1 – Introduction
2 – Instantaneous Creation
3 – Recent Creation
4 – Starlight, Star Distances, and the Speed of Light
5 – Genesis Is Scientific
6 – Creation versus Gradual Evolution Debate: a Summary
7 – Naturalism versus Super-Naturalism
8 – Big Bang Theory
9 – Astronomy and Academia
10 – Astrology: Earth at the Center of the Universe?
11 – Life on Other Worlds? And Conclusion
Appendix 1: Outline of the Days of Creation
Appendix 2: Scientists' Opinions on Big Bang Theory

*

8 – Big Bang Theory

When Christ sojourned in our earthly realm, He did some things miraculously that, under normal circumstances, would take much effort and time. To make six waterpots (20-30 gallons each) of wine, in the natural realm, would require a tremendous amount of work (harvesting grapes, fermenting, treading them, etc.). Yet Jesus made that much wine (out of water) in an instant. (*Book of John*, chapter 2)

On two occasions, Christ's "catering service" delivered food to hungry crowds of 4,000 and 5,000 men (not counting women and children). Normally, this would have required a huge amount of organization and money, but Jesus did it miraculously, multiplying a few loaves and fishes to such an extent that everyone was well fed, and plenty of food was left over. (*Book of Matthew* 14 and 15)

God doesn't need much to work with. When His supernatural power goes to work, it easily overcomes the normal barriers of our natural world. And in the creation of the cosmos, that's what was going on.

Naturalist theories like the Big Bang carefully avoid the topic of supernatural agency. For example, much emphasis is put on an extraordinary length of time for the formation of the universe – the

implication being that, with so much time available, why then almost anything incredible can happen. And this also serves to cast doubt on the Genesis version of Creation only a few thousand years ago. God's role in the formation of the natural world is minimized, left out; and consequently, we end up feeling the same on a personal level, that He is remote and unconcerned about the human race.

Nevertheless, we can give credit to the Theory for setting aside the common notion that the universe is eternal; it began at a finite time in the past, which should at least mean that there had to be a Creator to get things started.

But most Big Bang theorists leave the Creator out of the process as much as possible and as a result get stuck with trying to explain that the universe managed to create itself somehow. Not surprisingly, the Theory gets caught sometimes trying to smuggle in a "miracle" – like the one mentioned in the previous post about a different speed for starlight in the past.

Considerable guesswork is needed to patch up several other gaps that the naturalist viewpoint cannot account for. (See Appendix 2.) As a result many scientists nowadays are beginning to question Big Bang's validity because of all the confusing, misleading patchwork of questionable theories needed to keep it intact.

> **Big-bangers have suggested all sorts of exotic solutions to their puzzle, including that the laws of physics must have changed, or that there was expansion faster than the speed of light. So they can hardly point the finger at creationists who propose similarly esoteric-sounding solutions to essentially the same problem. (from "Starlight and Time – a Further Breakthrough" by Carl Wieland, 5 January 2009)**

The Second Law of Thermodynamics states that matter and energy tend to dissipate into disorder and scatteration; the Universe is only temporary; slowly but surely, it is winding down, "wearing out" we might say – which means it must have been wound up at some point in the past. Enormous as it is, the Universe is still finite and had a Beginning.

Knowing the implications of the Second Law of Thermodynamics is what

originally led science philosophers to propose the Big Bang Theory – with its central idea that everything began from a powerfully concentrated little dot (singularity) of matter/energy.

So we can give Big Bang credit for setting the record straight that there had to be a beginning. Also, the idea that the Universe expanded, is something that could help us understand what happened at the time of Creation. Several Scriptures, in fact, allude to God "stretching the heavens": Job 9:8; Psalm 104:2; Isaiah 40:22, 42:5, 44:24, 45:12, 48:13, 51:13; Jeremiah 10:12, 51:15; and Zechariah 12:1.

