

A Cross-Examination of Stephen Hawking

By Victor Zammit, LL.D., Ph.D.

Litigation lawyer Victor Zammit's imaginary cross-examination of Professor Stephen Hawking on the claim by Hawking that there is no afterlife. In a May 15, 2011, interview published in the UK's *The Guardian* newspaper, Hawking was asked: "What, if anything, do you fear about death?" He responded: "I have lived with the prospect of an early death for the last 49 years. I'm not afraid of death, but I'm in no hurry to die. I have so much I want to do first. I regard the brain as a computer which will stop working when its components fail. There is no heaven or afterlife for broken down computers; that is a fairy story for people afraid of the dark."

[Reprinted by permission of the author. For more of his work, see <http://www.victorzammit.com/> .]

It is submitted that the following is what a 'cross-examination' of Professor Stephen Hawking would be like. The "answers" given by Professor Hawking have been taken from his website and from other media reports about things he said and imputed. (Words in capitals refer to putting emphasis on that word.)

Courtroom scene. Professor Hawking is in the witness box being sworn in.

Judge: (looking towards his attendant) Swear the witness in.

Court assistant addressing expert witness Professor Hawking: Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth so help you God?

Professor Hawking [henceforth "Professor"]: I don't believe in God!

Judge to court attendant: Proceed with an affirmation. [An oath designed for atheists.]

Victor Zammit [henceforth "Victor"] [friendly, smiling]: How are you Professor? You feel all right?

Professor: Yes, I do. Why do you ask?

Victor: I want to establish for the purpose of the record that whilst there are problems with your body, you are in a good state of mind to answer all questions. Right?

Professor: Yes, I'm in an excellent state of mind.

Victor: Good. Tell us Professor. Are you intelligent?

Professor: Yes I suppose I am.

Victor: Would you agree that some scientists who agree with your theories say that you are extremely intelligent — in fact some scientists even called you a genius?

Professor: I'll leave that to those scientists who call me that.

Victor: But have you come across scientists who described you as a genius, YES or NO?

Professor: Yes.

Victor: What kind of a scientist are you?

Professor: I am a theoretical physicist.

Victor: What do you mean by that?

Professor: I study theoretical physics, especially cosmology.

Victor: You are famous for your cosmic theories. So when you come to conclusions about cosmology, you first ... investigate?

Professor: Yes, that's absolutely right.

Victor: Do you ever come to conclusions about some aspect of the universe without first having studied it?

Professor: No, of course not. That would be ridiculous. I cannot make conclusions unless I first study the area. I'm a scientist.

Victor: But being a theoretical physicist specializing in cosmology, would you not agree that some of what you conclude about the universe is theoretical, is speculative, since you cannot duplicate your results in a laboratory?

Professor: ... (hesitating)....yes ... I guess that's right.

Victor: For example, you mention black holes and what they do. But that is only speculative because you have never seen the full operation of a black hole ... You are speculating... right?

Professor: I suppose so. But I can show you why I'm right ...

Victor: But you can NEVER guarantee that your conclusions on black holes are absolute and irreversible, that they are one hundred percent correct, RIGHT?

Professor: ... (softly) I guess yes, that's right ...

Victor: You said earlier you are qualified in theoretical physics. Professor, are you qualified in law - do you have a law degree?

Professor: Of course not.

Victor: So you do not have the professional expertise to know what technically constitutes admissible evidence and the process of litigation?

Professor: As I said, I don't have any knowledge of law or of litigation procedure!

Victor: This means that a litigation lawyer would have the professional expertise about what is admissible in evidence as objective and subjective evidence more than a theoretical physicist, right?

Professor: I guess so ... it's quite obvious to me ...

Victor: Your answer is YES?

Professor: Yes.

Victor: Are you qualified in medicine?

Professor: Of course not. (*Looks at the judge and asks*). Your Honor, do I have to answer these questions?

Victor: Your honor, the question of objective AUTHORITY is critical in this matter.

Judge: Yes, yes I understand ... answer the question.

