Cosmology Demystified

Kazmer Ujvarosy

Abstract

Once we realize that our universe has human input and output, just as a tree has seed input and output, the universe no longer appears mysterious.

Our universe has the reputation of being mysterious, and indeed it is difficult to explain where the universe and we came from, unless we know the origin of the universe.

Scientists, who have the conviction that our universe is the effect of a singularity's cataclysmic explosion or Big Bang, or of a vacuum fluctuation, fabricated the weirdest origin models. Not surprisingly "The greatest science fiction stories are in the science of physics," wrote Morris Kline in his *Mathematics and the Search for Knowledge* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1985). Commenting on the state of theoretical physics Nobel Laureate Christian de Duve also noted in his *Vital Dust* (Basic Books, 1995): "Physicists … have been driven into such weird territories by their explorations that they are now far ahead of the most imaginative science fiction writers in the kind of cosmological scenarios they can invent." In the 18 December 2014 issue of *Nature* (**516**, 321-323) George Ellis and Joe Silk expressed concern about the state of modern cosmology in their article, "Scientific method: Defend the integrity of physics." They called attention to the fact that in theoretical physics the inability to formulate a falsifiable theory that can describe correctly the observed universe resulted a variety of speculative theories which are not backed up by evidence. They argue that even if a theory is professed to be elegant and explanatory it still must be falsifiable to be scientific, otherwise such speculative constructs undermine science and mislead people.

In modern times the speculations about the origin of the universe are largely based on the observations of the cosmic system's accelerating expansion, indicating for theoretical astrophysicists that the expansion is the effect of an initial explosion. Using Albert Einstein's general theory of relativity, they traced the expansion of the universe back to a singularity's explosion or Big Bang, which singularity allegedly contained all the matter of the universe in an infinitely dense and superhot dimensionless point.

The Big Bang model is considered to be well-confirmed. Astrophysicists attribute the detected cosmic background radiation to the Big Bang's afterglow. Yet the standard model of particle physics fails to explain not only why the universe is expanding faster than expected, but also what caused elementary particles to have mass and structure.

In 1973 Edward P. Tryon, a professor emeritus of physics at Hunter College of the City University of New York, was the first physicist to propose that our universe originated as a quantum fluctuation. In his *Nature* article of 14 December 1973 (**246,** 396–397), "Is the Universe a Vacuum Fluctuation?", he wrote: "Here I propose a specific big bang model which I believe to be the simplest and most appealing imaginable—namely, that our Universe is a fluctuation of the vacuum, where 'vacuum fluctuation' is to be understood in the sense of quantum field theory."

According to Tryon's model "the Universe has always existed," and "did indeed appear from nowhere" about 10 billion years ago.

Demystifying Modern Cosmology

At this point let's recall that scientists trace the expansion of the universe back to an infinitely dense singularity's explosion or Big Bang. But in 2014 *Nature* (**507**, 90–93) published the paper, "Rate of tree carbon accumulation increases continuously with tree size," showing that trees—including California's giant redwoods—instead of decreasing accelerate their mass growth rate as they get older and bigger. Nathan Stephenson, the study's lead author, wrote: "… for most species mass growth rate increases continuously with tree size."

The world's largest tree known to us is a giant redwood, namely the General Sherman Tree in California's Sequoia National Park. Based on the facts that the older the General Sherman Tree gets the faster its mass growth increases; that an estimated 97 percent of the General Sherman Tree's biomass is considered to be nonliving; and that no one living today could have observed its seed origin, are we going to extrapolate its expansion backward in time and conclude that initially the entire tree existed in an extremely superdense and hot state which dimensionless "point" exploded, giving rise to our tree's mass and structure, and eventually to the first biomolecules that managed to evolve into the complexity of leaves, flowers and seeds, as a result of "natural selection" acting on "random mutations"?

This illustration demonstrates that the scientific method of extrapolation is likely to lead to absurdities. Just as a tree's accelerated expansion is not the result of a singularity's explosion, undoubtedly the universe's accelerated expansion is not the result of a Big Bang. And just as the agent that can be used to describe correctly a tree's creation is its parent seed, most certainly the agent that can be used to describe correctly the universe's creation is its parent seed.

Even if a tree's parent seed is not observable and tangible that seed input is indicated by the tree system's seed output. As in the case of a tree, so in the case of the universe. Systems resemble each other in fundamental ways, consequently if we can identify our universe's output, that output will indicate our universe's input.

Based on the fact that a tree's seed input is made manifest by its seed output—which output can be used to describe the tree's creation—, we infer that our universe's initial input is made manifest by its human output, which output can be used to describe the universe's creation.

Understandably the universe's parameters are precisely fine-tuned for the production of human beings, just as a tree's parameters are precisely fine-tuned for the production of seeds, because the universe is a human being's way of making reproductions of itself. In a nutshell this is the rational explanation for the finding, called the "anthropic principle," that the parameters or determining values of our universe are exquisitely fine-tuned for the production of human beings.

It may be added that conceivably the initial human input generates the universe in order to recreate itself into human output, which recreation may constitute the input of the next universe. Thus the origin of our open universe is explainable without calling in the aid of agents not in evidence.

After demystifying modern cosmology let's demystify religion.

Demystifying Religion

In Genesis we are told that God created the universe to make man in his own image, "male and female he created them" (Genesis 1:27, NIV Textbook Bible). This implies that God himself is male and female, and that properly the term "man" denotes a person of the human race of either sex. However what remains to be determined beside God's sex is his identity, the unknown factor in this equation of creation. The created universe is in evidence, as well as the universe's output, namely man. Now the question is, do we have a system that similarly produces output in the input's image? Definitely: for example a tree's biomass is the input or parent seed's way to produce seeds in its own image. This finding indicates that according to Genesis the universe is a man's way to reproduce himself. That finding demystifies religion: man, the Creator, is in evidence.

