

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF INSIGNIFICANCE

By

Dave Lindsay

It is relatively easy to get hyped on man's extensive technology when science arrogantly considers that life as we know it on earth represents the only known life-forms in our entire universe.

Modern science has learned a great deal about our sun, just one of 150 billion stars in our galaxy, and our solar system, which is itself a truly remarkable cosmic marvel. The scientific achievements and technological knowledge attained in recent years are justly phenomenal by all known standards and are deservedly acknowledged accordingly. But on a cosmic scale, science has merely scratched the surface of a 13.5-billion-year-old sphere of unknown variables that

make up our astonishingly extraordinary universe. No human being can justly profess to understand the intricacies of the process that created our fabulous cosmological wonder.

The scientific community thinks it knows how the universe came to be, but I contend that they are being a bit too hasty. I pose to them another question; could the technologically advanced intelligence of mankind, who has only been around for a few thousand years, achieve enough vast knowledge in such a minute period of cosmic time to reach such galactic conclusions? Sorry, but I just do not think so.

Whether a supreme life-form (God) used some sort of supernatural six-day procedure and in a chronological order consistent with the biblical description or a Big Bang evolutionary process to create the universe is entirely and quite literally irrelevant. Now, before bible believing fanatics jump to conclusions and into defense mode to argue their position concerning the relevance, I invite you to read on and allow me an opportunity to clarify my reasoning for making such a statement.

I am a devout Bible believing Christian, but I do not pretend to understand the process of creation as depicted in a few pages of

biblical scripture and, even more to that point, I do not believe I was ever intended to. I do however believe God, not some cosmic coincidental accident, created our universe and everything in it by means of a process so technologically advanced that we could not even begin to comprehend. I would profusely argue that I can pose a logical theoretical hypothesis supported by a combination of theological and scientific evidence to substantiate that contention.

My reasoning is relatively simple; we could never fully understand the process of creation, even if we had 100 lifetimes to study it. Yet many Christians devote their life to and base their faith on the biblical description of the creation process, which was interpreted and written by a man some several thousand years ago. Again, even if it is a factual description, it is irrelevant. The fact of the matter is this; the process of creation is so very insignificant that God Himself, the true author of the bible, only devoted two very short and rather vague pages of one chapter in the entire Bible to address it.

Rather than dwelling on a concept so technologically advanced that mankind could never even fathom, I would contend that God's purposeful intent was for the biblical consideration of the creation process to be exactly as it was expressed, of minimal significance

at the very least. His creation process is truly insignificant. We as followers should give about as much attention to the prospect as God did. The significance, God created all things. The insignificance, how He did it and His timeframe really does not matter.

In my view, God's lack of information was intended to send us a message; God could not explain the technological details of that process in a thousand bibles or as many years. So, He gave the description of creation as much recognition and placed as much emphasis on those aspects as it deserved. God's biblical description of creation is for the most part insignificant.

In the scheme of biblical reference, how God created the universe and life within it really does not matter. It is those aspects in the bible that He emphatically accentuated that are important and thus significant. That is precisely what God intended us to focus on.

*****/**********

From a scientific perspective, it is virtually impossible for us to perceive time (hours, days & weeks) in the same manner as the

Creator who stood at the very threshold of the 'beginning' of time. Who among us can truly argue whether God created the universe by means of a 'big bang' or 'spoke' the universe into existence by virtue of a six-day process?

I certainly could not and never would dispute the matter of creation as depicted in the Bible. I can however and will dispute the scientific analysis of that process, which defies the very fundamental premise of all scientific speculation. The entire scientific community expects the world to accept a postulation that states; From no actual source, in the midst of infinite space and "From Nothing", a mystical form of intense power somehow formulated to emit a force of energy so powerful that it caused an extraordinary explosion (the 'big bang').

This mysterious and remarkably powerful spark, which set into motion an evolutionary process that led to the creation of all matter in our universe, could not have happened unless some form of energy and or matter existed prior to that massive explosion. How anyone, particularly the entire scientific community, could have conformed to the ludicrous premise that 'all of this' came 'from nothing' is truly a ridiculous notion to consider.

There is certainly enough scientific evidence to conclude that our universe may have begun with a so-called 'Big Bang', but I see no reason to believe that the process contradicts the biblical account. There are many, but the scientific 'fact' that I question most is the premise that, in vast infinite space and "from nothing", the so-called bang simply generated itself. A scientific community that demands proof and an element of logic to validate any methodical theory should practice what it preaches.

