**Can the Big Bang be Merged with Genesis 1?**

**Vincent**: Not sure how anything in the Big Bang contradicts Scripture.

**R. Sungenis**: Scripture says the earth came first, not light or the stars, and hence, not the Big Bang. The Big Bang has been thoroughly discredited by the ultra high-red shift of quasars that are connected to the low red shift of parent galaxies, and thus Hubble's law has been overturned.

The Big Bang was originally invented when Hubble saw all the universe's galaxies surrounding a central earth (*The Observational View of Cosmology*, 1936). In order to escape a central earth, Hubble invented an expanding universe so that the universe would look the same from wherever one viewed it, and thus not allow the earth to be in a unique central position (as Scripture said it was in Genesis 1:2, Chronicles, Psalms, Job, Isaiah). But the most amount of time he could pack into his expanding universe was 4 billion years. So Lemaitre invented the

stop-and-go expansion, that is, the universe would stop expanding long enough for the required years for stellar and biological evolution to have some semblance of workability (about 15 to 20 billion years), and then start again. But regardless of the time to expand, to begin an expanding universe, you had to have the expansion start at one specific point, hence, the Big Bang "singularity" was invented as the beginning. Only problem was that the “singularity” was not matter, and thus an undefined state of being.

In essence, modern cosmology has been one effort after another to get away from the Scriptural evidence, not support it.

**Vincent**: I think it’s a big problem for Evolutionists as it limits how much time was available compared to the Steady-State universe model with infinite time in the past and future.

Big Bang says there was a beginning and will be an End ... Hmmmmm science confirming in the 1960's what Moses and the Prophets said thousands of years ago.

**R. Sungenis**: Everyone knows there has to be a beginning and an end to the universe. The Big Bang adds nothing to that fact.

**Vincent**: Big Bang theory confirms General Relativity!

**R. Sungenis**: Not really. General Relativity was invented to make up for the failure of Special Relativity to answer the 1887 Michelson-Morley experiment which showed the earth was in the center of the universe, motionless in space (just as Genesis 1:1-2, Chronicles, Psalms, says it is). Unfortunately for Einstein, in General Relativity he had to go back to the very ether he had rejected in Special Relativity, so he ended up contradicting himself. Moreover, General Relativity is not an answer to reality. It is merely a set of mathematical equations that were formulated by working backward into Newton's laws, and then tweaking them a bit more.

**Vincent:** General Relativity predicts Time Dilation (Clocks run slower in strong gravitational fields). So how much slower did clocks run at the BB moment of Creation of the Universe? Clocks run slower on the surface of the sun compared to the earth.

**R. Sungenis**: There is no scientific proof that clocks run slower in higher gravitational environments because of "General Relativity" principles. As many other scientists hold, clocks may run slower merely because there is more gravitational ether in higher gravitational environments against which the clock's mechanisms must interact. The greater the friction, the slower the clock will tick. Common sense.

**Vincent**: And slower on GPS satellites and we have to correct this in order to navigate on GPS.

**R. Sungenis**: Yes, but the correction is not proven to be from General Relativity's principles. GR is but one explanation among many. As physicist Clifford Will says: “General Relativity has passed every solar-system test with flying colors. Yet so have alternative theories.”

Incidentally, the "correction" that had to be built into the GPS is the "Sagnac correction." Sagnac was the scientist who in 1913 showed the existence of ether and absolute motion, the total antithesis of Einstein's Special and General Relativity which denied ether and absolute motion. Ironically, the only way General Relativity can "work" with the GPS is if the GPS computers are programmed with an anti-General Relativity correction -- the Sagnac correction.

**Vincent**: Answer: When you tune a radio between broadcast stations, or a TV between stations ... you get noise. What is that noise. That noise has been shown to be the Cosmic Background Radiation *(CBR*) residual from the BB when matter first formed from the Energy present at the BB. When matter formed there should have been Photons released. The heat of this energy should have measured 3 Trillion degrees K >>> BUT we measure this today at a very cold 3 degrees K. The Universe has cooled by* a factor of ONE TRILLION*.