Professor: No, I'm not qualified in medicine ...

Victor: Professor, are you formally qualified in architecture, engineering, biology, advanced chemistry, advanced philosophy?

Professor: No, I'm not qualified in any of these except I know something about chemistry.

Victor: You agree then, that your only area of professional expertise is in the narrow area of theoretical physics, in cosmological science yes?

Professor: ... (hesitating) ...

Victor: ANSWER THE QUESTION PROFESSOR — YES or NO!

Professor: Yes ... my expertise is only in theoretical physics, in cosmology.

Victor: Would you be familiar with what is objective evidence and subjective evidence?

Professor: Yes, yes I would be.

Victor: Would you agree that what is scientific is consistent with using the same formula over time and space, keeping variables constant and getting the same results?

Professor: Yes, I agree with that.

Victor: By contrast, would you agree that a PERSONAL belief — such as blind faith, which cannot be independently supported would in itself be subject to invalidation — to COMPLETE invalidation, yes or no?

Professor: Yes, yes ... I agree with that.

Victor: So, you agree that any statement you make as a layperson could be absolutely wrong. Yes?

Professor: ... I guess so ... Yes.

Victor: Do you make mistakes as a scientist, Professor?

Professor: ... I've made mistakes in the past ...

Victor: Do you make mistakes when you make statements not related to your theoretical science?

Professor: Everybody makes mistakes ...

Victor: Your answer is YES?

Professor: Yes ...

Victor: So, you accept that you make mistakes as a scientist and when you make statements as a non-scientist. Right?

Professor: Right ... Yes ...

Victor: From what you said, you concede that you can make statements as a layperson or a scientist that could be absolutely incorrect, they could be wrong?

Professor: I suppose so ...

Victor: You were quoted in the media recently that you do not accept the existence of the afterlife — is that correct?

Professor: Yes, that's correct.

Victor: Would you accept that cosmological theoretical physics has absolutely nothing to do with knowledge about the afterlife.

Professor: Yes, I accept that ...

Victor: You agree that the two are completely independent and totally separate from each other and are inevitably unrelated.

Professor: Yes, that's right.

Victor: So, does being an expert in scientific cosmology give you any authority whatsoever whether or not the afterlife exists?

Professor: No ... it does not ...

Victor: You are also on record for stating words to the effect those who accept the afterlife are likely to be afraid of the dark. You said that?

Professor: ... Yes ... I said that too. But ..

Victor: DON'T SAY BUT ... No qualification — and no justification to the answer please; again, answer YES or NO to my question. Did you say those who accept the afterlife are likely to be afraid of the dark?

Professor: Yes ...

Victor: I remind you, you are under oath. Listen carefully. Have you ever investigated the evidence for the afterlife Professor. Yes or no please.

Professor: No.

Victor: NO? Just a while ago you called someone who comes to conclusions without first investigating, a fool and ridiculous. Are you a fool ... and ridiculous?

Professor: (No answer)

Victor: No need to answer that — the jury accepts you've answered that already! Have you ever asked your research assistant or anybody else what literature is available about the afterlife?

Professor: No ... I have not ...

Victor: Have you ever read the classic afterlife research *A Lawyer Presents The Case For The Afterlife* — presenting some twenty areas of afterlife evidence?

Professor: No, I have not.

Victor: Do you know Professor, that the afterlife evidence in this book by a litigation lawyer in eleven years has never been rebutted by any materialist genius scientist — not even for the allurements of one million dollars?

Professor: No, I don't know that.

Victor: How would you like to earn a cool million dollars professor?

Professor: What do I have to do?

Victor: You only have to rebut the evidence for the existence of the afterlife presented by that lawyer. Got the courage?

Professor: Maybe ...

Victor: What's the matter professor? Are you an intellectual coward or have you been professionally negligent — or both - when it comes to the afterlife?

Judge: Professor, you do not have to answer that question.

Victor : You don't have to — I accept the jury also accepts that the Professor answered that question already!

Professor: I'm not an intellectual coward ...

