky was a deeply religious person, but all his life he wondered about theodicy, the problem of the suffering of living beings with the simultaneous mercy of God. Moreover, many saints were often tormented by doubts.

[1:24:39] Krauss: Do you see that photon that lighting you up from that thing?

Tzortzis: Yes.

Krauss: It did not exist before it is emitted by the electron. Okay?

Tzortzis: Yes.

Krauss: It didn't exist. He was not there.

Tzortzis: And you saying, there is no cause?

Krauss: You know ...Yeah, I am saying ...What I am saying is could be physical causes for physical effects.

Tzortzis: Yes.

## 62 COMMENT

**A**theists often say something like that. Wanting to ridicule religion, they come up with some nonsense and laugh at it. They think they are laughing at religion, but in reality they are laughing at their own

stupidity. The causes of physical phenomena can be physical, no one argues with this. In addition, no religion teaches that God “pulls photons by strings.” For example, the Abrahamic religions clearly say that God created the laws of physics, according to which physical phenomena occur.

Krauss: Okay. But they don't need ...But God does not have to pull the photon, it just, the photon appears from nothing, doesn't require something Supernatural!

Tzortzis: I agree.

Krauss: Okay.

[1:25:10] Krauss: So the universe suddenly come into existence where it was not before, it does not require something supernatural!

Tzortzis: I have already give you defeated to the argument that if things begins to exist, they need not require any causes ...

Krauss: Not any purpose ...I just said, if the universe can come into existence by physical causes, where there is no universe begin with, it will happen in some time.

### 63 COMMENT

**T**he words “it just, the photon appears from nothing” are already cheating and forgery. Photon arises in the universe, where there is matter, space, time and the laws of physics. The appearance of a photon cannot be compared in any way with the appearance of the universe. It begins to exist from non-being, where there was no potential for its emergence. Moreover, this requires the attraction of

the supernatural, because nothing “natural” has yet existed! The universe cannot begin to exist due to physical reasons, that is, the laws of physics, since these laws themselves cannot exist outside the universe and should have arisen with it.

[1:25:32] Krauss: And your point was that it happened, and therefore there’s a reason ... which means there is an idea that it happened. Once it happened when it happened. But if this had not happened then, it would have happened at some other time. We moved the conversation to another time ...

Tzortzis: Wait. You are putting words in my mouth. Okay?

Krauss: What did you want to say then?

Tzortzis: I am not saying things like teleology ... — there is a purpose ...

Krauss: Do not use complicated words! Did you not say, “Our universe came into existence for some reason?”

Tzortzis: No, I did not say, “A reason.”

Krauss: Does the universe have a purpose?

Tzortzis: No, I said, “There is a cause.”

Krauss: And why you said, there is Intelligence. You give a whole long argument ...

Tzortzis: That is after using the conceptual analysis that you agreed, we established that there is an Uncreated Creator or a Cause that was Uncaused ...Now ...

Krauss: Forget all that. I just talk about our universe. Are you agreeing with me that our universe have not any purpose or reason to create it?

[1:26:16] Tzortzis: No, of course not! I do not agree with you! That is my argument! My argument is: deductively, was the universe once absent?

[1:26:24] Krauss: Yes.

Tzortzis: Yes. If that is the case, then ontologically, which means by nature, or source of reality, it could not have come into being without a Cause!

[1:26:35] Krauss: Well, well, okay. First of all, I wish ...I hope it's that way. Because in that case, you could understand me. It is possible that is not that way ... Okay? So ...The point is it: maybe time exists outside of our universe. Maybe it does. Let us pretended it does.

And then our universe came into existence and there was a physical cause for that. That is fine. I am fine with that. I am fine with our universe coming into existence for physical cause just like that photon being created.

## 64 COMMENT

Again and again, we repeat in a circle. The trick of Krauss and other atheists is that they “hide in their pocket” some part of the universe in the form of time and the laws of physics, and then take it out like a rabbit out of a hat and declare that the universe arose like a photon. However, in the nonexistence, from which the universe arose, there is neither time, nor the laws of physics, nor anything else “natural”.

[1:27:08] Krauss: But as I pointed out to you, it's equally possible that these notions, that we have in our brains because we're humans living at our classical level, that time exist and there is continuous flow, may breakdown. And if they breakdown at T equal zero, then any sense of the word “cause” becomes

nonsensical. The word “cause” is “red herring” in your terms. It is not worth discussing it may not be relevant to the creation of our universe. Because there may not have been any time before.

And therefore, the notion that every effect has a cause may be irrelevant if there’s no time. Now, I do not know if that is the case, but I am willing to ask the question, and I’m willing to do studies to see if it’s reasonable. I am not willing to presume answer before ask the question.

[1:27:58] Tzortzis: But the point is that presumption is that you require time and that is a specific physical to definition, time.

[1:28:06] Krauss: But time must be taken into account when it started ...Yes, this is absolutely true. Presumption after T equal zero required time, that is absolute true. The presumption required time at T equal zero ...If you took the equations, then there is no time in them.

Tzortzis: I am not going to argue with physics. This is your area.

Krauss: But if you look at the equations, you will see that there is no time. Time has no meaning, at T equal zero.

Tzortzis: Okay. I agree.

Krauss: Great! So, there is no cause ...

## 65 COMMENT

Just a minute earlier, Krauss had said, “perhaps time exists outside of our universe.” Now he is already talking about the fact that time began with the universe. He puts contradictory statements right

next to it. Perhaps Krauss himself does not know what he is talking about.

In commentary 30, we already wrote about two Principles of Causality. None of them includes time as a parameter. It does not matter if it was time or not, the principles of causality apply in any case.

[1:28:24] Tzortzis: I do not disagree with you in physics ...But all that is inductive in nature ...

Krauss: No, it is not. It is based on observations ...

Tzortzis: Which is inductive ...

Krauss: No, no. It is empirical.

[1:28:42] Tzortzis: Okay. What is empirical? Do you have an infinite set of observations? Have you had an infinite set of observations?

Krauss: Now, if you are going to tell me ...I read some in you wrote, which really misrepresented science. But, you are absolutely right if you are going to tell me, "Science can never tell anything with absolute certainty. Except things that are wrong. That is what science can tell!

## 66 COMMENT

**A**ll Krauss's words can be attributed to religion. At least in Christian theology, much, as in science, is based on experience and logic. In addition, in the same way, theology does not undertake to assert anything with 100% probability, except that it is definitely wrong. The statement that the universe could have arisen by chance, without the will of the Reasonable Creator, is precisely wrong.

As for the doctrine of God, it is often expressed in terms of apophatic theology (from Gr. ἀποφατικός — “negative”), that is, by denying all possible definitions of God, as incommensurable to Him, by striving to understand what He is not. Negative theology means that God and His manifestations in the world are spoken of in negative terms and expressions, something like “not this and not this”.

The apophatic method is characteristic not only of Christianity, but also of ancient philosophy. In particular, it is found in the teachings of Plato about ideas, in Neo-Platonism, in the ancient Indian Upanishads, in Judaism and in Islam. Krauss professes the most radical version of apophatic theology (but also essentially religious), which even denies the understanding of God as the Beginning and Creator of the universe.

Tzortzis: I agree.

Krauss: Science can tell that the age of the Earth is not six thousand years. Science can tell us many things ...

Tzortzis: I do not disagree with you.

## 67 COMMENT

The Bible does not say anything with precision and certainty about the age of the Earth and humanity. Since ancient times, attempts have been made to calculate the age of the Earth and humankind based on indirect data from the Bible. However, this is already a wide area of interpretation, and no one can

guarantee that these interpretations are correct. Therefore, chronology can be called “biblical” only using quotation marks. According to Byzantine tradition, Adam was created (or fell into sin) in 5509 B.C. Therefore, 2021 A.D. is approximately 7530 from the creation of Adam.

However, this is not the age of the Earth! The prehistory of the metaphorical six days of creation is not included in this chronology. Even purely etymologically, the word “day” (Heb. יום — Strong’s lexicon number 03117) in Six Days of Creation can mean a period of time of indefinite duration. In the Pentateuch alone, there are four more examples of its use in this sense (Gen. 26:15; 32:32; 38:12; Deut. 4:40). Therefore, there is no reason to assert that the “day of creation” lasted 24 hours, and not billions of years.

In addition, no dating has ever been dogmatized, and if data that are ever more accurate emerge, this will not be a problem for Christianity. In general, the age of the Earth and universe for Christianity is not a matter of principle. The Bible deals with a very different topic. It says why and why the universe was created, what is the purpose and meaning of human life. Natural sciences investigate only the structure of the material world. The scientific picture of the world does not imply such an event as the Fall. Moreover, in Christianity, this topic is one of the most important.

[1:29:17] Krauss: So, the fact, that science can lead us closer to that is the underlying reality. And it is also true, that science cannot say anything with absolute certainty, is that absolute truth, except what's wrong. Okay. And it can say, certain claims, for example, that the Moon split into two, was wrong.

Tzortzis: — Another “red herring”.

Krauss: I know, another “red herring”. But certain people ...

Tzortzis: Not sufficient today ...

Krauss: No, no, no. Some people, as you know, some interpreters thought that was the case. But they are wrong. Do you agree with me?

Tzortzis: — I am making a different point, sir.

Krauss: All I am saying is, “This is a book of words, and you can interpret it many different ways. And some interpretations are wrong.”

### 68 COMMENT

**K**rauss goes off topic, tossing smoked herring. Instead of talking to the point, he has a flatulence attack. More precisely, here Krauss uses a fairly common technique of demagoguery — generalization of the particular to the general. This is done simply: “Some interpreters have written nonsense about the Moon. Therefore, all religions are foolishness, and only science tells the truth.” However, this Krauss argument also misses the point. On the one hand, religions such as Islam or Christianity aim at exploring another universe hidden within a person. If some religious people were engaged in science, the study of the material

world, they did it as scientists, because you can be both a scientist and practice religion. In addition, religious scientists could be wrong as scientists. However, it would be wrong to attribute the mistakes of religious scholars to religion itself.

No one argues with the fact that theologians are sometimes wrong, and their interpretations of Holy Scripture are sometimes wrong. However, this is not yet a reason to criticize the Holy Scripture and religion itself. Likewise, scientists are sometimes wrong. Even venerable eminent physicists have made mistakes that now seem ridiculous. Moreover, this is normal; no one blames them for this. For example, at the beginning of the 20th century, prof. Curie told students in lectures that the atom will never be fragmented. In just a few years, the atom was shattered, and now, in the Large Hadron Collider, atoms are even split into bosons. Nevertheless, Curie is considered one of the leading figures in nuclear physics. The situation is similar in theology.

[1:29:56] Tzortzis: I will address that. And just look, touching on so many different issues, this is a typical strategy of avoiding to respond to a particular point. Look. The point of interpretation, for example. The Quran, for example, if we read the Quran holistically, we will understand that this is probably the only religious book that use the tools of interpretation. For example, Quran says, there are some open-ended verses, ambiguous verses ...So, in linguistics has

intertextuality. Now, therefore, it creates a scope of interpretation ...Yes, I agree, this is interpretation ...

[1:31:13] Krauss: But the Catholic Church accepts evolution, for example. And you are right, the book does not tell you how to interpret it, even though the same ridiculous book of Genesis ...

## 69 COMMENT

**Y**es, Krauss constantly changes the subject, and this is one of the demagogic tricks. There is nothing absurd in the book of Genesis if you read it with an open mind. Only it must be compared not with modern scientific data, but with other cosmogonies of ancient times. Moreover, of course, you cannot treat it like a book on physics. Its purpose is completely different.

**B**esides, to call one of the main books of the Bible ridiculous is rude. The Bible is the most unique book in the world (more precisely, a collection of books). Its total circulation for the entire time of printing is almost four billion copies! This fact alone suggests that it affects the most important aspects of people's lives. Moreover, to ridicule this is a great rudeness.

Krauss: This is nothing unique! You keep pretending as if Islam is unique. I do not see it.

[1:31:29] Tzortzis: Let me do the point at time ...We believe Islam is not unique. We do not believe Islam is unique. We believe that there is the universal message, we believe One True God, and that you cannot fetter yourself in your own ego, and your desires, social

pressure ...Free yourself, free yourself from these! Free yourself from the shackles! And worship the Divine, which give you true freedom! Liberty ...

