

## Prologue

Only a fool would step into the ring and argue a point with a bunch of astrophysicists if you didn't grow up drinking their milk, so I don't plan to do so now. For sure, they won't give my position the time of day for I am outside their paradigm. Their minds made up already, my positions and thoughts as a nonscientist don't count in their eyes. One method of self-preservation is to not recognize your opponent. I do, of course, have a keen interest in quantum mechanics, cosmology and particle physics. One time many years ago, I attended an open plenary session at an astrophysics convention at the University of Oklahoma. To my surprise and excitement, I understood roughly half of what they were talking about. I came away feeling that I could have a serious position worth the time of reflection. Obviously, no "fixed agenda scientist" would ever agree with that statement. In my retort, I say "why not?" ...You guys [astrophysicists] are all over the place, having wild ideas you can't prove, and arguing why your peers are wrong. Is there not room for me?

Just look at all the ideas floating in the scientific camp. The Universe is: a Big Bang Singularity, it is a Baby Universe, it was born from a Past Universe, there are multiple Universes, it is inflationary, it is a bubble, it is string theory, it always is expanding, it is not expanding, it is a Cyclic Universe, it is a quantum fluctuation, it will die in a Big Crunch. Take your pick...are you sure there is not room for me? There are as many ideas about the Universe as there are scientists; this is not a bad thing. I like creative thinking and the internal sense of exploration and invention. I just wish they [scientists] weren't so blind to the real visible actions of a Creator God.

I've never met Paul Valletta, but I like what he posted on the Cosmic Variance Blog on April 28, 2007. When discussing how the Universe started, saying "There are many interpretations, one might just as well ask: Did the Universe start from nothing? ...If so, where did this nothing come from?" Great question, Paul! But instead of working on that question, he goes off into never-never land saying our Universe came from a previous Universe which, I think, a ridiculous idea! Do we need to ask the next question? So where did that previous Universe come from? How far back do you want to go with this line of thinking?

Let's get back to his much more important question: "Did the Universe start from nothing?" The answer, of course, is a loud "yes"! But as he also states, "...Einstein's GR [General Relativity] states, you cannot create something from nothing, so there must have been a previous "something"..." How arrogant a belief that is! How limited in thinking! How

little room you have for the miraculous! Why must there previously be something; just because Einstein says so? Where did the four natural Laws come from? Scientists have been striving to understand that one singular point where all four natural laws are one grand beautiful law; a Grand Unified Theory or GUT. It must be clear and understood that all these particles that makeup matter and antimatter must have come from some one source. You can't believe that perfect symmetry, in balance for all eternity, would suddenly on its own accord, in some wild serendipity, trip up to create an imbalance and thus matter that we could see and evolve into life itself.

Cosmologists have been searching for how the Universe began for many many decades; this is good, I'm not putting them down. I applaud them! It is like asking, what is around that corner, or beyond that mountaintop? Asking questions, looking for answers, inventing an idea, testing and weighing the results is an awesome process. Of course, if you are a chef or a little ol' grandmother, some of the best delicable desserts have developed of this process! The point I wish to assert is, why would you engage in this hunt for the treasure of the ages by throwing away half of your tools, half of your information, indeed half your treasure map?

At one time many scientists were inspired by God's creation and credited the fixed natural laws to the Creator. The Bible was inspiration and guided them under a set of ethical standards into life's major questions and search for knowledge. Now, to raise Biblical points, embrace a Christian world view and its teachings is ridiculed and dismissed as ignorant by many scientists. What are these scientists afraid of, that maybe they don't have the answers after-all, that they will lose position and power of control? One has to ask, why does Richard Dawkins fight so hard? What is the upside for being an atheist? That when you die that is the end of your experiment on this planet? What's the point to have anything, to have life, to produce and have passions? That it [we] will all become dust again? How glamorous is that? You are willing to stake your eternal soul on that weak belief, an absolute fabrication? What little vision you "nonseeker"! I, my nearsighted friend, am wonderfully created on a beautiful planet in an awesome Universe in order to be in relationship with that Creator God for His enjoyment. Let me ask you, which belief [yours or mine] has the best upside to it?

Here is what I mean. In the same April 27, 2007 series blog posts noted above, we find a great example of the bias closed agenda often found within these so-called open and searching scientists. Here comes one Sam Gralla who says "I love the classical interpretation of the Big Bang because it falsifies all major religions while affirming theism. Thus, it makes nobody happy (except me)." What the heck does that mean? This

is one unhappy guy here, or he is simply one of the most arrogant I've run across. First, you will find in Part One of this book that a classical Big Bang does not falsify Christianity! Second, to suggest that Christianity [one of the major religions] is falsified by the Big Bang, yet affirm theism makes zero sense. Christianity is the one major religion that holds to God as being a creative source for man and the world and controlling the Big Bang..."Let there be light, and there was light".

Scientists will hold on that the world and the Universe operate on dependable fixed laws within an easily understood, yes, and intelligent context. We have the four natural forces, namely: electroweak, gravity, strong-nuclear, and electromagnetism. Why can they not have room for a creator to bring the indefinable yet obvious natural principles into being for a purpose? What kind of scientific inquiry leaves this out?

Again, I ask, what is the point to push the position that one had to first reject God to search for truth? How silly a notion! What a world of chaos it would be. Let's all reject the barometer for truth and ethical standards so we are now free to pursue our own inventions and create our own standards and our own datum to which to measure our own sinful performance! This anarchy is some kind of freedom, I suppose; in a world like this we now can say what we want, think what we want, and pronounce whatever belief we conger up to be the truth. The sad part of all this is the scientists, prejudice against a theistic worldview, so entrenched in a singular plane of reference and sucking others down with them, are now immune to seeing creation as an act from a benevolent creative omnipotent omnipresent power in the Universe; the direct intentional action from the Great Creator God. The purpose of this book is to try to stop this downward spiral and present a different way of viewing the world and the Universe, and to encounter this wonderful loving "**I Am**, the Great Creator God"