Victor: Do you think it is right for you to create havoc in this world without being responsible for what you say and do?

Professor: (does not answer) ...

Victor: Some intellectuals and others would call that cowardice pushed to its extreme ... agree with that Professor?

Professor: (does not answer) ...

Victor: We are waiting ... alright, we'll let the jury answer that for us with their verdict ... Have you done any research about the afterlife?

Professor: No.

Victor: Why not? Too lazy?

Professor: I'm not lazy ...

Victor: Why then did you NOT bother to review the most fundamental and substantive scientific evidence for the afterlife before you made a conclusion about something you know absolutely nothing about?

Professor: (no answer) ...

Victor: You shock all of us with your afterlife knowledge!

You stated earlier that professional litigation lawyers are the professionals who

know what is admissible objective and subjective evidence. Right?

Professor: ... Yes ... right ...

Victor: Then why didn't you investigate the works of the lawyer who presented the evidence for the afterlife — someone with professional expertise about admissible evidence for the afterlife?

Professor: (silent)

Victor: Your Honor ...

Judge: Yes, yes Professor answer the question.

Professor: (silent) ...

Judge: I will hold you in contempt unless you answer the question put to you.

Professor: I admit I did not do any research about the afterlife ...

Victor: Just assume for one moment that the hundred or so scientists who accepted the objective and repeatable evidence for the afterlife are right, would you accept the evidence for the existence of the afterlife?

Professor: I would have to examine the evidence

Victor: Just answer YES or NO to that question ...

Professor: I would have to answer yes I guess

Victor: Have you come across a recent book by British scientist Ron Pearson WHY PHYSICS PROVES GOD?

Professor No I have not.

Victor: Have you read the brilliant physicist Sir Oliver Lodge's masterpiece why he accepts the afterlife?

Professor: No ... I have not.

Victor: Have you ever read about the materialization experiments of that great scientist Sir William Crookes which led him to accept the evidence for the existence of the afterlife?

Professor: No, I have not.

Victor: Have you read the brilliant work of Professor Jan W. Vandersande's afterlife research?

Professor: No I have not ...

Victor: Have you ever read the most brilliant proof for the afterlife we have in the world to-day - David Thompson's miracle materializations - where the evidence is objective and repeatable?

Professor: No, I have not ...

Victor: YOU HAVEN'T? WHY NOT?

Professor: (does not answer ...)

Victor: Never mind, the jury heard you answering that one ...Have you ever read Arthur Findlay's great works on his empirical evidence for the afterlife?

Professor: No, I have not.

Victor: Have you read the most impressive scientific afterlife research of Professor Ernst Senkowski?

Professor: No, I have not.

Victor: Then what clearly follows is that you do not have authority about the afterlife, right?

Professor: Putting it that way ... I suppose so ...

Victor: Just a little louder professor, so that the jury members can hear you.

Professor: I suppose so!

Victor: Now, professor, I want you to answer my clear short and sharp question: do you have any authority outside your narrow area of theoretical physics — in relation to the afterlife, yes or no?

Professor: ... No

Victor: Does this mean you are totally ignorant - kind of an imbecile about matters to do with the evidence for the afterlife?

Professor: (hesitates, looks at the judge...)

Judge: Professor, you do not have to answer the question.

Victor: Again, he has already answered that question to the members of the jury. Now Professor, have you read the great afterlife works of that brilliant scientist Sir Arthur Conan Doyle?

Professor: No, I have not ...

Victor: (addressing the judge) On this line of questioning your honor, I would like to enter into evidence the list of some of the scientists who investigated the afterlife and accepted the afterlife.