Interesting the word “rokh”. In the Arabic language means “soul” or “self” and it comes from ...

Krauss: So “soul” or “self”? Which one?

[1:31:59] Tzortzis: Both, in different context. Okay? Let us not be reductionist.

Krauss: Do you want to tell me what the soul is?

Tzortzis: Well, when you die, you find out. Let me just give my point.

[laughter and applause in the audience]

Tzortzis: Let me make my point.

Krauss: This is a very bad explanation. I need something that I can test.

## 70 COMMENT

**M**any things cannot be verified even in physics. For example, the existence of dark matter and dark energy cannot be verified.

[1:32:18] Tzortzis: Listen, I am the Greek, I have to deal with sophistry and rhetoric here!

Krauss: This is what you are doing.

Tzortzis: The point I am trying to say is that the word “rokh” etymologically have the same meaning with word “rokha”, which means “liberty” and “serenity”. And what’s interesting is that, you know, we all want to seek this type of liberty. But the irony is that from an existential perspective, you know, what does it mean to exist “who am I?” we are all in the state of slavery ...

[1:34:16] Tzortzis: I would like to talk about the moral judgments about certain traditions, because in the end

...

Krauss: And by the way, it is not just about Islam. You know, If you want me offend other religions, I am happy to.

Tzortzis: No, I am not saying that, Mr. Krauss. Someone who rationalizing incest have no moral ample grounds point the finger at religions!

[laughter and applause in the audience]

[1:35:05] Tzortzis: And the other point ...Let me finish ...Let me complete the sentence ...So, the point I am trying to say you, prof. Krauss, is this. You know, to accuse something different from your tradition when ... Where is your ontological basis for an objective moral values?

## 71 COMMENT

**T**his is an important question. No matter how hard atheists try, they cannot provide any ontological basis for moral values. Morality cannot be derived from logic and common sense. This is the realm of the human spirit. For details, see comments 44–45.

[1:35:08] Krauss: You know, in fact ...

Tzortzis: Is it objectively wrong with the fact that she is wearing a “bag”? Is it objectively wrong?

[1:35:15] Krauss: I am not said, “It is wrong.” I asked, “If it is sensible?” And so, my question to you, as it seems to me. The given the fact, that I happen in view, women and men as, you know, we have lived differences ...But in every other sense, we are equal human beings. And in fact, in many senses, as you know, there are advantages and disadvantages.

[1:35:34] Tzortzis: We do not disagree with that.

[1:35:15] Krauss: So, I do not see any reason to treat women differently than men. I know, does make sense to me. That is all I say.

[1:35:42] Tzortzis: Okay. Good. So, the point is, when we make moral judgments ...I know we are discussing the degree of reasonableness, but in some cases ...

Krauss: No ...Unlike you, I do not talk about morals. Because I try in this sense ...The question before us is not "Is Atheism moral?" or "Is Islam moral?" but "Is it sensible?"

## 72 COMMENT

**H**ere Krauss let it slip. It turns out that morality has no meaning for him. Moreover, this is already very bad from any point of view.

[1:36:01] Tzortzis: So, why have you spend 25 minutes pointing the finger and make moral judgments ... instead of responding to my arguments?

Krauss: I did not make the moral judgment about your misinterpretation of whether infinity is allowed in physics. I did not make a moral ...I was evaluating in terms of facts!

Tzortzis: I did not say anything like that. I said that it makes sense in physics, because you need the mathematics to correspond the physical reality. I do not disagree with that. I am saying ...

[1:36:26] Krauss: This is very important. You need the mathematics to correspond the physical reality ... Physical reality allow for infinity ...

[1:40:08] Tzortzis: I agree. But then I said, that since we ...Now, we have the best possible explanation. This is Uncreated Creator, or there is the Cause, that was not caused ...

Krauss: Is this the best explanation in your opinion?

[1:40:17] Tzortzis: Because I gave you all the logical explanation ... This is the point, you should be attentive.

[1:40:21] Krauss: No, I have the best explanation: the universe came from nothing by physics.

### 73 COMMENT

**K**rauss says, “The universe came from nothing by physics.” In other words, physics came from nothing by physics. However, this is just a demagogic “vicious circle” trick! This is not proof at all, but a gross manipulation of consciousness. The initial impulse for the emergence of the universe could not have come from physics, simply because there was no physics itself. Physics cannot exist abstractly “by itself”; it is an attribute of the universe. Thus, the source of this impulse could only be metaphysical<sup>1</sup>.

[1:40:22] Tzortzis: But your “nothing”, is it really “nothing”?

Krauss: No space, no time, our universe did not exist. There was no quantum fog, no space, no time; everything we see in this room in which we are sitting did not exist ...

[1:40:41] Tzortzis: When your friend, Alexander Vilenkin, a known cosmologist ...

Krauss: Yes, my good friend.

Tzortzis: A good friend. I mean, I read some of his works, and they are too complex for me ...

Krauss: You know what?

Tzortzis: What?

---

1. More about this look in the comments 10.

Krauss: In fact, Alex Vilenkin, if you read my book, wrote on a similar topic. He wrote about a creation of space from no-space.

#### 74 COMMENT

**I**n one version of the well-known trick of getting a rabbit out of an “empty” top hat, the secret lies in the hat itself, which has a flap insert flap. It fits with the edges to the wall and freely reclines during the performance of the trick. The rabbit is hiding under the valve. So the hat only seems empty to the audience, in fact, the rabbit is already hidden in it.

**M**etaphorically, we can say that cosmologists are doing something similar. For example, in the theory of the quantum creation of the universe, it is postulated that the universe arose from an unreal quantum field, from a purely mathematical abstraction, called by A. Vilenkin “literal nothing”<sup>2</sup>. This mathematical “literal nothing”, due to a wonderful spontaneous fluctuation, was able to give rise to a pseudo-real particle, representing the embryo of the future universe. In addition, she, in turn, with the help of quantum tunneling overcame the barrier separating the abstract mathematical world from the physical reality!

**H**ere, too, the secret of the theory lies in the fact that the laws of physics are recognized as existing even before the birth of the universe. However, the

---

<sup>2</sup>. Vilenkin A. Creation of universes from Nothing//Phys. Lett. Vol. 117B, # 1, 2, 1982. P. 25–28.

laws of physics by themselves do not exist outside the universe; they are an attribute of the material universe. Thus, cosmologists simply hide a certain “part” of the universe in a “secret pocket” invisible to the viewer, and then take it out like a rabbit from a hat.

[1:40:58] Tzortzis: Yes, I agree. Recently he has mentioned that there is a space-time boundary. Right?

Krauss: No.

Tzortzis: What has he said?

[1:41:08] Krauss: You know, we can talk about the details of the instant-on that he described. But, in fact, there is no space at the central point ...

Tzortzis: Okay. My main point is that this evidence suggestive of an evidence, which I would call far more strong, they has great epistemic value, because they has great epistemic value. Because you admit to the inductive method does not lead to certain conclusions. While the deductive method leads to certainty ...

Krauss: You misunderstood me ...

Tzortzis: No, if the premises ...

Krauss: I can be sure that something is false. Right?

Tzortzis: I agree, but, Krauss, if the premises are sound and the logic is valid, it is too certain ...You still have to prove to me ...

Krauss: What if the world around you does not obey your logic?

Tzortzis: Yes, but prof. Krauss, you still have to prove to me, that the deductive logic I used is unsound or no valid. And you haven't done that.

Krauss: You do not understand my evidence, but I brought them.

## 75 COMMENT

All these controversies can go on forever. In general, this is what happens when people do not see the boundaries of different concepts. Both participants in the debate almost immediately dodged the main topic. Basically, the question was discussed, “Do the data of natural sciences correspond to the data set forth in the Quran and other religious books?” Atheists always strive to turn the conversation into this area. It is a pity that Tzortzis went to play on a foreign field. In fact, atheism and science are two different things. Moreover, discussing whose logic is more correct is completely counterproductive. Concepts such as morality, good and evil, virtue and vice, love and hate, do not obey any logic. This is what should have been spoken about.

[1:41:58] Moderator: Okay. I am really sorry to interrupt you, prof. Krauss, Hamza, you going at it hammer and tongs but is a whole bunch of guys who want to have a say. Okay. Okay guys.

[1:42:16] Audience [holding Krauss’s book *A Universe from Nothing*]: Okay. My first question is to prof. Krauss. This is just to sort out so the whole thing you are talking about. I just opened up your book, and it says, “Nothing is something.”

[1:42:29] Krauss: That is the title of the chapter<sup>1</sup>.

Audience: Yes, this is the title of the chapter ...May I ask my second question now? Your whole book is based

---

1. Lawrence M. Krauss. *A Universe from Nothing*. 2012. Chapter 9. Nothing is Something.

on mathematics. And mathematics, as you know, is based on deduction.

Krauss: No, it is based on evidences. Based on observation data.

Audience: Okay. And you use mathematics through your book, and you say, deductive ...

Krauss: Show me the equations in my book. Show me the equations. Are there equations?

Audience: Yes, they are.

Krauss: One or two in a two hundred page book ...

Audience: Okay. Let me ask my question. My first question was, you said, “Nothing is something.” Secondly, you said, “Deduction does not work.” And math is based on deduction.

Krauss: Yes, but I said it may not work.

Audience: No, no. You said, “Deduction does not work.” And your book is full of mathematics and deduction. Mathematics is based on deduction. It is actually good introduction to logical fallacies!

## 76 COMMENT

**Y**es, the audience quite rightly noticed that Krauss’s book illustrates logical errors well! By the way, in the aforementioned chapter 9, Krauss writes, “The laws may be eternal, or they too may have come into existence, again by some yet unknown but possibly purely physical process”<sup>1</sup>. In other words, Krauss claims (as always unfounded, of course) that the laws of physics created themselves! This logical fallacy is called a “vicious circle”!

---

1. In the same place. P. 145.

In addition, with the help of the assumption of some “unknown but possibly purely physical process” you can explain anything at all. Nevertheless, even this does not remove the main question: “How did physics arise?” Moreover, a 200-page book hardly makes sense if Krauss answers the main question in two words: “We don’t know.”

[1:43:23] Krauss: Okay, good. I think, of course, all this rhetorical things so ridiculous. But okay. I like catchy phrases. And when I was said “Nothing is something” (it is the chapter title). My position, many philosophers do not understand it, I guess, but in any way ... “Nothing” is a physical quantity. It is not a philosophical quantity. It is not an imaginary quantity. “Nothing” in physics is the absence of something. So, therefore to understand what “nothing” is, you first have to ask the question, what is “something”? And to do that, requires a lot of work. It is required all work of the 20th century, a lot of bright people, experimenters and physicists. So, that I’m trying to do is explain what we mean by “something”. So, that people could actually learn what we mean by the absence of “something”. I tried to be very clear and accurate. So, it was just, in fact, I wasn’t trying to convince people of anything. I was just trying to explain it. The point is that in physics “nothing” is the absence of “something”. So, to understand what the absence of “something” is, you have to describe it. You have to know what “something” is to know what the absence of “something” is. First.

## 77 COMMENT

**K**rauss argues that “nothing” is a physical quantity without any grounds, premises and without evidence. There was no physics before the universe! Krauss is simply engaged in sophistry and demagoguery! It is necessary to use the correct terms. The universe arose not from “nothing”, but from non-being (Lat. *ex nihilo*, Gr. οὐκ ἔξ ὄντων). Non-being is absolute non-existence, the denial of any existence (any of its forms), and the denial of any physics in the broadest sense of the word. It lacks any essence, potency, inner law and anything else. No concepts of not only physics, but also even abstract mathematics are inapplicable to it!

**The** concepts of “spontaneity”, “probability”, “fluctuation”, which are often manipulated by quantum cosmologists, are applicable only to the material world. For example, heavy atomic nuclei spontaneously split into lighter ones. The reason for this process is that the core is unstable energetically or otherwise. It simply has to disintegrate when time tends to infinity. Decay time can be talked about in terms of probability, and the apparent randomness strictly obeys the corresponding distribution function. However, all this happens in a world where there is space, time, matter and the laws of physics. However, in nonexistence there are no processes, laws, even potential ones. Therefore, the

concepts of spontaneity, randomness and anything else are inapplicable to him.