Most scientists have conformed to the 'fact' and accepted the notion that the universe was created from a big bang, but it shocks me to consider that no one has successfully challenged the 'from nothing' concept. While the scientific community has postulated numerous theories to address the singularity issues, virtually no evidence exists to substantiate any of them.

Since we live in an age of rationale and logic, logic dictates the only thing that could possibly come from nothing is nothing. To state otherwise would defy all known laws of physics. Yet rather than consider the prospect of a supreme creator, a concept that at least offers a rational explanation and answers the questions of how and why, the scientific community steadfastly dismisses the notion based on its arrogant and extremely finite wisdom.

If I can rationally justify the prospect of a creator in a manner that is comparable to the philosophical scientific notions, my theories are entitled to comparable consideration. And I can offer a theoretical hypothesis that demonstrates with logic and rationale HOW and WHY a Creator would have and could have conceivably designed the energy and/or particles that initiated the big bang and thus our universe.

I believe the source of such energy, immense enough to cause a Big Bang and generate all the elements necessary to create our vast universe, simply could not and did not happen by chance or create itself. Until there is a scientific theory that can indisputably cancel out the undeniable possibilities proposed herein, I would expect the scientific community to extend equal consideration and honor the prospect of divine design.

*****/**********

What if there were other universes created 'from nothing' (if you must) with an even more powerful source of energy and gravity that dated back to five times (or more) the age of our own universe? What if the gravitation pull from that universe or multiple

universes were pulling against the weaker gravitational pull of others like our own much younger universe? Could the excessive gravitational pull of another universe be why our universe is expanding at such a phenomenal rate? The logical prospects prompt a series of logical questions and a few rational considerations.

Science now recognizes that black holes exist at the center of each known galaxy. It is unknown just what they are, where they came from and where all the matter they swallow goes. It has been determined that a distinct relationship exists between the black hole itself and the stars at the extreme outer regions of the galaxy. Scientists have only begun to theorize about this mystery and they still do not know which came first, the galaxy or the black hole. How a black hole is generated and where the massive gravitational pull comes from or leads to remains a complete mystery.

As usual, science puts on its two-dimensional blinders when it comes to the unknown. Even the most prominent astrophysicists proclaim there are aspects of the universe and space that we simply do not understand and are beyond the realm of today's modern physics. Yet, for every unexplainable phenomenon, science still insists on developing rational theoretical notions that fit into the

framework of commonly accepted scientific and mathematical knowledge, anything to avoid considering the prospect of a Divine Creator. They choose instead to define the unknown as "the strong force", "the fractional super force" and even refer to the Higgs Boson as the "God Particle", but the possibility of a Supreme Being is adamantly and arrogantly dismissed.

Rather than challenging the scientific community to consider the prospect of supernatural knowledge capable of creation on a universal scale, a knowledge that I submit to be so vast that it stems from knowledge dating back to a time long before the Big Bang, I'll submit a logical scientific theory to explain it instead.

Why is it that our universe is still expanding at an accelerated and rather alarming unexplainable rate? Was the concussion of the original thermonuclear blast on such an extensive grand scale that we are simply still experiencing the earliest stages of the initial explosion? And is there then an outer boundary to our known universe?

Although I had come to the same conclusion over ten years ago, science has finally come to accept the rational considerations associated to the concept of a multiple universe theory. But my

question is this; if you are willing to accept the probability, why do you refuse to look any further than beyond into infinity?

Could it be that our 'Big Bang' was only one of many that were manifest beyond our universe and throughout infinite space? And what if ours is simply one of the youngest? I challenge anyone to disprove this theoretical concept of multiple universes and its conceivable impact on all components in our universe?

My multiple universe theory takes notion to an extreme, but in a conceivable well justified manner that coincidentally takes the concept of black holes in a new direction as well. Consider a secondary universe (created 'from nothing' if you must) with an even more powerful source of energy than ours and a point of origination dating back to five times the age of our own universe. Consider a gravitation pull from another or multiple universes pulling against the weaker gravitational pull of our miniscule universe, a gravitational pull so strong that it supersedes that of ours, a gravitational pull that is serving to accelerate the rate of expansion.