(to the Professor): Professor, have you read any of the afterlife works by these scientists and empirical afterlife investigators? Dr. Peter Bander, Dr. Robert Crookall, Professor John Bockris, John Logie Baird, Professor Arthur Ellison, Dr. Peter Fenwick, Professor Festa, Dr. Edith Fiore, Professor David Fontana, Dr. Amit Goswami, Professor Gustav Geley, Professor Ivor Grattan-Guinness, Professor Stanislav Grof, Dr. Arthur Guirdham, Dr. Glen Hamilton, Professor Charles Hapgood, Professor Sylvia

Hart-Wright, Professor James Hyslop, Professor William James, Dr. Elizabeth Kubler-Ross, Drs. Jeff and Jody Long, afterlife investigator Mark Macy, (engineer/physics) George Meek, Dr. Raymond Moody, Dr. Melvin Morse, Dr. Morris Nertherton, Dr. Karlis Osis, Dr. Peter Ramster (Psychologist), Edward C. Randall (Lawyer), Dr. Konstantine Raudive, Drs. J.B. and Louisa Rhine, Nobel Laureate Professor Charles Richet, Dr. Kenneth Ring, Dr. Aubrey Rose, Professor Archie Roy, Dr. Michael Sabom, Dr. Hans Schaer, Professor Marilyn Schlitz, Dr. Rupert Sheldrake, Judge Dean Shuart, Dr. Ian Stevenson, Dr. Claude Swanson, Dr. Emmanuel Swedenborg, Professor Jessica Utts, Dr. Pim Van Lommel, Professor J.W. Crawford, Professor Wadhams, Professor Alfred Wallace, Dr. Helen Wambach, Dr. Carl Wickland, Dr. Carla Wills-Brandon, Dr. Julie Beischel — read any of these substantive scientists' afterlife work?

Professor: No, I have not examined the afterlife evidence by the scientists you mentioned.

Victor: Tell us professor, do you think all these brilliant scientists I mentioned — some of them with Nobel Laureates — are afraid of the dark?

Professor: ... I guess not ...

Victor: (gives the Professor a stern look)

Professor: No, they are not afraid of the dark ...

Victor: And WITHOUT investigating the works of these scientists, WITHOUT investigating the evidence, WITHOUT having read anything about the afterlife, you stated there is no afterlife, right?

Professor: I guess so ...

Victor: That's not very intelligent is it Professor?

Professor: No ... it's not.

Victor: So, when you said there is no afterlife, did you say that as a scientist?

Professor: No, not as a scientist.

Victor: Then as a layperson?

Professor: ... Yes as a layperson ...

Victor: As an afterlife UNINFORMED layperson?

Professor: ... (no answer)

Victor: YOUR HONOR!!!

Judge: Yes, Professor, you must answer the question ..

Prof : Yes, as an uninformed layperson ...

Victor: Good. Nothing wrong with being honest occasionally. ("objection" by Prof lawyer ...) Yes, yes I withdraw that remark. You do make a distinction between being intelligent in the narrow area of your science and that you may not be so intelligent and not informed and un-read about afterlife matters. Right?

Professor: ... I guess so ...Yes, right

Victor: Now Professor, you CONCEDED you have not read anything about the afterlife. You conceded you never read any of the works of the scientists I mentioned. You conceded you have never shown where, when, how and why the afterlife evidence produced by scientists and lawyers could be wrong. You conceded that one should never make a conclusion unless one first investigates — they are your own words ... Could you tell the court and the world then how on earth you state there is no afterlife when you HAVE NEVER INVESTIGATED THE AFTERLIFE, WHEN YOU HAVE NEVER

READ ANY OF THE WORKS BY THE GREAT SCIENTISTS I MENTIONED HERE EARLIER?

Professor: ...(. Hesitating .., does not answer)

Victor (addressing the judge): Your Honor, could you direct the witness to answer this very important question ...

Judge: Yes, answer the question please Professor

Professor: ... remains quiet ...

Judge: Answer the question or I will hold you for contempt of court!

Professor: I'm lost for words ...

Victor: Alright, then you admit then you were absolutely WRONG in saying there is no afterlife, YES or NO?

Professor: ... Yes, I guess I admit I was wrong in saying there is no afterlife ...

Victor: You admit you have NO AUTHORITY AT ALL ABOUT THE AFTERLIFE?