*Atheism is a Religion of Unbelief*

**M**any theologians have noticed that atheism is a kind of religion. However, when atheists are told about it, they laugh and twist their fingers to their temples. “What religion? We do not believe in anything! Atheism is religious nothing,” say atheists. Nevertheless, let them listen to prof. Krauss, and let the atheist Krauss listen to himself: “Nothing is something.”

**Y**es, atheists deny metaphysics, but this denial is of a metaphysical nature. For example, in mathematics, zero is “nothing”. However, zero belongs to numbers, and it plays a significant role in mathematics. A “metaphysical zero” is also metaphysics. Atheism, on the other hand, can be not only a “metaphysical zero”, but have a “metaphysical module” even much greater than zero.

**F**or example, the first atheistic state, the USSR, was very similar to some theocratic state in its worst manifestations. The prohibition of “heretical” literature (that is, not atheistic), the persecution of dissidents, and much more took place in the atheist state on a much larger scale than in some theocratic ones. Philosopher S.L. Frank wrote, “Russian nihilism is not at all simple disbelief, it is belief in disbelief, a religion of denial.” These words fully

apply to atheism: atheism is belief in unbelief; it is a religion of unbelief.

One of the first laws of Soviet power was the Decree on the Separation of Church from State and School from Church<sup>1</sup>. At first glance, it simply proclaimed the principle of separation of the state from any religious organizations, similar to what was customary at that time in the USA, France, and Switzerland. However, in its details there was a fundamental novelty hidden. According to the Decree, no religious societies had the right to own property, did not have the rights of a legal entity (clause 12), and all their property was declared national (i. e., actually state) property (clause 13). The teaching of religious beliefs was prohibited in all state and public, as well as private educational institutions (paragraph 9). Thus, the Decree outlawed all religious organizations, that is, it declared war on them. In fact, for 70 years in the USSR there was a war with religions. It was sometimes hot, bloody, sometimes cold, hidden, but it never stopped. At the same time, atheists always lied to representatives of other countries that

---

1. The decree on the separation of Church from state and school from Church was adopted by the Council of People's Commissars of the RSFSR on January 23, 1918. It entered into force on February 5, 1918, after being published in the "Gazette of the Workers and Peasants' Government". On its basis, open persecutions of religious organizations began. The decree was canceled only on October 25, 1990.

there was no persecution of religions in the USSR. Is this lie reasonable?

In 1925 the Union of Atheists was created<sup>2</sup> later renamed the Union of Militant Atheists, and there was such a thing as “militant atheist”. Ask a person who has armed himself and says about the war, “With whom is he going to fight?” If he answers, “With the one who does not exist”, then you can diagnose “schizophrenia”. However, schizophrenia is ill one by one, and militant atheists create entire armies with “artillery” and “tanks” of mass propaganda and state repression. Of course, there may be “non-militant” atheists, but this simply speaks of their passivity, and not of the absence of some kind of metaphysics in their worldview. Likewise, there are Christians and Muslims who believe “within themselves” and do not follow the

---

2. In 1922, the newspaper “Bezbozhnik” began to be printed in Moscow. In 1924, the Society of Friends of the Atheist newspaper was established. At the first congress of this society in 1925, it was decided to create a single All-Union anti-religious society, which received the name “Union of atheists”. The monthly scientific and methodological journal “Anti-Religious” became the printed organ of the Central Council of the Union of Atheists of the USSR. In 1929, the second congress of the Union of Atheists was held in Moscow, at which the organization was renamed the Union of Militant Atheists. At the congress it was decided to create a children’s “godless” — the organization of Young Militant Atheists. Periodicals appeared: the newspaper “The Godless”, the magazines “Godless”, “Antireligious”, “Militant Atheism”, “Young Atheists”. They were published in many languages of the peoples of the USSR. Atheists also invented new, non-religious holidays and rituals. The Union of Militant Atheists was officially dissolved in 1947 in connection with Stalin’s change of internal policy.

religious precepts of their denominations. Here are some examples of atheist wars.

*Metaphysics in the Field of Culture*

**E**xplaining what atheism is, Krauss said [00:36], “We do not choose to believe that stuff, because it is not sensible.” Oh well. Indeed, everyone has the right not to believe what seems to him unreasonable. Nevertheless, there are things that have at least a moral, aesthetic, and didactic meaning. For example, people watch feature films, read plays by Shakespeare, “The Three Musketeers” by A. Dumas, “War and Peace”<sup>1</sup> by L. Tolstoy, books by Jules Verne and others. It would never occur to anyone to laugh at all this, create caricatures, and prohibit them on the pretext that these works do not correspond to the data of history and natural sciences.

**T**he Bible occupies a special place not only in Christianity, but also in the culture of many countries. Outside the biblical context, it is impossible to understand many masterpieces of literature, music, painting, and sculpture, even those that were not at all intended for church use. However, in the USSR, the Bible and other religious literature repeated the fate of religious organizations.

---

1. “War and Peace” it is an incorrect translation of the title. The correct translation should be “War and World”.

At various times, a hot or cold war was fought against it<sup>2</sup>. Is it reasonable?

Atheists say that the Bible is absurd, is a collection of myths, and in general it is all nonsense. In this case, it would be reasonable and logical to print it as much as possible, study it at school, make it available to everyone so that everyone can see and learn this nonsense. Then Christianity will disappear by itself. Nobody wants to follow stupidity. However, the atheist communists demonstrated only their stupidity and metaphysical hatred. In the very first years of Soviet power, crude cartoons of the Bible were published — “The Bible for Believers and Unbelievers” by Yemelyan Yaroslavsky and “Funny Bible” by Leo Taxil. The Bible itself was practically inaccessible to the general reader before the collapse of the USSR.

---

2. Some people remark that even in the “better times”, during the Synodal period, relatively few copies of the Bible were printed. However, this comparison is completely wrong. In pre-revolutionary times, church education was widely available. Most of the content of the Bible was transmitted orally. In addition, there were many books by St. Fathers and other church literature, from where one could get biblical teaching. Therefore, the small number of copies of the Bible was not very critical. Of course, it was necessary to publish the Bible, but this was hindered by disputes about translation, that is, the fear of introducing distortions. This is another big topic that has no place here. After the revolution, the situation was completely different. Religious education was prohibited, and there were very few active temples. Therefore, there was an urgent need for the publication of the Bible and other Christian literature, but the authorities in every possible way prevented this.

In the 1920s, the authorities reduced to a minimum the importation of religious literature from abroad and its printing within the country. On March 11, 1931, the import and sale of the Bible was prohibited in the USSR. The New Testament and the Bible have become the objects of a real hunt by the special services. “The organs of the OGPU-NKVD even confiscated the Bibles legally published in the USSR in the 1920s”<sup>1</sup>. If someone kept the Bible at home, without even reading it, just as a memory of his grandmother, then he could easily be exiled to the camps for many years. By the way, atheists do the same in our time in North Korea.

During the Second World War, Stalin, under pressure from circumstances, was forced to ease the persecution of believers and even decided to create a puppet Moscow Patriarchate at a “Bolshevik pace”. Therefore, the ROC MP was created (and not recreated) by a directive of the People’s Commissar of State Security of the USSR in September 1943 and the entire Soviet period was completely controlled by the Council for the Affairs of the Orthodox Russian Church under the Council of People’s Commissars of the USSR.

---

1. Savin A.I. The Bible in the Soviet Union: to the history of import from abroad, publication and distribution/Савин А. И. Библия в Советском Союзе: к истории ввоза из-за границы, издания и распространения//Исторический курьер. 2020. № 2 (10). С. 33–50. URL: <http://istkurier.ru/data/2020/ISTKURIER2020-2-03.pdf>

In 1948 the American Bible Society proposed to send to any part of the USSR 100 thousand copies of the Bible, 200 thousand copies of the New Testament and 500 thousand copies of the Gospel<sup>2</sup>. Then several more times the Americans sent or tried to send tons of religious literature to the USSR. In the USSR, all these gifts were accepted with hypocritical gratitude, and then destroyed. Only a small part, about 3%, was transferred to the Moscow Patriarchate.

In 1956, the Russian Church was finally allowed to print the Bible in only 25,000 copies. Then the Bible was reprinted several more times in 1968, 76, 79, 88. It is not possible to find out the real number of printed copies, since in the USSR everything was built on total lies. If the books brought as a gift by kind Americans were blasphemously destroyed, then it was even easier to print fewer copies than indicated in the circulation. In general, it is impossible to draw conclusions about the facts of Soviet history from Soviet documents, since what is said in these documents may have nothing to do with the real state of affairs.

---

2. More look in the article: Savin A.I. The Bible in the Soviet Union: to the history of import from abroad, publication and distribution/Савин А.И. Библия в Советском Союзе: к истории ввоза из-за границы, издания и распространения//Исторический курьер. 2020. № 2 (10). С. 33-50. URL: <http://istkurier.ru/data/2020/ISTKURIER2020-2-03.pdf>

Even after the “legalization” of the Bible, thanks to its official publication in 1956, sometimes-even seminarians could not get a personal copy. The Bible was not available in all regional libraries. Atheist scholars working in the humanities could be acquainted with the Bible only in the reading rooms of libraries (without the right to take it out of the hall) and only with a written request from the place of work. Moreover, they experienced such difficulties for purely atheistic purposes — for their denunciations and the search for all sorts of “inconsistencies”. At the same time, the myths of Ancient Greece or the countries of Southeast Asia, any fantasy — all this was widely available to everyone.

However, is there any rational meaning in these prohibitions and restrictions? Is it sensible? Krauss likes to say that the main question is “what is more sensible?” In addition, he himself answers, “It is what produces more rational actions” [1:14:38]. Nevertheless, the war of atheists against the Bible (and in general against the Holy Books of various religions) is absolutely unreasonable and irrational. It has a metaphysical (in fact, religious) nature. Atheists love to accuse Christians of the Inquisition, of censorship that created an index of banned books. Yes, all this was in ancient times (however, not thanks to, but contrary to the Gospel). However, what the atheists who came to power did was, in

fact, also a kind of Inquisition, in its worst, fanatical forms. Therefore, in this respect, atheism is no different from religion.

*Metaphysics in the Social Sphere*

**T**he worst and most insane deed of the atheist communists in the USSR was total terror against religious people, a bloody struggle against any dissent. The chairperson of the Union of Militant Atheists, Emelyan Yaroslavsky, defined the vector of atheists' activities in the following way, "The working masses must crush the main class enemy acting under a religious shell. It is time, finally, to put an end to the actives of priests, rabbis, mullahs, evangelists, preachers of all kinds, shamans, sorcerers and other parasites lurking on the body of the USSR, but in reality they are a terry counter-revolution that has not yet got to Solovki ..." This is such a monstrous lie, that Hitler and Goebbels could envy her.

**I**n principle, there was no class antagonism between the main religions that existed in Russia and the communist ideas of social structure. The first Christian communities were ideal "communist communes", the Jesuit republic in Paraguay (1610–1768) was essentially communist. A large number of seminarians, clergymen, and children of priests initially supported the socialist revolution in Russia in 1917.

It is just as absurd to suspect Buddhists of any class struggle. Certainly, they could not be a “double-sided counter-revolution”. However, atheist communists plundered and destroyed Buddhist datsans and places of worship, arrested believers, destroyed their sacred relics, and blew up temples. All this had nothing to do with politics.

The real essence of the conflict was the metaphysical atheist communists’ Atheism. They themselves provoked believers to resist, leaving them no other choice. Destruction and plundering of churches, destruction of cultural masterpieces, blasphemy, and desecration of shrines, mass executions of priests and much more cannot be considered a manifestation of reason and common sense.

Atheists call religions myths. However, even with this approach, if you do not believe in the myths, they can be considered useful for didactic purposes. For example, children believe in Santa Claus, in the real existence of fairy tale characters. Nevertheless, adults are not worried about this deception: the children will grow up, they will understand everything themselves. Why didn’t atheists prove their case by the methods of science, with the help of rational arguments? According to their own statements, if ignorance disappears, religions disappear. Then why didn’t they convince only

through education, why did they resort to violence?

