

Dark Cosmos ...

Dan Hooper

I do not recommend this book nor will I read this author again. I am displeased with authors of science for the masses who have a motive for writing a book that is not presented in the title or description of the book. The real motive for such a book is almost always religious, either the religion of Christianity or more likely the religion of atheism. Mr. Hooper's religion is atheism, which is fare enough. However, deceiving me into reading the book so he can express his beliefs serendipitously is not fare.

The information on "dark matter" and "dark energy" is interesting but is not convincing, at least for the common masses, to disregard "dark matter" and "dark energy" as the ether theory of the 21st century. However, as I said, that is not the purpose of the book. The real purpose is not found until the last few chapters, which is typical of this type of deception. Mr. Hooper takes a course similar of many who write for the masses on evolution, e.g., Dawkins. First muse about something in relation to nature. A few paragraphs later talk of that musing as if it is a reasonable hypothesis. Then as if it is a theory. Within two pages what was mused is now fact and consequences of it are being discussed. Mr. Hooper's muse is that the universe is so fine tuned for us to exist not because there is a God, but because there are an unlimited number of universes with different physical laws. Ours just happens to be the one with the necessary laws for our existence. This metaphysics is more the purpose for the book than the physics of missing matter. If Mr. Hooper was honest with me up front I would not have bought the book. I am not interested in metaphysics. It is not that I would shy away from a book claiming that science disproves the existence of God. I would very much relish reading such a book. But, none exist that I have seen. At least none that are up front about it except perhaps Dawkins book "The Blind Watch Maker". The problem with that book is that there was little science, it refuted the scientific method, and was mainly emotional.

I do not believe any scientist claims that science can prove the existence of God. But many such as Hugh Ross claim that science leaves little room for other possibilities. Hugh Ross does not try to deceive me and is up front with his beliefs and purposes. He calls his organization "Reasons to Believe", which leaves no reason to suspect he is trying to

deceive me as to what he is presenting. I can take or leave his beliefs as I choose. The science he presents is quite interesting.

Mr. Hooper's book I could have left on the shelf and not been the worst for it.

Mathdrooler 24 Dec 2008