Science leads us to believe that the accelerating expansion rate of our universe was initiated by the projecting impact of the

original blast. That may or may not be the case, but considering the recent discovery of dark matter, that just does not seem practical or logical. Regardless of your opinion on the matter, it is quite evident that all surrounding galaxies within our range of telescopic site will eventually bleed off into the darkness of oblivion. The light from these distant galaxies will never be seen again.

But I think it is extremely important to keep in mind that while this powerful gravitational expansion is taking place at speeds in excess of light, each galaxy remains universally linked. I would suggest that the mysterious gravitational quandaries, the massive black holes at their center, and perhaps the elements of the eleventh dimension serve to tie these eternal cosmological constants to the source of its creator.

Where within our universe could such a powerful gravitational force of nature have generated? I submit that it is not a force within our universe that creates black holes. I would suggest that a gravitational force (or forces) from an undetectable source, perhaps another universe (or universes), somehow links via black holes to form new galaxies in our universe. I suggest that it is no coincidence that each galaxy is formed by these incredible gravitational forces, which begin a spiraling process that feeds on

all of the surrounding matter as it eventually and ultimately consumes all substances, including light itself, that are within its immense gravitational boundaries.

At the core of each black hole, the creation of stars and new worlds are a regular phenomenon. Where orbiting speeds of the surrounding stars exceed the speed of light, massive black holes are fed on an appetite of all forms of matter and energy, which are absorbed at a phenomenal rate into an unknown cavity...another universal singularity. I pose the following very rational, but hypothetical suggestion:

Consider that a larger universe with a more powerful gravitational force existed and that the boundaries of that sphere merged with the boundaries of our own much smaller universe. As an illustration; picture two bodies of water, one large body of RED water merging with a smaller BLUE one. I would presume that another universe would intersect with our own, not collide, in much the same manner. Unlike the temperature (CBM) and force (gravitational pull) of equal sized bodies of water (each universe) these variables would most likely differ proportionately. The larger body water (greatest gravitational force) would most likely dominate and even dictate the effects on the smaller body.

If a similar scenario were to take place if/when two universes were to collide, a gravitational battle would most likely ensue as each universe struggles to retain its own gravitational force and resist the opposing force. In most cases, I would expect the stronger of the two forces to overpower the universe with weaker gravity. Since each universe is so vast and has no outer shell, it would not be a collision at all, more like a merger. Depending on the speed at which they merged, it would not only alter but most likely warp the shape of both universes. The gravitational pull of our universe could conceivably, and most likely would, begin a process of merging with the dominate force. The gravitational pull of the more dominate object could, and again most likely would, overwhelm the gravitational pull of the smaller body to cause an expansion process that resembles the process that our universe is presently experiencing.

Perhaps the black holes, which clearly permeate our universe, the dominate universe is virtually sucking the life and contents of our universe into its own. I may be alone on this postulation, but is such a scenario in infinite space so difficult to fathom?

I am certainly not a mathematician, but if there were a handful

of good ones willing to assist me in providing evidence to support this theory, I truly believe we could find a means of validating the hypothesis. Perhaps the bi-directional radiation emitted from these massive sites is due to a pull in opposite directions by an imposing universe that has consumed or is in the process of consuming ours with a much greater gravitational pull. Surely, if the same gravitational force of another universe were pulling against ours, the rate and magnitude of each black hole would reflect an element of relativity in the form of speed, intensity, and perhaps even direction. Where is all this matter that black holes are consuming disappearing to?

We know that dark matter exists. We do not know what it is or exactly what role it plays, but we know it is there and the scientific community has also conceded the probability of an 11th dimension. Although science still cannot define the 11th dimension and there is no evidence to support the prospect, I believe that they are inherently linked. But if science cannot say for certain, they must consider the only other alternative...the possible influence of a Supreme Being.

Science can search for rational scientific explanations until hell freezes over (and we know that simply is not happening), but at

some point, the scientific community, like it or not, must consider the theological conjecture that supports the concept of creation by design. It all boils down to a simple matter of logical thinking. Divine Design is the ONLY theory that makes any sense. At some point, when science can no longer explain the inexplicable, it will be left with no other alternative but to consider the prospect of an unscientific notion.

When you consider a supernatural force, one can rationally apply a logical perspective to address the questions how and why. Where did the big bang come from? I have a rational explanation and mine does not stem from or offer up a conclusion based on a ridiculous 'from nothing' philosophy.

*****/*********

© 2017 All Rights Reserved

www.DLBooks.com

Author@DLBooks.com