Rationally, even if religions are myths, they are often useful (even for an atheistic state) myths. They motivate to love your neighbor, to do charity work, to work honestly, not to steal, not to kill, not to commit any crimes. For the state, there are solid benefits in all this. Atheists say that religion is the result of ignorance and delusion. However, neither one nor the other is a crime. Then why did the atheist communists turn the majority of the country's population against themselves by organizing a bloody anti-religious terror? Therefore, it was not only in Russia, but also in many other countries. This is absolutely unreasonable, it makes no rational sense!

The history of atheism bears witness to its metaphysical nature. He, just like many religions, sometimes wages a "hot" war with other religions, sometimes a "cold" war, and sometimes coexists with them relatively peacefully.

#### *Bias in Science*

An unbiased scientific approach obliges to consider all possible variants of the origin of any phenomena. For example, let us say Krauss has a significant amount of money in his bank account. He could receive royalties for a book, receive financial aid from sponsors, or win the lottery. It would be

completely unreasonable to consider only one and the most incredible option — winning the lottery. Nevertheless, this is exactly what atheist cosmologists do about the origin of the universe.

**A**theists say that the existence of God is not proven (by scientific methods), and therefore it is impossible to mention God in scientific discussions. However, in science, too, many things are not proven, but are formulated inductively. For example, such fundamental laws of physics as the first and second laws of thermodynamics (the law of conservation of energy and growth of entropy) are not proven in any way. It is just that no one has ever found any exceptions to them.

**N**evertheless, in the same way it is possible to formulate the Particular principle of causality (the phenomenon of creativity): everything that arose out of non-being arose due to the creative act of a person who has free will. No one has ever discovered any exceptions to this law. Moreover, physics could not have arisen with the help of physics (this is a vicious circle). Therefore, it makes sense to say that the initial impulse for the emergence of the universe had a metaphysical cause.

**W**hy, then, do cosmologists come up with many hypotheses of cosmogony, one more improbable than the other, but never say anything about a possible metaphysical First Cause? The creation of the universe by God does not contradict any laws of

physics. Therefore, scientific honesty requires saying about this, at least as one of the possible options. Nevertheless, atheists never do that. Such a bias in the field of science is unreasonable, irrational, and has a purely metaphysical reason — the unwillingness for God to be, opposition to everything that says about Him.

### *Atheism as Religious Plagiarism*

**W**ise King Solomon wrote, “Is there a thing of which it is said, “See, this is new”? It has already been, in the ages before us” (Eccl. 1:10). Modern atheism is not a new word in history, but willy-nilly, with small variations, repeats what religious people have already said.

In ancient culture (from Rome to Babylon), the term “atheism” had an “accusatory” character. The wording “atheist” was used in criminal law as an accusation of not honoring the “state” gods, that is, of high treason. It did not matter whether the accused worshiped any other gods or not: everyone who did not recognize the gods of the official state cult was called atheists.

**T**his is why the Romans accused Christians of atheism<sup>1</sup>, because biblical monotheism rejected Roman polytheism. Emperors Nero and Caligula staged massive, sophisticated executions for

**1.** Dawkins’ joking slogan “atheists for Jesus” may make sense if by atheists we mean those who reject pagan deities and any form of idolatry.

Christians in Rome, calling them atheists. On the other hand, Christians said to pagans who worshiped idols that they were atheists (ἄθεοι — Eph. 2:12), because they do not know the true God. At that time, no one was surprised that representatives of one religion accuse representatives of another religion of Atheism. It's just that in the ancient world the word "atheist" was considered a strong abusive expression, synonymous with "wicked", "fool" and "madman" (Ps. 14:1).

As in ancient times, some religions criticized other religions, declaring the falsity of the concept of God in them, so do atheists. For example, there is a lot of Christian literature denouncing superstition, idolatry, demonolatry, etc. Modern atheists write very similar texts in many ways. They could even just quote Christian books, but for ignorance or for ideological reasons, of course, they do not do this, but they write almost literally the same thing. Often, the image of God that they criticize and ridicule is unacceptable for Christians.

For example, in a conversation with the atheist A. M. Goldberg, Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh asked him, "In what God do you not believe?" When he outlined his ideas about God (roughly coinciding with the distorted ideas of Krauss), the metropolitan

said, “I think that I cannot say anything against denying such a ‘god.’”<sup>1</sup>

However, much more often atheists criticize not the concept of God itself, but religious institutions, practices and behavior of believers. In this respect, they also do nothing new. Different religions constantly criticize each other’s practices. In addition, within one religion, there may be different trends, branches, and confessions that criticize each other.

Unfortunately, atheists often confuse the concept of God, and religious teaching, and religious institutions, and practices, and rituals. However, there can be a very large distance between them. Moreover, it is very difficult to understand this without special education. For example, when talking about Christianity, they often talk about the Church. However, despite the fact that this concept is one of the most important in theology, there is still not even an unambiguous definition of the Church, which would not raise questions and criticism. Many people believe that Christianity and the Church are the same. Nevertheless, in reality, this is far from the case, especially today. The church is both a hospital, and the patient himself, and a part

---

1. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh. Dialogue between a believer and an unbeliever. A series of conversations aired on the BBC’s religious program in Russian in 1972. Anatoly Maksimovich Goldberg (1910–1982) was an employee of the BBC’s Russian service.

of society (one of its institutions), and a part of culture.

The prophets and Christ Himself also denounced the Old Testament institutions. Moreover, the Apocalypse, written at the end of the 1st century, criticizes the seven Churches of that time. And then, throughout history in the depths of Christianity, zealous Christians, to the extent of their understanding, denounced the historical Church, denounced the substitution of Christ by the Church<sup>1</sup>. The most paradoxical thing is that the Church (which is defined as the “organism of love”) persecuted, tortured, and persecuted not only the Gentiles and heretics, but also even the saints. Moreover, Christ was crucified not by atheists, but

---

1. Church historian Eusebius of Caesarea (265–340) describes the state of the Church before the start of the persecution of Diocletian, “And this complete freedom changed the course of our affairs: everything went somehow, by itself, we began to envy each other, shower each other with insults and just, on occasion, do not grab a weapon; the primates of the Churches — to break verbal spears against each other, the laity to rebel against the laity; unspeakable hypocrisy and pretense reached the limit of vileness. God’s judgment, as usual, spared us (the meetings were still being arranged) and directed us, without extreme measures, to meekness ... As if having lost all understanding, we did not worry about how to propitiate God; as if the atheists, believing that our deeds were not an object of care and concern, we did evil after evil, and our imaginary shepherds, discarding the commandment of piety, with all their fervor and fury got involved in quarrels with each other, multiplied only one thing — envy, mutual enmity and hatred, strife and threats, aspired to power as eagerly as to the tyranny of the tyrant.” Church History, VIII, 78.

by the religious leaders of the Old Testament Church.

During the Synodal period, the Seminaries of the Russian Empire taught criticism of Catholicism from Protestant textbooks and criticism of Protestantism from Catholic textbooks. Moreover, critics of Orthodoxy in Russia took as a basis both Catholic and Protestant books against Orthodoxy. The atheists did not have to invent anything new; in fact, they simply plagiarized. However, if Catholics, Protestants, or Orthodox Christians were wrong about something, then this means that they were wrong, and it does not follow at all that atheists are automatically right. If atheists have found a lie somewhere, this does not mean that metaphysical truths do not exist.

However, the atheists have come up with something conditionally new. They began to teach that all nature and man arose thanks to impersonal materialistic laws and are completely dependent on them. There is a similar idea in Hinduism, which speaks of the impersonal laws of karma. Atheism denies metaphysics, but the irony is that the nature of this denial is metaphysical.

*Metaphysical Motivation for Atheism*

**A**s mentioned above, religions were criticized by religious people. Atheism simply took this criticism to the extreme. Many of the leaders of atheism were raised in a Christian culture. Darwin, Marx, Stalin are the most famous, but there were many like them. However, in their struggle with religion, they experienced a kind of metaphysical motivation, caused by disillusionment with Christianity. Quite a lot of books have been written about this<sup>1</sup>.

**M**aybe they decided to reject church institutions, wanting something more definite, solid, something that “always works”? Indeed, church history gives reason to think about it. Some believers have said thousands of prayers, observed church fasts for many years, read the Gospel hundreds of times, confessed and started church sacraments countless times, and the result is zero. In ordinary life, in moral terms, they are no different from completely unbelievers.

**P**erhaps the disillusioned people simply reached a dead end, relying only on church institutions. People come to such a dead end when they try to shift the burden of their freedom and responsibility onto something, onto someone. God gave man the opportunity to cognize the world, self-realization, and creativity, so that he could do good and grow in

---

**1.** Daniil Andreev wrote about Stalin’s mystical experiences in *The Rose of the World* («Роза Мира»).

love. At the same time, there is no need to experience any mystical sensations. It's personal relationships that matter.

[1:44:33] Krauss: Secondly, mathematics is mathematics. You are absolutely right. But physics is not mathematics. I did get degree in mathematics and I did degree in physics. I learned I was not a mathematician. And more importantly, I learned many of my the best mathematician colleagues are not physicists.

### 78 COMMENT

**T**his sentence of Krauss is reminiscent of an anecdote about the Indians, when one of them, named Eagle Eye, saw the obvious. A school course in mathematics and physics is more than enough to understand the difference between them. It is strange that Krauss needed to get a degree for this.

[1:44:48] Krauss: Because the universe, the way the physics works is that we make mathematical models of reality. But we do not to say that they are right. We say, (in fact I, do wrong all the time) that most of them are wrong. I said on a good day, trying to make a mathematical model that explains reality and do not test it, at 99.99% of the time it is wrong. Because that is the way, science works. And it didn't work that way anymore you could do it. So, it's not inductive in the sense. The mathematics is a useful language. In fact, is the only useful language to describe nature is far as we can tell.

## 79 COMMENT

**W**hat does “the only natural language” mean? Mathematics is an abstract science, an absolutely artificial language. It is based on postulates that people come up with arbitrarily. Complex numbers, Euclidean or Riemannian geometry are examples of this. In some area, mathematics can adequately describe reality, but in some not. A. Einstein said, addresses to Prussian Academy of Sciences (1921), “As far as the laws of mathematics refer to reality, they are not certain; and as far as they are certain, they do not refer to reality.”<sup>1</sup>.

[1:45:22] Krauss: But we do not to say ...Mathematics can describe an infinite number of universes. You know, you could write mathematical descriptions of an infinite number of universes. Most of them are not our universe. The way we determine if they are our universe, is we do an experiment. Science is experimental. Without experiment, pure thought leads nowhere. If you lock a particle physicists in a room and ask him to come up with the theory of reality without any experimental observation, he come up with wrong answer.

## 80 COMMENT

**I**t is quite rightly said, “Science is experimental. Without experiment, pure thought leads nowhere.” That is why there are limits to scientific knowledge,

---

<sup>1</sup>. Quoted from: [https://todayinsci.com/E/Einstein\\_Albert/EinsteinAlbert-MathematicsAndReality.htm](https://todayinsci.com/E/Einstein_Albert/EinsteinAlbert-MathematicsAndReality.htm)

if only due to the impossibility of setting up an experiment in a number of research areas.

For example, people will never 100% reliably know what is inside the Earth, and why the temperature is stable and constantly high there. It is simply impossible to drill a well to magma, because any material melts. In addition, there is a horizontal displacement of the drill. The Kola (Russia, Murmansk region) superdeep well with a depth of 12,262 m holds the record for drilling depth. The temperature at this depth is 220 °C. As for the Earth's core, its temperature is estimated at  $5960 \pm 500$  °C.

In addition, in many other areas of research, it is simply impossible to experiment. Without experimental observation, theories can be completely wrong! This applies primarily to those models of cosmogony that claim that the Universe arose by chance, without the will of the Creator! You can juggle the formulas of mathematics as much as you like, but from the point of view of physics it is incorrect to talk about what happened in the beginning, at  $T=0$ . Physics itself did not exist at  $T=0$ . Therefore, it does not matter if the physicist is in a closed room or in open space. In any case, no experiments in this area are possible, not only technically, but also theoretically — after all, it is impossible to “turn off” physics and simulate conditions at  $T=0$ . Therefore, one can speak about

the beginning of the universe only from the point of view of metaphysics.

