

Fiat Lux

(Genesis 1:3)

Ron Bourgoin
Edgecombe Community College
Rocky Mount, North Carolina, 27801

Abstract

In the vast reaches of space between galaxies, we find dust. Where did it come from, this dust? We hypothesize it is generated by light escaping from the galaxies. We then make a quantum leap and suggest our Universe began from light escaping from other universes.

For Robert Leon Carroll, the Beginning begins with the creation of two particles, electron and positron.^{1,2}

We have thought in the past that those two particles necessarily annihilate in the presence of each other, but today there are doubts. We don't quite know how to make sense of it all right now, but the PAMELA satellite is measuring huge quantities of electrons and positrons in space that obviously are not annihilating each other.³ This is upsetting our paradigm that says those two particles should not be peacefully co-existing side-by-side. What's going on?

We've been bombarded by all sorts of accounts recently that say such things about the PAMELA findings as "the electrons and positrons exist in widely separated streams in space."

That statement, however, is a fabrication. The evidence is that the two particles exist in what can be called a positron-electron soup. Apparently the particles don't always annihilate one another. Why they don't is a question for the future to resolve. All you and I can do at present is look at the evidence and reason on the basis of it.

Carroll says Creation began with the creation of electrons and positrons. From these two particles are composed larger more massive particles. Cynthia Kolb Whitney says that neutrons, for example, are composed of 920 electrons and 920 positrons. The proton, she adds, is made up of 919 positrons and 918 electrons.⁴ Atoms, as we know, are made up of electrons, neutrons, and protons.

If God could create on the basis of just two particles, why would he use the Standard Model with its 200 different types of particles? How much sense would that make? Why use 200 different particles if only 2 will do?

In the beginning, whenever that was, a lot had to be done. It just makes sense that God would have used the simplest means to get the job done. We realize we're thinking like mathematicians here, where all is reduced to its simplest possible terms and there is balance, but that's not an unreasonable second-guess.

If we admit that God acts according to reason, then our 2-particle scenario is a reasonable possibility. It might have happened this way, we have to admit. But if you read Carroll very carefully, you will see that his electron and his positron are made from photons. He doesn't tell you that; you just have to figure it out. His electron is made from a left-hand spinning photon, and his positron is made from a right-hand spinning photon. A modern author who has said the same thing is Chen Sen nian.^{5,6} It is obvious that Chen Sen nian is not aware of the prior work of Carroll, which, in my opinion, is significant because it says that two great minds came up with exactly the same idea. Obviously there's something right about the idea. We get the impression after reading nian and Carroll that an awareness is beginning to creep into the human mind: that matter is created from light. We thus have a physical cycle of light → matter → light → matter, etc.

As physicists we have to find a plausible physical explanation for the source of the light. We will say therefore that our Universe was created from light from other universes in the multiverse.

We find in the vast spaces between galaxies in our Universe, dust.⁷ Dust, whose source we do not know, exists in the enormous space between galaxies. How did it get there? We believe it comes from photons that escape from the surrounding galaxies.⁸ Their light energy is deposited slowly, ever so slowly, over the eons to form particles and atoms and molecules and dust. From dust come stars and planets, as we know. In other words, evidence of our Universe's beginning might be staring at us from the other end of our telescopes.

Genesis 1:3 therefore to us means that light is the physical agent of creation.

References

1. Robert Leon Carroll, The Eternity Equation, J.R. Rowell Printing Company, Charleston, South Carolina, 1976.
2. Robert Leon Carroll, The Energy of Physical Creation, Carroll Research Institute, Columbia, South Carolina, 1985.
3. Pamela.roma2.infn.it
4. Cynthia Kolb Whitney, "The Neutron: A Challenge for Post-Maxwell Physics", *Hadronic Journal* **31**, 3, 201-250, 2008.
5. Chen Sen nian, "Photon, Charged Particle and Anti-Charged Particle", *Adv. Studies in Theor. Phys.* **3**, 11, 401-419, 2009.
6. Chen Sen nian, "The Formation of Spin $\frac{\hbar}{2}$ in \pm Charged Particles and Different Interpretation for the Wavefunction", *Adv. Studies in Theor. Phys.* **4**, 12, 565-574, 2010.
7. E. Xilouris *et al.*, "Abundant Dust Found in Intergalactic Space", *Astrophysical Journal* **651**, L107-L110, 2006. (Arxiv:astro-ph/0610027)
8. Ron Bourgoïn, "Dating the Universe by Intergalactic Dust", *Infinite Energy* **15**, 90, March-April, 2010.