If we are correct that a man constitutes the universe's seed or input and output, did that man made himself known to us? See Revelation 22:13 where Jesus Christ identifies himself with the universe's input and output: "I am the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last, the Beginning and the End." Also in Colossians 1:17 Paul, an apostle of Christ, tells us that "He is before all things, and in him all things hold together."

Thus Christ is before the universe, just as the parent seed is before the tree's biomass, and his biofield holds the biomass of the universe together, just as the parent seed's biofield holds the tree's biomass together.

Perhaps it is evident by now that the age-old questions of where the universe and we came from are explainable without calling in the aid of any agent that is not in evidence.

By comparing a tree—whose seed origin is known—to the universe—whose origin scientists think is unknown—it is possible to identify man with the seed of the universe. To continue this reasoning, by knowing that a tree's seed output has the potential to produce the biomass of an immense tree for the purpose of self-reproduction, the inference must stand that the universe's human output similarly has the potential to produce the biomass of the universe for the purpose of self-reproduction. From this point of view, then, man indeed may be regarded as the center of the universe, irrespective of the earth's position in the cosmic system.

Professor Tryon believed that the vacuum fluctuation origin of the universe was "the simplest and most appealing imaginable" theory, however we propose that our theory, namely that human life constitutes the universe's seed or input and output, is the simplest and most appealing imaginable. It is clearly stated, understandable, and not expressed in abstruse mathematical equations. As there is no need for mathematics to determine that a tree has seed input and output, there is absolutely no need for mathematics to determine that our open universe has human input and output. In the light of our theory it is apparent that modern cosmology's models of the universe—in which models life is not a factor—are expressed in abstruse mathematical symbols to make them look as if they might be scientific. This brings us to the determination what the term "religion" really means.

The Meaning of Religion

The origin of the term "religion" is uncertain, and its meaning is being disputed since ancient times. The term's most likely etymology is that it comes from the Latin *religare*, meaning 'to bind' to the Creator or supreme power of the universe to whom reverence is due. Allegiance to the Creator of the universe also deeply binds a society.

Since we know that a man in Jesus Christ's person constitutes the genotype of the phenotype universe, we know also that we are not bound to a superhuman invisible God, but to a man akin to us.

In Acts 17:22-31 we are told that while Paul was in Athens he told the men of the city: "… as I walked around and looked carefully at your objects of worship, I even found an altar with the inscription: TO AN UNKNOWN GOD. Now what you worship as something unknown I am going to proclaim to you." So he proclaimed to them the one man who made the world and every nation of men, of whom we are his offspring. Paul did not proclaim to the men of Athens an unknown, invisible and superhuman being. Nevertheless we are being told by the "experts" that the concept of a Creator is not based on observable and testable evidence.

This basic and rational demand by science brings to mind the incident reported in John 14:1-14. When Jesus spoke to his disciples concerning the Creator or Father, namely concerning the parent seed of the universe, Philip wished to see empirical evidence for the Father's existence:

> Philip said, "Lord, show us the Father, and that will be enough for us." Jesus answered: "Don't you know me, Philip, even after I have been among you such a long time? Anyone who has seen me has seen the Father. How can you say, 'Show us the Father'?

Thus the evidence is indubitable that according to the Bible instead of a being not subject to test and observation the Creator is a man in Jesus Christ's person. This means that those who revere the man who created the universe for our sake are religious, and those who irrationally believe that lesser beings created the universe, and ultimately what is inanimate—like the singularity's Big Bang—are not religious, but superstitious.

In all probability the question will be raised: If a man is the Creator of the universe, who created the Creator? The answer is that human life is everlasting, and the existence of human life has never been falsified. The eternity of human life is affirmed by the unfalsified law of biogenesis, as well as by the Creator himself not only in Revelation, but in Isaiah 48:12 as well: "Listen to me, O Jacob, Israel, whom I have called: I am he; I am the first and I am the last." In other words our Creator is the cosmic system's human input and output.

As nonlife generating even the simplest form of life in the absence of life is not in evidence, similarly anything nonhuman yielding human life is not in evidence, in spite of the rhetoric of evolutionists. Moreover the question confuses the cause with the effect. The cause of the universe is not an effect; the universe itself is the effect of its initial cause or human input.

We cannot escape the conclusion that the proper place of any cosmology in which human life does not constitute the universe's input and output has its proper place in fiction, not in science.

In our scientific theory of creation human life, that created the universe for our production, is in evidence. On the other hand fantasies of singularities, quantum fluctuations, strings, and the rest creating the universe are not in evidence.

Ironically people who deny the existence of our Creator, namely human life, are in fact denying their own existence. Also the concept of a Creator is considered to be a subject outside the domain of natural science because allegedly the Creator is not amenable to confirmable observations and scientific tests. In light of the theory that the Creator is a man akin to us these grand assertions are absurdly false, and are made from a position of profound ignorance. By keeping God out of science education in our public schools in reality authorities are trying to keep human life out of science classrooms.

Perhaps enough has been said to show that the concept of atheism, namely the belief that there is no God—i.e. no human life—crumbles under logical scrutiny.

I studied International Relations at San Francisco State University and wrote my thesis on the subject of *Aircraft and Spacecraft in U.S. Intelligence Activities*. What made me interested in cosmology and in our relation to the universe is the theory that IR is the study of man. What I discovered conflicts fundamentally with nearly all that we are being told concerning the origin of the universe and that of ours.