[1:45:48] Audience: Okay. You did not answer the question. You just repeated. Yeah. You said, "Deduction doesn't work ..."

Krauss: No, I did not say that!

Audience: Let me just repeat the question, you did not understand the first time. Right? You said, "Deduction doesn't work," and your book has mathematic ...So I want to ask you, "What is deduction?" That is my question, "What is deduction?" I have studied mathematics at University and I think that you do not know what it means. What is deduction?

[1:46:16] Krauss: You know what ...Let me just say this. Okay. You could make definitions of things; I can try to figure out how the universe works. I will make progress and you will sit here.

### 81 COMMENT

**A**nother demagoguery from Krauss. Generations of scientists have worked on clear and unambiguous definitions. Science does not work at all without unambiguous definitions. How can you neglect them? Even in this brief debate, Krauss is often confused about definitions, showing a much-distorted view of science.

Krauss is making obvious strides, not in understanding how the universe works, but in publishing his books in huge print runs in many languages, thanks to the atheist lobby. However,

readers of these demagogic books, as Krauss put it, flush their time down the toilet.

[1:46:31] Moderator: Okay. Thanks very much. Next question, please.

Audience: My question is for Hamza. It is about what he said about science and Islam ...Embryology and the Quran ...

[1:47:20] Tzortzis: First point is ...Essay was written not to show that the Quran give science ...It basically says, than the Quran is very general, most places concerning science quite ambiguous. In Islamic theology ...

Only someone very silly is going to find quantum physics and embryology in the Holy Book. That is not the divine; that is not the will of the Creator.

[1:47:52] Krauss: And the same can be said about the Bible.

## 82 COMMENT

**Y**es, the same can be said about the Bible. The Bible speaks of the creation of the universe not for the sake of transmitting any scientific knowledge, but pursues a spiritual goal. The authors of the Holy Books sought to show that the universe had a beginning, and therefore the world (nature) is not God. This was important in exposing pagan religions that deified nature. If the Bible says something about the universe, about nature, then spiritual goals are pursued, and not at all scientific.

[1:47:54] Tzortzis: Yeah. It is not a scientific book. Matn ash-Shaatibiyya, a theologian, said, "Look. This book the Quran is there to make you think about the most

important questions about life. Quran i? Whose am I? Why am I? Who am I?" These existent questions ...

So, the point I am trying make, from embryology perspective, it is to show, not that the Quran is scientific per say. But that its language is not represented in 7th century science. That was my main point. So it's good nothing to do with the fact ...

[1:48:28] Audience: So, there is no science ...

Tzortzis: No, why should it be? ...

[1:48:38] Tzortzis: In some cases, there is, but not in terms of here are the details. It is not like ...

[1:49:48] Tzortzis: We have understood what science is. This is why I wrote the essay ...We misunderstood evolution. I am not denying the science of evolution. I just go tomorrow academics on the philosophy of science. And there are issues, like the problem of hard and of weaknesses of empiricism, the problem of induction, falsification, and so far. So, from that perspective, I think, you misunderstood the point of the paper ...

[1:50:13] Krauss: Your paper suggests, that evolution was not tested by enough experiments, as well as scientific ideas of gravity or quantum mechanics. We make new drugs based on it. In fact, the evidence of evolution makes evolution a fact.

### 83 COMMENT

**A**s expected, we are talking about evolution. These two themes, the emergence of the universe from “nothing” and evolution, are the main arguments of atheists. They argue that the universe was born by chance because of a hypothetical spontaneous Big Bang, and life on Earth just as accidentally

originated, and because of evolution, all kinds of living beings and humans arose. At the objections of religious people, atheists angrily exclaim, “Do you deny the evolution that science has proved?”

This is a double lie of atheists. First, no one denies the proven facts. Second, there are many inconsistencies in both the Big Bang theory and the doctrine of evolution<sup>1</sup>, and in addition, science cannot prove some key points in principle. The so-called “singularities” of the origin of the universe, the emergence of life on Earth and the origin of moral, spiritual qualities of a person are “blind spots” for the natural sciences. Natural science methodologies do not allow one to say anything with certainty about these singularities, nor to conduct experiments<sup>2</sup>.

The fact that the very idea of the emergence of physics (the universe) with the help of physics is absurd has already been said more than once. Many books have been written about the problems of evolution<sup>3</sup>, therefore, here we restrict ourselves to only brief remarks.

---

1. For example, the Hubble Space Telescope has shown that the background relic radiation is too uneven to be considered an echo of the Big Bang.

2. More on these look singularities in the book: К. Г. Волкодав. Эволюция: тёмная сторона самого грандиозного шоу на Земле. Т. 1/Серпухов, 2016. С. 47–62.

3. For example: К. Г. Волкодав. Эволюция: тёмная сторона самого грандиозного шоу на Земле. Т. 1/Серпухов, 2016.

Evolution was known thousands of years before Darwin. From time immemorial, people have been engaged in plant breeding and breeding useful animal breeds. This has never been a problem for any religion. Darwin himself considered his idea to be only one of the possible interpretations of the Bible, which, in his opinion, is in better agreement with the observed facts. He objected to the concept of separate creation of each kind, not to creation in general. Even at the end of his days, in the last, sixth edition (1872), *The Origin of Species*, he declared, “I see no good reason why the views given in this volume should shock the religious feelings of any one ... A celebrated author and divine has written to me that ‘he has gradually learnt to see that it is just as noble a conception of the Deity to believe that He created a few original forms capable of self-development into other and needful forms, as to believe that He required a fresh act of creation to supply the voids caused by the action of His laws.’”<sup>1</sup>. And he ends this book with the words, “There is grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one; and that, whilst this planet has gone cycling on according to the fixed law of gravity, from so simple a beginning endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been, and

---

1. Charles Darwin. *The Origin of Species*. London, John Murray, 1872/Chapter XV. P. 422.

are being evolved.”<sup>2</sup>. Later, in 1876, Darwin enthusiastically wrote about the success of the main work of his life, the book *The Origin of Species*, “Even in the Hebrew language, an essay appeared<sup>3</sup> about it, proving that my theory is contained in the Old Testament!”<sup>4</sup>

Many clergy and theologians did not see anything contrary to the Bible in Darwin’s book. For example, the English physicist and theologian, professor of geometry and at the same time the parish priest Powell Baden (1796–1860), who was also engaged in optics and thermal radiation, recognized Darwin’s description of evolution in nature as the main argument in favor of Divine Providence!

In 1996, in his Message to the members of the Papal Academy of Sciences, Pope John Paul II, referring to the encyclical *Humani Generis* (August 12, 1950) of his predecessor Pope Pius XII, stressed that “if the origin of the human body comes through living matter which existed previously, the spiritual soul is created directly by God”<sup>5</sup>. In fact, the Pope

---

2. Charles Darwin. *The Origin of Species*. London, John Murray, 1872/Chapter XV. P. 429.

3. Book by Naftali Halevi from Radom (Poland) «Toledoth Adam» (“Generations of Man”), which the author sent to Charles Darwin in 1876.

4. Дарвин Ч. Воспоминания о развитии моего ума и характера (Автобиография): Дневник работы и жизни/Пер., и коммент. проф. С.Л. Соболя. — М., 1957. С. 132.

5. Pope John Paul II 22 October 1996, Message to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences: on Evolution. Eternal Word Television Network [Электронный ресурс] — URL: <https://www.w>

did not say anything new. He was referring to the concept of theistic evolution, which has long been held by many theologians to interpret the first book of the Bible, Genesis<sup>1</sup>.

Lamarck, who created a holistic theory of the evolution of living nature 50 years earlier than Darwin did, divided the question of the origin of man into two parts: the origin of the body and the origin of human spiritual qualities. On the one hand, the body of great apes is very similar to the human body, and one could assume a similar way of the appearance of these bodies. On the other hand, self-awareness, intellect, conscience, creativity, spiritual aspirations, etc., cannot be the result of evolution, no laws of nature lead to them. They could appear only with direct Divine participation. Atheists seized on the first half of Lamarck's idea, deliberately ignoring the second, much more important. Lamarck ends the first part of his work "The Philosophy of Zoology" (1809) with the words: others"<sup>2</sup>.

Many religious people have made significant contributions to the study of evolution. For example,

ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp961022.htm (дата обращения: 11.05.2018).

1. In the same Epistle to the Academy of Sciences, the Pope refers to the treatise of Thomas Aquinas "The Sum of Theology", written at the end of the XIII century.

2. Lamarck. Philosophie zoologique, 1809/Ламарк Ж.Б. Философия зоологии. Том 1./Пер. с фр. С. В. Сапожникова. — М.-Ленинград: Биомедгиз, 1935. С. 279.

the eminent English biologist, anthropologist, naturalist, and geographer Alfred Russel Wallace<sup>3</sup>, who developed the doctrine of natural selection before Darwin and expressed the same ideas as Darwin in *The Origin of Species*. He also made a significant contribution to the taxonomy of wildlife, describing a number of zoological taxa. Darwin was very worried that the fame of the discoverer might not go to him, but to Wallace. However, unlike Darwin, Wallace never doubted the existence of God. The abbot of the Augustinian monastery, Gregor Johann Mendel, formulated the laws of inheritance, named after him. This was a discovery of great importance and the first step towards modern genetics. One of the “founding fathers” of the Synthetic theory of evolution (STE) was Feodosiy Grigorievich Dobrzhansky<sup>4</sup> — Soviet and American geneticist<sup>5</sup>. While working with atheist students, he remained a believing Orthodox Christian and even received a doctorate in theology from St. Vladimir’s Seminary in Crestwood<sup>6</sup>. Another Orthodox geneticist-evolutionist

---

3. Alfred Russel Wallace (1823–1913). More about him look in the book: К. Г. Волкодав. Эволюция: тёмная сторона самого грандиозного шоу на Земле. Т. 1/Серпухов, 2016. С. 107–112.

4. His mother, Sofia Vasilievna Voinarskaya (1864–1920), was the daughter of a cousin of the writer F.M. Dostoevsky.

5. In 1937 he published the book “Genetics and the Origin of Species”, which became one of the most significant works on STE.

6. Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia, New York.

Yu. P. Altukhov also carried out significant research in the field of evolution.

[1:50:26] Tzortzis: Okay. I even addressed to that.

Krauss: Yeah. I try to read it and it seem to me that you were suggesting, but anyway ...I may have misunderstood it. I am willing to agree that I may have misunderstood it ...

[1:50:42] Moderator: We go to the next question, please.

Audience: My question is to prof. Laurence Krauss. First, let us not confuse science and the Atheism. As you will agree that science does not logically entail Atheism. It is methodologically neutral. Therefore, my question is this: "Science, been empirical method, based on observation and experimentation, can never answer metaphysical questions, such as, the existence of God. So, here's what I would like to know. In theoretical reasoning about whether God exists, how do you have already deduced for yourself the answer, presumably based on reason? Therefore, how do you prove your belief empirically? How can you say common sense or nonsensical? Please. Thank you very much.

[1:51:29] Krauss: Very good question! Okay. I should clarify that. This is a very good question. So, yeah ...Let us applaud! Let me try clarifying this. I want to again emphasize it. Atheism is not a belief. Okay? It is not a belief. As a scientist, I do not believe anything. As a scientist, I do not believe anything. If you were used the word "belief", scientist should not use the word "belief".

## 84 COMMENT

**D**ebates often shied away from the topic, discussing science and religion rather than Atheism and Islam. Krauss constantly mixed atheism and science using demagogic techniques. Now one clear question puts everything in its place. Atheism does not follow from science. Indeed, among atheists there are many completely ignorant people who are very far from science. Therefore, all of Krauss's previous reasoning is absolutely wrong. For Krauss, it was like a verbal knockdown. He even took a break to collect his thoughts. Once again, Krauss avoids answering a specific question, chatting it up and moving the conversation to another area.