**R. Sungenis**: There is no proof that the CMB is from a Big Bang. That is merely a convenient and self-serving interpretation. The CMB could merely be the residual temperature of the stellar energy in space, or any number of things. Ironically, it is the isotropy of the CMB which discredits the Big Bang, since the same energy existing in all directions means, once again, that the Earth is in the center of it all.

**Vincent**: Why is this important? We don't only measure Energy by temperature. We measure Energy by the Frequency of the Light (Electromagnetic wave) emitted. If the temperature of the *CBR* cooled by a factor of one trillion. That means the Frequency of the electromagnetic wave also slowed by one trillion. THE ATOMIC CLOCK RAN ONE TRILLION TIMES SLOWER AT THE CREATION THAN IT DOES NOW!

**R. Sungenis**: All self-serving speculation without an ounce of proof.

**Vincent**: It is an annoying coincidence to Genesis critics that 15 Billion years divided by One Trillion = *5.5 days*.

**R. Sungenis**: Genesis doesn't need our unproven speculations about how fast or slow atomic clocks ran or run. Again, trying to fit modern Big Bang cosmology into Genesis is totally futile, since Genesis insists that the Earth came first and everything else was built around it.

**Vincent**: If you read Genesis carefully, I think you will notice that a distinct difference in the pace of the narrative that occurs after God rests. The story proceeds from a human perspective ... its like we switched Clocks from God's Time to human time.

**R. Sungenis**: No, the same length of days are used before the seventh day as after. That is why Exodus 20:11 uses the same time factor for both periods.

**Vincent**: General Relativity. It's in the Bible long before Einstein invented it in 1905. The more we learn ... The Bible is getting smarter all the time.

**R. Sungenis**: General Relativity is not in the Bible. It was invented by Einstein to escape the truths of the Bible, not support them. Those who see GR in the Bible are using eisegesis, not exegesis. Einstein was an atheist who hated the Catholic Church. I have many quotes to that effect in my book.

**Vincent**: It makes no difference to me whether the scientific community has all or part of their theory of the universe correct or wrong. The theories are always adjusted or sometimes completely discarded when new evidence surfaces.

But does scripture say the Earth was created before light? I am not sure. Genesis 1: The Beginning: 1 In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.

**Vincent**: The Fabric of space and matter earth, water, air, and fire, which was thought to be the constituent matter of the heavenly bodies and latent in all things.

**R. Sungenis**: No, the fabric of space wasn't created until the second day, when God created

the firmament. The firmament is also called the "heavens" (Genesis 1:8: "And God called the firmament heaven"), and the place where the birds fly (vr. 20).

Genesis 1:1 ("In beginning God created the heavens and the earth") is merely an introductory title for the rest of the creation days. It is like the chapter heading of a book. The earth is the first entity of matter that Genesis records. The second is the water surrounding the earth.

**Vincent**: 2 Now the earth was formless and empty, darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was hovering over the waters. The matter (earth) that the planet earth is composed of had not yet formed the planet

**R. Sungenis**: The Hebrew simply means that the earth was indistinguishable ("formless") from the water that surrounded it, and no vegetation or anything else had yet been created on it ("empty").

**Vincent**: 3 And God said, "Let there be light," and there was light. 4 God saw that the light was good, and He separated the light from the darkness. 5 God called the light "day," and the darkness he called "night." And there was evening, and there was morning—the first day.

Light was emitted AFTER matter (Earth, the element) formed -- (That's what the BB theory says ... The CBR is the result of the formation of matter). But before the planet Earth was formed.