Nevertheless, the theory fails to account for two important questions: 1) Where did that powerful little "dot" come from? Or what triggered the eruption to cause that single point in the universe to "explode"? If we say that it just came from nothing, then the first Law of Thermodynamics is violated, the Law of Conservation of Energy. Something can't come from nothing; something has to come from something.
2) An expanding bundle of energy would grow into a crumpled mess, so how can the Big Bang explain the incredible order and complexity of the natural world? It seems ridiculous to think that an unguided process could achieve the finely balanced equilibrium that exists now in the cosmos. (See Appendix 2 for scientists' viewpoints on Big Bang difficulties.)

On the other side of the scale, many philosophers have taught that the universe has always been as it is – eternal – which contradicts the Second Law of Thermodynamics that there had to be a beginning. So whichever naturalistic theory of origins one adopts (universe-began-from-a-dot, or universe-is-eternal), one will always run into that stone wall of having to violate one of those two basic laws of science.

Big Bang philosophers have tried to accommodate both points of view but have fallen flat on both counts. Firstly, there is the problem of trying to explain where the "dot" came from. It's been given a fancier name – singularity – but it's still "something", and the only way something can come from nothing is if God (the great "I AM") brings it into existence. (Exodus 3:14)

And secondly, Big Bang theorists have tried to bestow a sort of divinity on the universe by teaching that it has no boundaries nor center, that it is

infinite. But if the universe is considered to be eternal, that raises the question of time and how to account for the fact that we even exist if there was no beginning:

> **"If the regress of past events were infinite, then it would be impossible for the present moment to arrive. For it is impossible to cross the infinite to get to today. So today could never arrive, which is absurd, for here we are!" – W.L. Craig, *Reasonable Faith*, pg. 96**

In our realm time has to have a starting point. And since the time dimension is linked to the spatial dimensions (according to Einstein's Theory of Relativity), then the Earth too and the universe must have a starting point. We function in a finite realm. We cannot understand, much less operate, in that realm of infinity, whatever that is. But that's where God dwells, and He is able to shape time and the cosmos as He will since they are His creation.

So the idea of an eternal universe is absurd once we understand these principles: 1) that time cannot regress infinitely, and 2) the Second Law of Thermodynamics, that the natural world is "wearing out". As pointed out in 2Corinthians 4:18, *"The things which are seen are temporary, but the things which are not seen are eternal."* (NKJV) (As for the question of *why* our natural realm was created, some ideas for that are considered in Post 11 of this series.)

Realizing the temporal state of the natural world (as affirmed by the Laws of Science), we more easily understand that our universe was created from the eternal realm by the supernatural Supreme Being whom we call God. That is the starting point for any valid explanation for the Universe's origin. Only an Infinite Being, incomprehensible to us, could have brought it into existence out of nothing – with all its essential components of mass, energy, space, and time.

All of this means, of course, that Earth, the solar system, and the universe had a definite Beginning. And that Beginning is what the Genesis account is all about. Evolution theory, on the other hand, makes it all sound hazy, as if there were no Beginning, and offers the vague suggestion that the natural world itself is eternal.

If we know, scientifically, that an eternal natural world is impossible, and that our environment is temporary, then why are science theorists trying to convey the impression that it is eternal? Aside from its lack of rationality, such teaching has the negative side effect of generating confusion about our origins in the minds of our young people.

In a subtle way that leads to the idea that God had nothing to do with the formation of the natural world. And this leads to the next conclusion that God doesn't exist; or if He does, then He doesn't have anything much to do with us.

To draw humanity away from the Creator is, of course, the aim of the forces of spiritual Darkness. And if we can't be persuaded to believe the natural world is eternal, the next best thing is to make the Beginning sound vague and extraordinarily long ago, while applying the veneer of "science" to make it seem valid.

But if God is real and if He's what He's supposed to be – a competent and caring Being – He would not be so negligent as to leave His created beings without a record of how things got started. Of course, the forces of spiritual Darkness, while aiming to establish their kingdom on Earth, have worked hard to discredit or hide this information in hopes of drawing the world away from their Creator.

*

Continue to: 9 – Astronomy and Academia