**N**atural sciences will never be able to answer metaphysical questions, and therefore do not logically entail Atheism. These are completely different areas. In the same way, art does not follow from science. Therefore, for greater clarity, we will give an example from the field of art. If several physicists are asked to evaluate a painting, piece of music, poem or sculpture, whether this work is a masterpiece or has no special value, one of the physicists will be able to give the correct answer, someone wrong. In any case, their answers will not be related to science, will not be based on the laws of physics or the theorems of mathematics. In the same way, when a physicist chooses a future wife, he does not think about quantum mechanics, about

the theory of probability (if he is sane). In all such cases, people make their personal choices based on empathy, on a kind of metaphysics. Thus, they no longer make their choice as scientists.

Similarly, if any physicist talks about metaphysical things, then he does not speak as a physicist, and it does not matter what regalia and academic degrees he has. What matters is how much he understands metaphysics. In this case, it is clearly seen that Krauss does not understand metaphysics at all.

[1:51:56] Krauss: There are things that are more likely and less likely. In fact, if you think about what Hamza said, science can say nothing with absolute certainty. Because it say, something is very very likely whether something is very very unlikely, based on the evidence of experience and testing ...Okay. And so, the question is: "What is more likely?" That is all atheistic saying. And the atheist just saying, "Look ..." The first thing they're say ...I mean people who claim they are atheists ...

### 85 COMMENT

**A**t the singularity point at  $T=0$ , physics does not exist, and there is no physical concept of probability. Therefore, nothing can be said about the likelihood of the Big Bang. Natural sciences cannot describe singularities at all; they are outside their field of application. Metaphysics can talk about this, but also not in the language of probability theory. She speaks of free will that the initial impulse for the

emergence of the universe from nothing was given by the free decision of the Reasonable Creator.

It is noteworthy that both Krauss and other atheists categorically refuse to consider this option, although it is quite reasonable (there are analogies in human creativity) and does not contradict any laws of physics.

[1:52:31] Krauss: By the way, you know, more scientists do not think enough about God to even know that they are atheists. Because God is irrelevant. God never comes up in any scientific conference, in any discussions, anywhere ...It does not ...Because, in fact, we are just trying to figure out how the universe works.

### 86 COMMENT

Once again, Krauss is, to put it mildly, wrong and contradicting himself. In his scientific book *A Universe from Nothing*, there are only 200 pages, and he talks about God more than 60 times! When studying such issues as the origin of the universe or life, at the conceptual level, scientists quite often talk about God both at conferences and in discussions.

On the other hand, Krauss improperly mixes scientists and atheists. For some, the question of God is not important, but for others it is very personal. Below Krauss admits that among his colleagues there are good scientists who believe in God. Why is Krauss in charge of all scientists? Religious people, too, have never included God in

formulas when studying nature. This is not required. God established the laws according to which the universe works. It's another matter if a scientist tries to figure out how the universe, nature, the laws of physics came into being. In this case, to say that physics created itself would not be at all convincing. Therefore, metaphysics is needed.

Physics conferences do not speak not only about God, but also about music and about painting. These are completely different topics, unrelated to the question of how the universe works. God is not a part of nature, but its Creator and transcendental to it. Therefore, it would be absurd to speak about Him in the language of physics.

[1:52:43] Krauss: You are absolutely right also to the fact, that I want to express one more time, that science, (and I may sliding difference with my friend Richard Dawkins about this) ...Science does not require Atheism. And the proof of that is empirical. Since I believe empirical proof. I have several colleagues of mine who are very scientists and not atheists. Therefore, since they are very good scientists and also not atheists, science does not require atheism!

### 87 COMMENT

Science does not require an atheist scientist — Krauss reveals the obvious. Science has developed for thousands of years in religious societies. Religious people developed it. Often, one and the same person could be a prominent scientist and

religious figure. One did not interfere with the other. All modern Academies are named after the religious and philosophical community of Plato<sup>1</sup>. The great ancient geometer Euclid was a follower of Plato's school. Pythagoras of Samos is not only an outstanding mathematician, but also a mystic, the founder of the religious and philosophical school of the Pythagoreans. Educational institutions in Europe were most often founded either by monastic orders or by the episcopate to train clergy. For example, at Oxford University in England and at the Sorbonne in France, theology was one of the main disciplines. Archbishop Leo the Mathematician of Thessaloniki at the beginning of the 9th century founded the Magnavr High School, which soon became the University of Constantinople. They taught there: rhetoric, grammar, dialectics, arithmetic, astronomy, geometry, music, geography, medicine, history, different languages, philosophy, chemistry, physics, biology, etc.

Many thick books have been written about the contribution of believers to science<sup>2</sup>. For example,

1. In Athens, the philosophical school-community of Plato (Academy) was a religious union of the guardians of the sacred grove of the hero of the Academy with admirers of Apollo and the muses. On the other hand, the Platonists considered their religious and philosophical doctrine to be the highest science, giving knowledge, which is the meaning, goal and condition of man's salvation from suffering and death.

2. Hundreds of examples of deeply religious scholars are given in the book: Henry Morris. Biblical Foundations of Modern Science.

William Derem, an Anglican priest, physicist, chemist, astronomer, and physician, conducted extensive scientific research; William Wewell — Anglican priest, theologian, philosopher, historian of science, professor of mineralogy and generally versatile scientist<sup>1</sup>; Nicola Louis de Lacaille — French abbot, astronomer, geographer, mathematician, optician; Giovanni Battista Godierna — priest, astronomer, philosopher, physicist, botanist; Berthold Schwarz — German Franciscan monk; Gregor Mendel is an Augustinian monk, abbot, Austrian biologist and botanist. Detailed information about their work can be found on the Internet.

You can enumerate for a long time the glorious names of clergy-scientists, and among the children of the clergy there are even more scientists. We have already mentioned the great German mathematician Bernhard Riemann<sup>2</sup>, son of a Lutheran pastor. Moreover, for physics, only Christian Nikola Tesla did a thousand times more than the atheist Krauss! Nikola Tesla was the son of an Orthodox Serbian priest and was going to follow his father's example, but it did not work out. In any case, he never doubted the existence of God. Nikola Tesla is rightly considered "the man who invented the 20th

---

1. He invented and introduced the use of the term «science» and «scientist».

2. Riemann, Georg Friedrich Bernhard, 1826–1866.

century.” He is widely recognized for his contributions to the creation of AC devices, polyphase systems, a synchronous generator, and an asynchronous electric motor, enabling the second phase of the industrial revolution. He invented the first AC motor and developed the technology for generating and transmitting alternating current. Tesla is known to compete with any inventor or scientist in history. According to unconfirmed reports, he destroyed information about a number of his inventions, because he feared that they could be used for military purposes, and already at the beginning of the 20th century, there was a tendency for the degradation of the moral level of society.

[1:53:04] Krauss: Now. People can contrariety ideas at the same time. That is one of the reasons. But science can never disprove purpose in the universe.

### 88 COMMENT

**I**f opposite ideas coexist in the mind, and then this is a mental pathology. Krauss, like other atheists, does not understand that natural sciences and metaphysics cannot be in conflict — they are different fields. Physics deals with the material world, and religion with the metaphysical. Therefore, there can be no conflict between them, as between physics and music.

For example, A. Einstein, besides physics, also loved music, played the violin. However, this does not mean that opposite ideas coexisted in his mind.

In the same way, any scientist (and in general a person of any profession) may adhere to the concepts of any religion, or may not believe in anything. This is spiritual choice. Science has nothing to do with it.

[1:53:13] Krauss: All we can ask is just giving the evidence of our observation. I think it is more likely, that is a personal God, That cares about this random planet, a random galaxy in the middle of millions galaxies in the universe, which everything we see is just 1% of the whole universe. If we remove all galaxies except ours and everything else, the universe will be just as large, and we will remain the same cosmic pollution. It seems ridiculous to imagine, for me play some everything I see in my common sense, to imagine the universe was created for me. That is all.

### 89 COMMENT

**S**ome of the reasons for the disbelief of Krauss and other atheists are erroneous “common sense” and misconceptions about God. Common sense can be wrong. A. Einstein remarked very correctly, “Common sense tells us that the Earth is flat.” Likewise, faulty common sense prevents Krauss from believing that the universe was created specifically for humans. Krauss, like many other people, concocts an erroneous image of God in his fantasies, creating God in his own image and likeness. By the way, in Christianity there is a prayer: “Lord, help me get rid of every false image of You, no matter what it costs me ...” Such prayers and

Apophatic theology (negative theology) are aimed at not creating a false image of God in your imagination.

From the point of view of human common sense, logic, utilitarian approach, doing unnecessary work is unreasonable. Krauss thinks it is unwise to create many galaxies if it was enough to create only one. However, God is not man (Num. 23:19; 1Kin. 15:29; Hos. 11:9) and does not follow human logic (comp.: Is. 55:8). God has no difficulty in anything, “For he spoke, and it came to be; he commanded, and it stood firm “ (Ps. 33:9; Ps. 148:5). It makes no difference for Him whether to create one galaxy or hundreds of millions. And if at least one person comes to amazement at the realization of the scale of the universe, and touches his heart at the thought of how great God is, who brought many galaxies from non-existence (non-being) into existence, then, from the point of view of God, an increase in scale will not be superfluous<sup>1</sup>. If God is not stingy in creating galaxies in abundance, then it is easy to agree with Scripture, “What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the human heart conceived, what God has prepared for those who love him” (1 Cor. 2:9).

---

<sup>1</sup>. In the mid-1990s excursions to the Pulkovo Astronomical Observatory were organized for students at the St. Petersburg Theological Seminary. They were conducted by the famous professor-astronomer physicist Sergey Anatolyevich Grib, and at night, with the observation of the starry sky through a real telescope. Seminarians were shocked and delighted with what they saw.

On the other hand, we can say that the “extra” galaxies were created by God with the rational purpose of giving the universe some necessary properties. One of the greatest physicists of the 20th century, W. Heisenberg, described an amazing phenomenon that remains one of the deepest questions of science. This is the appearance of new properties in the whole when the parts are added. Of course, the universe, which consists of many galaxies, has certain properties that would not exist in a “simple” universe consisting of one galaxy. Even if a person cannot observe most galaxies, their existence can play a role in the anthropic principle, since thanks to them, the universe acquires new properties (and it does not matter that we do not know about them yet).

[1:55:40] Krauss: Let me make this clear, because it could be a real difference and it should just represent our fundamental differences. You do not believe that your beliefs should conformed at the evidence of reality.

Tzortzis: No, of course not.

Krauss: Okay. Good.

Tzortzis: Krauss! You just even agreed that science itself, which we love and we think is a mercy from the Divine reality to use ...There are even lines that clearly indicate that in cognition we must use reality and being empirical ...You have assumed that empiricism itself would lead to understanding of reality, absolutely. You yourself agreed ...

Krauss: No, no, no. Nothing absolute! I have always said, “Plausible, likely, unlikely.” That is the way. The whole question is, “What is more sensible?” And the point is, once again I said empirically: a thousand religions. You are atheists for 999 of them; I am just an atheist for one more.

## 90 COMMENT

**H**ere Krauss himself puts atheism on a par with religions.

*Metaphysics of Good and Evil, Freedom and Suffering*

**K**rauss has said more than once that atheism is an attempt to find out “what make sense? what is more sensible?” [00:37; 1:35; 1:55], and everything that atheism says can be described by the phrase, “This is unlikely to be true” [00:36]. Such an approach can be productive in the natural sciences, for the study of nature, but it would be a big mistake to extend it to absolutely everything. This is the most primitive obscurantism — looking at the world through a narrow hole. With this approach, it is impossible to explain art, love, good and evil, human passions, the problems of religions and much more.

**T**he inner spiritual world of a person is a kind of whole universe. Physics and chemistry, biology and mathematics cannot adequately describe it. Having no theory or conceptual apparatus for studying this universe, atheists resort to simplification. Therefore, the entire inner life of a person, which religious people call spiritual, atheists reduce only to the

work of the intellect. This means that such concepts as good and evil are for atheists a kind of “correct” operation of a “computer” in the brain, or some kind of mental error. Belief in the correct, “scientific” algorithm has actually replaced belief in God.