Professor: No ... I have no authority about the afterlife

Victor: You admit it was professional negligence pushed to its extreme on your part when you neglected to investigate the scientific afterlife works of the scientists I mentioned before you made those uninformed remarks about the afterlife?

Professor Yes, yes ...I admit I was rather negligent in not investigating the afterlife works of the scientists.

Victor: As a matter of fundamental procedure, you concede that you should not have come to any conclusions about the afterlife before you investigated the afterlife ...right?

Professor: Yes, right, I was wrong when I made statements about something I knew nothing about

Victor: Would you apologize to that class of millions of people you insulted by your colossal ignorance about the afterlife

Professor: ... No answer ...

Victor: WE ARE ALL WAITING PROFESSOR ... ARE YOU GOING TO BE DECENT, WITH INTEGRITY, WITH HONESTY AND WITH PRUDENCE - AND APOLOGIZE TO ALL PEOPLE YOU TRIED TO INSULT?

Professor:

The following is a part of the summing up to the members of the jury by Victor Zammit about the Professor's testimony:

Members of the jury ... accordingly, I say that the Professor by his own admission, failed to investigate the afterlife. He failed to show where, when, how and why the scientific afterlife evidence cannot be right. He conceded he knows absolutely nothing about the afterlife. He conceded he is totally ignorant about the afterlife. He conceded he never ever read anything about the afterlife.

This professor failed to realize that outside his area of specialization as a theoretical physicist, he has NO authority at all to speak, to insult, to denigrate those who accept the afterlife — especially, those scientists who bothered to investigate the afterlife first, BEFORE they came to any conclusions about the afterlife.

This professor wrongly assumed that he is omniscient — he's all knowing and infallible. He thought he could deliberately mislead, misinform and misdirect the public about his own personal, non-scientific negative prejudices

about the afterlife by using his status as a scientist. That is in a way cheating, trying to fool everyone.

And that is most maliciously unfair, most unjust, most inequitable.

This Professor wrongly expressed an opinion without informing himself about the matter. His statement saying there is no afterlife is not admissible as an objective fact because it was a personal opinion not backed by science. He made that uninformed statement NOT as a scientist but as a layperson. He himself states that as a scientist one should investigate first before making claims that will hurt people everywhere. He conceded he did NOT do that. Because the matter was reported in the global media, that becomes very serious on a global level.

This professor himself stated he was professionally negligent in making anti-afterlife statements when he had no knowledge whatsoever about the afterlife.

He never referred to the existing afterlife evidence and he never had the decency, the courtesy, and the honesty to refer to the scientific evidence of the other brilliant scientists who proved that the afterlife, according to their experiments, exists. That was a huge omission by the Professor. And he had the audacity, the effrontery, the gall to say that these brilliant afterlife researchers - some of them worked at genius level - are afraid of the dark!

Instead, he used his status as a professor in theoretical physics to promote his unproven atheism and his anti-afterlife negative beliefs and prejudices. Clearly that was a willful, deliberate, and intentional colossal abuse of power in the hands of someone who confessed he was totally ignorant of the afterlife evidence.

This Professor may be brilliant in his own narrow field of specialization — about cosmic science. But to-day, here before you, he is not here as a scientist. He is here as a layperson about his uninformed statement which received wide media attention that there is no afterlife. But the huge problem is that many people would not be able to separate his science from

his negative beliefs. That metaphorically means he has lead millions into confusion and darkness!

Really, in this particular case, I can't see you having any other alternative but to find him liable for his gross negligence, for his most unethical conduct, for misleading the people and for spreading darkness around the world - and for making himself look really professionally ridiculous — something that history will never forget.

Yes, I urge all of you on the basis of the clear and definitive evidence presented to you to find him LIABLE.”

(Any lawyer who would like to defend Professor Stephen Hawking is free to contact me to submit his defence of the Professor. I'd be more than happy to publish any defence, rebutting the issues I raised. — Victor Zammit, LL.D., Ph.D.; <http://www.victorzammit.com/>)

∞