**R. Sungenis**: No, the Big Bang theory says that the earth came about 8 billion years after the "light" of the Big Bang. Moreover, Genesis doesn't use the Hebrew word ERETS ("earth") for "matter." To translate ERETS as "matter" is an imposition on the text that is not supported by the context. The context speaks of an ERETS as having water surrounding it (vr. 1), which water was then divided from the land and the land was also called ERETS (vr. 10). The ERETS then had plants put on it the third day (vr. 11). In other words, ERETS always refers to the earth, not raw matter.

**Vincent**: All that was on the first day. It doesn't look like the Planet earth was finished until the second or third day.

**R. Sungenis**: Unless you can show how "matter" was surrounded by "water" before the "light" came, then the BB simply cannot fit into the chronology of Genesis 1.

**Vincent**: Two issues: 1. Did Augustine, Origen, and Aquinas believe Moses?

"What person of intelligence, I ask, will consider as a reasonable statement that the first and the second and the third day, in which there are said to be both morning and evening, existed without sun and moon and stars, while the first day was even without a heaven? […] I do not think anyone will doubt that these are figurative expressions which indicate certain mysteries through a semblance of history."

**R. Sungenis**: It doesn't take any more intelligence to figure out that the light of Genesis 1:3 on Day 1 was composed of the same substance as the light which the sun and stars produced on Day 4, that is, fire. It also is reasonable to assume that the earth existed as a tiny sphere surrounded by millions of miles of ice (water), and that a hemispherical mass of fire revolved around the earth for the first three days, creating a day and night sequence, which eventually liquified the ice so that life could then be sustained by Day 3. When the firmament expanded (as Day 2 specifies in vrs. 6-9) it took the fire with it to the recesses of its created space, perhaps then being used to constitute the stars and the other light-bearing bodies in space, while a residual was left in the proximity of Earth and was formed into the sun.

**Vincent**: Origen, On First Principles: "Perhaps Sacred Scripture in its customary style is speaking with the limitations of human language in addressing men of limited understanding. … The narrative of the inspired writer brings the matter down to the capacity of children."

**R. Sungenis**: Origen was known for allegorizing almost the entire Scripture, even parts that were commonly accepted by everyone else as quite literal, so his allegorizing of Genesis 1 really doesn't mean much. So his opinion here is not really decisive, especially when every other Father took Genesis 1-3 very literally.

**Vincent**: St. Augustine, The Literal Meaning of Genesis : "On the day on which God created the heaven and the earth, He created also every plant of the field, not, indeed, actually, but "before it sprung up in the earth," that is, potentially. … All things were not distinguished and adorned together, not from a want of power on God's part, as requiring time in which to work, but that due order might be observed in the instituting of the world. Hence it was fitting that different days should be assigned to the different states of the world, as each succeeding work added to the world a fresh state of perfection."

**R. Sungenis**: That was only one of Augustine's ideas for interpreting Genesis 1. Augustine, by his own admission, struggled with Genesis 1 because he didn't know how to fit in the angels, which then led him to think that the Days may be for the contemplation of the angels. He also got confused by his misconstruing of Sirach 18:1 ("He that liveth for ever created all things together") which he believed taught that all things were created at once. Augustine didn't know either Hebrew or Greek in order to figure out that Sirach 18:1 wasn't making a chronological commentary on Genesis 1, he only knew the Latin (which misconstrued the LXX Greek word KOINE ("in common") for the Latin SIMUL ("altogether"). Moreover, Augustine never abandoned his original interpretation that the Days of Genesis 1 were sequential. He merely said he preferred the "at once" interpretation due to the issue about the angels, and he also said (in the Literal Interpretation of Genesis) that he was open to have his mind changed on the issue if someone could come up with a better explanation.

**Vincent**: Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica: "In matters that are so obscure and far beyond our vision, we find in Holy Scripture passages which can be interpreted in very different ways without prejudice to the faith we have received. In such cases, we should not rush in headlong and so firmly take our stand on one side that, if further progress in the search of truth justly undermines this position, we too fall with it. That would be to battle not for the teaching of Holy Scripture but for our own, wishing its teaching to conform to ours, whereas we ought to wish ours to conform to that of Sacred Scripture."