Nevertheless, this simplistic approach is refuted by many facts. Human behavior is ontologically fundamentally different from the behavior of animals and from the work of any artificial intelligence. A dog that has bitten a child who tried to pet her is not imprisoned by anyone — it is useless. The category of morality in relation to the animal world is not applicable. Nevertheless, a person, unlike animals, according to Christian anthropology, has an image and likeness of God, moral and spiritual potential. Therefore, a person who has harmed another person is judged and imprisoned, and not sent to study at the University so that he grows wiser. Even the most intelligent and highly educated person can be an evil genius. Only a pure heart (not mind) correctly distinguishes between good and evil.

However, atheists have no other language, no other tools, other than fruitless talk about correcting the errors of the intellect. The only effective means of atheists are control, laws, and restrictions, so that a war of all against all does not start in a society of civilized egoists. Now the secularized world is turning into a global lunatic asylum, or into a global

concentration camp. Human rights become fiction. At every step, a person is being watched, fearing that something might turn out, that the citizens might have illegal intentions. Anyway, attackers will always find a way to get around obstacles. Social problems are rooted in metaphysics and cannot be solved by any technical means.

Thus, atheism offers a one-sided and counterproductive approach. It is not enough just not to do evil. We still have to do good. To do good without expecting any praise or reward for it, and even in secret, just for the sake of good (comp.: Matt. 6:3–4). However, atheism cannot offer any rational motivation for this.

Total surveillance and restrictions on freedom lead to global misfortune for people. After all, the secret of a person's inner spiritual life lies in the fact that the vector of all his aspirations and desires is directed towards greater freedom. Consciously or subconsciously, a person always wants to increase the degree of his freedom in a broad sense. Freedom is metaphysical happiness. For the sake of freedom, a person is often ready to make any sacrifices and suffering. For the sake of possible release, the prisoner digs a tunnel with his hands, endures physical pain, and overcomes the fear of being killed for trying to escape.

However, it is not only in prison that a person can be not free. From time immemorial, people spoke of

the prison soul (Ps. 142:7), of bondage to passions and vices (John 8:34). In modern society, perhaps more than ever before, a very large percentage of people are subject to various addictions. But not all addictions are treatable with psychotraining and pills. Without studying the metaphysics of consciousness, you can build a colony on the Moon and Mars, but you cannot make people on Earth happy, build a society on the principles of love and kindness.

Modern technologies open up great opportunities; their broad prospects are simply inebriating. Therefore, people, not having a solid spiritual foundation of metaphysical truths, are restless in life, not knowing what to do with themselves. They make capricious, contradictory decisions and flounder in the mud of vague feelings, moods, and desires. People “freed” from metaphysics turn out to be slaves of empty and unnecessary pseudo-freedom. Now you can freely change your gender. What is next? Soon it will be just as free to sew on yourself a monkey’s tail and donkey ears. Someone will say, “Why?” Moreover, someone will say, “Well, I like it.” Thus, freedom in the atheistic doctrine turns out to be ontologically unjustified.

True freedom does not consist in constantly changing your opinions, living according to your whims, and serving yourself as the center of the universe. Freedom is not to seek your own happiness

and well-being, avoiding suffering in every possible way. Freedom is expressed, first of all, in perfect inner wholeness, in the formation of the personality, in dedication and love. There is no need to demand from God, from people, from the world “give”. In addition, one must say, “take it.” Take my creativity, kindness, and love. Figuratively speaking, this is the “humanity in man”. Serbian Patriarch Pavel said, “We do not choose either the country where we will be born, nor the nation in which we will be born, nor the time in which we will be born, but we choose one thing: to be human or non-human.”

[1:56:33] Tzortzis: This is precisely my point. Why did I, therefore, use an empirical inductive method to true what I believe certain? ...

So, if I believe something is so certain, as the existence of the Divine, and the miraculous nature of the Quran, I am not going to using inductive method which is speculative and probabilistic, which, you would even agree, ranges from 0 to 99%. I would have to rely heavily on what you would call other method epistemic routes to knowledge, such as deduction. And they are sensible.

[1:57:04] Krauss: What might be said, “Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence.” And the claim, that you are absolutely certain of the truth, what you personally are absolutely certain of the truth, is a remarkable claim. And the evidence was not ...

[1:57:24] Tzortzis: I am absolutely sure of the basic truths. And this is could epistemic foundationalism.

Krauss: I do not have that presumption, I am not so presumptuous.

Tzortzis: Well, you have say the presumption, that induction works ...That is fundamentally not true.

Krauss: No, I do not have a presumption, that I know the truth ...

[1:59:31] Tzortzis: Okay. The interesting thing is: your very statement is a metaphysical statement. It could be translated metaphysically. For example, induction is the only way, the only method to use to trying establishing our reality. That statement is self-defeating. It cannot be proven by empiricism! It is inductive statement! So, the point is ...I give example ...It is almost crude ...

Krauss: I do not claim to know it is valid just by knowing it ...

Tzortzis: No. But you have to by virtue the statement in itself. Because is almost like you presenting this crude scientism or logical positivism ...

## 91 COMMENT

*Relativity of Atheist Evidence, the Problem of Suffering*

**K**rauss with great self-confidence denies the existence of God, although he does not, and in principle cannot have, for this, sufficient scientific evidence. This is a metaphysical question, and for its solution, it is necessary to go beyond physics. Based on materialistic data alone, one can form a false picture of reality. Plato spoke about this in his metaphor about shadows in a cave. W. Shakespeare beautifully expressed it, "There are more things in

Heaven and Earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy.”<sup>1</sup>

Willy-nilly, the atheist Vladimir Nabokov in his novel *The Gift* gave a good example of the relativity of atheist evidence. In one of his stories, he narrates that an elderly man dies after a serious illness in a room with closed shutters and painfully decides the question: is there anything there after death or not? Finally, tired of doubts, he answers to himself, “... ‘Of course, there is nothing afterwards.’ He sighed, listened to the splashing and murmur outside the window, and repeated with extraordinary clarity, ‘There is nothing. It is as clear as it is raining.’ Meanwhile, outside the window, the spring sun played on the roof tiles, the sky was thoughtful and cloudless, and the upper tenant was watering flowers along the edge of her balcony, and the water gurgled down.”<sup>2</sup>

This story metaphorically refutes the so-called “scientific evidence” of atheists. It seems to be clear and obvious that it is raining — the noise of falling water drops is heard. However, in reality, there is no rain — there is the sun.

Seeing that there is a lot of suffering, disease, and various kinds of evil in the world, atheists often say, “If God existed, would He allow all this?” For

1. W. Shakespeare, *The Tragical Historie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke*.

2. Nabokov V.V. *The Gift*/Набоков В.В. Дар [1938]. Гл. 5//Собр. соч. в 4 т. Т. 3. М.: Правда, 1990. С. 279.

example, the atheist physicist Alfred Kastler said, “If I were the Creator, I would find, it seems to me, an opportunity to create the world without its progress being based on destruction and suffering.”<sup>1</sup>

Believers also see and understand all this. The prophet Isaiah writes, “The treacherous deal treacherously, the treacherous deal very treacherously” (Is. 24:16). However, once you open the shutters, remove the blinders of Atheism, and the picture will be completely different. God is not the culprit of evil, not the culprit of suffering. Evil and sin in the human world occur because of free will, which itself is good. Moreover, suffering and its meaninglessness are the weapons through which the devil fights against God and against humanity. Moreover, humanity throughout history is trying to unravel the mystery of suffering. This topic is one of the most important in many religions, and atheism often speaks about it.

Christianity, unlike everything else, does not try to save a person from suffering (in this age), but gives it meaning. On the one hand, the secret of evil is associated with the secret of free will (of both people and other creatures — the angelic world and the

---

1. Alfred Kastler (1902–1984), 1966 Nobel Prize winner for his research in optics. Quote from a conversation with French philosopher Christian Chabanis on the book: Chabanis C. Dieu: existe-t-il? “Non” respondent P. Anquetil, R. Aron, Ch. Boule... Paris: Fayard, 1973.

animal world). On the other hand, Christ teaches people not from somewhere high, but He Himself becomes at the epicenter of suffering, pain, death and even “God-forsakenness” (Matt. 27:46; Mark 15:34). Through suffering and death, Christ defeated the devil and paved the way for people to be resurrected from the dead. In his life, each person chooses for himself whether his suffering will have meaning (in a Christocentric perspective), or it will remain in vain and meaningless.

In a Christ-centered perspective, all “the sufferings of this present time are not worth comparing with the glory about to be revealed to us” (Rom. 8:18) in the next age, where there will be a new heaven and a new earth, “where righteousness is at home” (2Pet. 3:13). God loves man so much that for his sake he went to extreme self-abasement — incarnation, suffering and death on the Cross. At the same time, He will ask each person at the Last Judgment: “What have you done to help your neighbor, to reduce evil and suffering in the world?” (comp.: Matt. 25:31–46)

[2:00:08] Krauss: Not using words!

Tzortzis: Okay. Then you use words it is great, but I cannot do that.

Krauss: I do not think have used very much jargon at all. If I did, I apologize.

Tzortzis: Okay. Scientism is (I will define it for you) the persuasion science is the only way to full concludes about reality. Okay. That statement itself is, once,

self-defeating, because science cannot prove that statement. Secondly, science itself, that statement itself is incorrect, because science cannot prove mathematical truths. Also it cannot prove ontological truths. It cannot prove moral truths, historical truths. If you study epistemology ...

### 92 COMMENT

**K**rauss, of course, used special vocabulary. He talked about the Pi number, spontaneity and fluctuations of the background cosmic microwave radiation. Not every person is obliged to know about this. However, interestingly enough, Krauss preaches the concept of scientism, but does not know what scientism is.

[2:00:40] Krauss: Yes, where did you get the idea that science cannot prove? Wait, how do you know that it cannot prove historical truths? How do you know that it cannot prove moral truths? You make assumption ...

### 93 COMMENT

**S**cience cannot confirm much. A real scientist knows this very well. For example, there are K. Gödel's incompleteness theorems, which prove that it is impossible to fully cognize it from within the system, that is, there are statements that cannot be proved or refuted. This sets the boundaries of knowledge, both for mathematics and for all sciences using mathematics.

[2:00:47] Tzortzis: Okay. Let me make a point. How do we know Aristotle existed?

Krauss: There is lots of evidence.

Tzortzis: Okay. Let me give a piece of evidence that I know. We know him through Plato. Okay?

Krauss: It's highly likely we know that from science.

Tzortzis: Okay. Let me make my point. Even anyone study epistemology, which is the study of knowledge and beliefs ...You know that the majority of what all these people know is based on non-empirical evident ... is based ...Let me finish ...

Krauss: — I understand that they could be wrong. Aristotle may not have existed ...

### 94 COMMENT

**M**ay Aristotle not have existed? What is Krauss saying? There is evidence about Aristotle, there is evidence about God. However, Krauss stubbornly denies both, simply out of a desire to deny everything. This desire itself is metaphysical; it is not the voice of reason at all.

[2:01:14] Tzortzis: Yes, but this is what you are missing, sir. I am trying to show you that there are other sources of knowledge. Such as so testimony, for example.

Krauss: What testimony?

Tzortzis: Authentic and valid testimony.

Krauss: Oh, my goodness! You really believe in testimony as proof ...Do you really believe that?

Tzortzis: But, prof. Krauss, the whole ...

Krauss: Do you really believe if I say that something happened?

[2:01:36] Tzortzis: Go to the berkeley website on the scientific method. It says, "One of the majority ..."

Krauss: I do not sit on websites, I just do science!

Tzortzis: Okay! It is very great! Now, listen to the science ...The berkeley website says, "The key part of

the scientific method is also the works of other scientists.

[2:01:52] Krauss: You should test it, test, you do not trust, and you repeat their experiments, because you do not trust ...That is way science works.

Tzortzis: I agree. But there is a lot of science of other people's results requires ...

Krauss: Do not trust other people's results.

Tzortzis: Excuse me, sir, but there is a lot of science requires testimony, yeah?

Krauss: What?

Tzortzis: Lots of science.

Krauss: What?

Tzortzis: Okay. I give an example. Have you done every possible experiment concerning evolution?

Krauss: No.

Tzortzis: So, you believe it is true. Thank you very much! ...

Krauss: — I do not believe in anything!

Tzortzis: Excellent!

Krauss: I think, based on the evidence of my experience and everything I see in the world around me, that evolution is highly likely. That is what I would call a fact. Unbelievable highly likely ...Even I have never been in space, although I would not mind. I believe the Earth is round because ...

## 95 COMMENT

**M**oreover, other people's testimonies must be taken into account, and repeated experiments to confirm the results are essential. However, both are relative. In both cases, there may be errors. These are really two problems of epistemology. A scientist simply

cannot physically check all the stages of science and is forced to believe the testimony of other scientists. However, it is possible that they could all be wrong. In addition, simply due to physical limitations, it is impossible to double-check all experiments (some of which can last for years). Moreover, in some cases, it is possible that some experiment will refute everything. As A. Einstein said, “No amount of experimentation can ever prove me right; a single experiment can prove me wrong.” This once again confirms the argument that natural sciences cannot prove everything.

[2:02:54] Moderator: — I believe in gender equality. And the only woman wants to ask a question in the room right now. Let us do it.

Krauss: — I applaud you for that.

[2:03:05] Audience: I would like to talk about the incident that happens before this even began. I had a run-in with a brother who could not find the seat when he was coming from. But, I believe that he has the right sit where he wanted to. But, that has been some misunderstanding. In the Islamic tradition, equality is very important ...But the issue here was not one of superiority, as no one impose segregation upon him. And he was also allowed to sit in the front with females. But as some of us, some of the ladies, chosen to sit at a distance from the men, why must he impose himself upon us. If I sat in a restaurant with my friends away from men, would it be appropriate for him to join me at my table too? And I am basically offended by his disrespect for my values ...

[2:04:15] Krauss: Let me respond instead of the organizers. Look. The point is, as I said, I do not think people should be uncomfortable. Okay? And they should move if they are uncomfortable. However, you chose to come to an event that was not segregated. If you felt uncomfortable by that, I think, you have the right not to be here and watch it on video. But you chose to do that. And therefore if you know a ...And I realize, that you may be uncomfortable. I respect that. You should not be forced to do that. But if you choose to go to a hockey game or a what do they call a football game (which is really soccer) then you subject yourself to the social conventions of the time. So, I respect your desires and I don't want you be forced to do. And in fact, you should have moved away if it was offensive. But, the point is that this was a non-segregated event, and you knew that coming in. And you dare for were subjected to the possibility they might be there someone. And that was your choice.

### 96 COMMENT

**A**sksed by Krauss about the torturing of sinners in hell<sup>1</sup> you can answer by paraphrasing his own words — in any case, it was their choice. There is no will of the Heavenly Father for at least one person to go to hell (comp.: Matt. 18:14). For his part, God did everything to prevent this from happening. Nevertheless, God does not limit the freedom of will and spiritual choice of a person.

---

1. Look at comment 52, chapter “The last judgment is not about faith, but about humanity.”

On the topic of choice, Yuri Levitansky wrote the following poem in 1983:

Everyone chooses for himself  
Woman, religion, road.  
Serve the devil or the prophet —  
Everyone chooses for himself ...

## CONCLUSION

This debate is very characteristic. They followed in line with many other similar debates. Krauss often used tricks of demagoguery, sophistry, and contradictory statements. All this speaks of a certain direction of will, of the desire to adjust the solution to the “necessary” answer. This is what fanatical atheists do, about whom Einstein wrote, “Then there are the fanatical atheists whose intolerance is of the same kind as the intolerance of the religious fanatics and comes from the same source. They are like slaves who are still feeling the weight of their chains which they have thrown off after hard struggle. They are creatures who — in their grudge against the traditional ‘opium of the people’ — cannot bear the music of the spheres. The Wonder of nature does not become smaller because one cannot measure it by the standards of human moral and human aims.”<sup>1</sup>

Krauss did not say anything significant about the issue identified in the topic of the debate. It remains unclear how, from an atheistic point of view, to go (at least schematically) from hydrogen atoms, from cosmic dust, at least to this debate? How and why could cosmic dust over millions of years accidentally

---

1. Einstein to an unidentified addressee, Aug. 7, 1941. Einstein Archive, reel 54-927, quoted in: Max Jammer, *Einstein and Religion: Physics and Theology*, Princeton University Press, 1999; 2002. P. 97.

form to such a state that two “lumps of dust” began to argue about the meaning, about the truth, about the knowledge of reality? These are metaphysical questions; they have nothing to do even with the “stomach”, with the animal desire for a well-fed and comfortable existence.

Moreover, of course, each participant in the debate remained unconvinced. Both atheists and religious people have written many books to prove their case. However, it seems that the final choice takes place in the metaphysical depths of a person. All the evidence, of both one and the other side, has little effect on those who have already decided everything for themselves without proof. However, there are also hesitant people who have not yet decided. For them, this book, which presents different points of view, can be useful.

## EPILOGUE

**D**uring these debates, and in other disputes between atheists and believers, no one formulated one important problem, although it always seems to be “in the air”. Atheists say that “what works is good”, and demand that believers show them hard facts. At the same time, atheists are quite calm about the paradoxes of quantum mechanics and the contradictions between various theories in physics. Atheists are quite confident in talking about the existence of dark matter and dark energy. However, it is basically impossible to confirm their existence with the help of experiment, because they do not participate in any interactions.

**T**herefore, the general answer to the claims of atheists can be as follows: metaphysics also has its own paradoxes and its own contradictions between different theories. Nevertheless, as in the case of physics, paradoxes and contradictions do not diminish the significance of metaphysics itself. They require study. Moreover, if something is not possible to verify experimentally, this does not mean that it does not exist.

**F**or example, the sacred and theological books of Christianity and Islam often talk about deeds of love, mercy, and compassion. It can be concluded that these are religions of love and peace. However, history tells us that most Christians were killed by

Christians and most Muslims were killed by Muslims. In addition, in their free time from the extermination of their fellow believers, representatives of these two most peaceful religions fought with each other. Such contradictions give atheists a reason to deny the existence of God. However, they do not understand that, in fact, they do not deny God, but a substituted concept that personifies religions and everything to which they were related.

On the other hand, both in Christianity and in Islam there have always been many people striving for the highest spiritual values, many deeds of love, self-sacrifice, and charity. There are many paradoxes in religions, which cannot be said here briefly. You will need at least one more book, which we will call Quantum Mechanics of Metaphysics. Why are we talking about metaphysics and not about religions? There are many human, social, and cultural aspects in religions. Therefore, in the language of religion, it is often impossible to explain paradoxes, such as in the above example. Moreover, Christ did not create religion and never spoke about it.

Another important aspect of the disputes between atheists and believers is that, willy-nilly, participants and audiences have to think about the main issues of human life. Both questions and answers can be very different. For example, one of the most influential people of our time, Elon Musk, said in an

interview with *BusinessWeek* magazine, “The hardest part is coming up with the right questions. Once you succeed, everything else is very simple.” He himself, while still in college, constantly thought about what in the future will most affect the fate of humanity. For himself, Elon Musk decided that it would be the Internet, the transition to renewable energy sources and the resettlement of people to other planets.

All this, of course, is good, but did people really suffer for millennia just because they did not have the Internet, solar panels, and spaceships? Moreover, is it really, when these goals will be achieved, is the kingdom of universal happiness will come on Earth? This is obviously not the case.

There is really nothing to invent here. The most important problem, both for an individual and for society as a whole, was formulated many thousands of years ago, “Sin is lurking at the door; its desire is for you, but you must master it” (Gen. 4:7). It is a matter of choosing between good and evil, which takes place in the metaphysical depths of the human soul. No “smartest” rational algorithms will help here. That is why metaphysics seems to be much more important than physics, both for an individual person and for all humankind as a whole.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- [1] Borde A., Guth A. and Vilenkin A. Inflationary space-times are not past-complete. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 90 151301, 2003.
- [2] Vilenkin A. Creation of Universes from Nothing//*Phys. Lett.* Vol. 117B, # 1, 2, 1982. P. 25–28.
- [3] Max Jammer, *Einstein and Religion: Physics and Theology*, Princeton University Press, 2002.
- [4] Климишин И. А. *Релятивистская астрономия*. М.: Наука, 1989.
- [5] Зельдович Я. Б. Возможно ли образование Вселенной «из ничего»?//*Природа*. 1988. № 4.
- [6] Л. Краусс. *Вселенная из ничего* (Lawrence M. Krauss. *A Universe from Nothing*. 2012).
- [7] Волкодав К. Г. *Эволюция: тёмная сторона самого грандиозного шоу на Земле*. Т. 1/Серпухов, 2016.
- [8] Иммануил Кант. *Критика чистого разума*//Пер. с нем. Н. Лосского. Изд. Мысль. М., 1994.
- [9] Прот. Георгий В. Флоровский. *Восточные Отцы IV века*//Св. Григорий Нисский. *Судьба человека*, гл. 10/Изд. Белорусского Экзархата. Минск, 2006.

## MAIN SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

|       |                |
|-------|----------------|
| Lat.  | Latin          |
| Gr.   | Greek          |
| Heb.  | Hebrew         |
| Ger.  | German         |
| comp. | compare        |
| Bulg. | Bulgarian      |
| Fr.   | French         |
| prof. | professor      |
| etc.  | et cetera      |
| M.    | Moscow         |
| Ap.   | apostle        |
| Prot. | Protopresbyter |

### Examples of Bible Books References

|                        |                                                                                                 |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 Cor. 2:7             | First Epistle to Corinthians, chapter 2, verse 7                                                |
| 1 Cor. 2:7–10          | First Epistle to Corinthians, chapter 2, verses 7 to 10                                         |
| 1 Cor. 2:7, 12–16      | First Epistle to Corinthians, chapter 2, verse 7 и and verses of the same chapter 12 to 16      |
| 1 Cor. 2:7–10, 12–16   | First Epistle to Corinthians, chapter 2, verses 7 to 10 and verses of the same chapter 12 to 16 |
| 1 Cor. 2:7–3:4         | First Epistle to Corinthians, chapter 2, verse 7 up to chapter 3, verse 4                       |
| 1 Cor. 2:7–10; 3:4–8   | First Epistle to Corinthians, chapter 2, verses 7 to 10 and chapter 3, verses 4 to 8            |
| 1 Cor. 2:7, 15         | First Epistle to Corinthians, chapter 2, verses 7 and 15                                        |
| 1 Cor. 2:7; 4:6        | First Epistle to Corinthians, chapter 2, verse 7 and chapter 4, verse 6                         |
| Matt. 3:9;<br>Luke 3:8 | Gospel of Matthew, chapter 3, verse 9 and Gospel of Luke, chapter 3, verse 8                    |

### **About the author**

In 1994, the author graduated from the Faculty of Experimental and Theoretical Physics of the Moscow Engineering Physics Institute with a degree in Photonics and Quantum Radiophysics. In 2011 he defended doctoral dissertation (PhD) at the Faculty of Theology of the Aristotle State University of Thessaloniki. Research interests are in the field of philosophy, epistemology, anthropology, psychology, metaphysics, religious and cultural studies.

### **Disclaimer**

PLEASE NOTE: The author and the Publisher do not take any responsibility and do not provide any guarantees in connection with the publication of facts, data, results and any other information. This book presents the private opinion of the author. Interpretation of facts and all conclusions are evaluative. All texts are fictional and have nothing to do with real events. All characters, names and titles are fictitious, and any coincidence with real living or living people is completely accidental.

On the flyleaf there is a photograph of a 16th century fresco from the Dionysios monastery (Holy Mount Athos, Greece).

In the first photo: the hallmarks of the life of St. Gerasim of Jordan. Second photo: Gospel stories and parables.

Feedback on this book can be sent by email:

[bonum.librum@gmail.com](mailto:bonum.librum@gmail.com)

[logos@logoselpidas.com](mailto:logos@logoselpidas.com)

[eleosagapi@gmail.com](mailto:eleosagapi@gmail.com)

or through contacts on the site: <http://logoselpidas.com>