**R. Sungenis**: Well, all the Fathers, even Origen, DID take a strong stand on Genesis 1. No one was without an interpretation he didn't feel was correct. Aquinas is talking about Scripture in general, not necessarily about Genesis 1.

**Vincent**: And I copied this from John Wesley's Genesis 1 Wesley's Notes on the Bible

2 And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

1:2 Where we have an account of the first matter, and the first Mover.

1. A chaos was the first matter. 'Tis here called the earth, (tho' the earth, properly taken, was not made 'till the third day, Ge 1:10) because it did most resemble that which was afterwards called earth, a heavy unwieldy mass. 'Tis also called the deep, both for its vastness, and because the waters which were afterwards separated from the earth were now mixed with it. This mighty bulk of matter was it, out of which all bodies were afterwards produced. The Creator could have made his work perfect at first, but by this gradual proceeding he would shew what is ordinarily the method of his providence, and grace. This chaos, was without form and void. Tohu and Bohu, confusion and emptiness, so those words are rendered, Isa 34:11. 'Twas

shapeless, 'twas useless, 'twas without inhabitants, without ornaments; the shadow or rough draught of things to come. To those who have their hearts in heaven, this lower world, in comparison of the upper, still appears to be confusion and emptiness. And darkness was upon the face of the deep - God did not create this darkness, (as he is said to create the darkness of affliction, Isa 45:7.) for it was only the want of light.

**R. Sungenis**: Mr. Wesley is not exegeting Scripture here. He is just asserting his opinion. Furthermore, his opinion does not agree with the text. Genesis 1 says nothing about the Earth being created on the “third day.” I don’t know anyone who holds that view. As I said in my last email, the Hebrew word ERETS does not refer to anything but the Earth as we know it today. Raw matter cannot be encompassed by water, only the Earth as a spherical object could be encompassed by water, and then have that same water divided vertically and horizontally on Day 2, since water assumes the shape of its container.

**Vincent**: 2. It is claimed the Earth was created before Light. That would certainly be a Miracle... and I believe in miracles ... but you cannot expect the scientists to explain the universe by invoking Miracles.

**R. Sungenis**: The Big Bang IS a miracle. Anyone who believes that something (matter) came from nothing (a singularity composed of no matter) believes in miracles. Modern science merely prefers its own miracles to the miracles in the Bible.

**Vincent**: As far as I know, in Physics (not miracles), light is the child of matter. If matter exists at any temperature above 0 Kelvin ... Photons will be emitted. So God when he created the Earth would have had to first or simultaneously created the matter the Earth is composed of... when He did this ... he also created Light at the same time.

**R. Sungenis**: They are still struggling to figure out whether light is a wave or a particle, much less whether there are packets called photons. I don't think anyone is prepared to say, definitively, what light is. We might agree that anything above 0 Kelvin emits energy, but whether it is visible light that could create a day/night sequence is another story altogether. Obviously, the matter which composed the Earth and the water surrounding the Earth on Day 1 was composed of atomic particles, including electrons, and thus there was a form of energy. But the Light God created on Day 1 is in the visible spectrum, and enough to accomplish its task of illuminating the Earth.

**Vincent**: Now which came first, the chicken or the egg? As a believer in Creation ... THE CHICKEN! Likewise, Light is the daughter of matter. But I suppose if HE wanted to, God could have created the Earth and matter at precisely the same moment, and the matter could have been at Absolute Zero Kelvin temperature.

**R. Sungenis**: Yes, the Earth and the ice could have been at 0 Kelvin. The Light could have made the temperature of the firmament 2.73 Kelvin, as it is today. As for the chicken and the egg, is fire (which is light) from matter? Many scientists consider fire the fourth state of matter, which they call plasma. It is not pure energy and not pure matter, but seems to be something in between the two.