

THE HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSE IN 1000 WORDS OR LESS

Manjunath.R

#16/1, 8th Main Road, Shivanagar, Rajajinagar, Bangalore560010, Karnataka, India

*Corresponding Author Email: manjunath5496@gmail.com

Cosmic Event in which our universe was born – Inflation in which the Grand Unified Force was separated into the Four Forces of Nature as We Now Know Them, and the Universe started to Expand to Many Times Its Original Size in a Very Short Period of Time – Rapid expansion in which the universe cooled, though not Quite as Quickly -- PARTICLE-ANTIPARTICLE ANNIHILATION in which All the Antiparticles in the Universe Annihilated Almost All the Particles, Creating a Universe Made Up of Matter and Photons and no antimatter -- DEUTERIUM AND HELIUM PRODUCTION in which Many of the Protons and Neutrons in the Early Universe Combined to Form Heavy Hydrogen and Helium -- RECOMBINATION in which Electrons Combined with Hydrogen and Helium Nuclei, Producing Neutral Atoms -- GALAXY FORMATION in which the Milky Way Galaxy was Formed -- TURBULENT FRAGMENTATION in which a Giant Cloud of Gas Fragments broke into Smaller Clouds, which later Became Protostars -- MASSIVE STAR FORMATION in which a Massive Star was Formed -- STELLAR EVOLUTION in which Stars Evolved and Eventually Died--IRON PRODUCTION in which Iron was Produced in the Core of a Massive Star, Resulting in a Disaster called SUPERNOVA EXPLOSION in Which a Massive Star Ended Its Life by Exploding -- STAR FORMATION in which the Sun was Formed-- PLANETARY DIFFERENTIATION in which the Planet Earth was Formed-- VOLATILE GAS EXPULSION in which the Atmosphere of the Earth was Produced -- MOLECULAR REPRODUCTION in which Life on Earth was created -- PROTEIN CONSTRUCTION in which Proteins were built from Amino Acids -- FERMENTATION in which Bacteria Obtained Energy from Their Surroundings -- CELL DIFFERENTIATION in which Eukaryotic Life had a beginning -- RESPIRATION in which Eukaryotes Evolved to Survive in an Atmosphere with Increasing Amounts of Oxygen -- MULTICELLULAR ORGANISMS CREATION In Which Organisms Composed of Multiple Cells emerged -- SEXUAL REPRODUCTION in Which a New Form of Reproduction Occurred and with the invention of sex, two organisms exchanged whole paragraphs, pages and books of their DNA helix, producing new varieties for the sieve of natural selection. And the natural selection was a choice of stable forms and a rejection of unstable ones. And the variation within a species occurred randomly, and that the survival or extinction of each organism depended upon its ability to adapt to the environment. And organisms that found sex uninteresting quickly became extinct -- EVOLUTIONARY DIVERSIFICATION in which the Diversity of Life Forms on Earth Increased Greatly in a Relatively Short Time -- TRILOBITE DOMINATION In Which Trilobites (an extremely successful subphylum of the arthropods that were at the top of the food chain in Earth's marine ecosystems for about 250 million years) Ruled the Earth --LAND EXPLORATION In Which Animals First Venture was Onto Land – COMET COLLISION in which a Comet smashed the Earth -- DINOSAUR EXTINCTION In Which the Dinosaurs Died -- MAMMAL EXPANSION in which Many Species of Mammals was Developed -- HOMO SAPIENS MANIFESTATION In Which our caveman ancestors Appeared – LANGUAGE ACQUISITION in which something called curiosity ensued which triggered the breath of perception and our caveman ancestors became conscious of their existence and they learned to talk and they Developed Spoken Language -- GLACIATION in which a Thousand-Year Ice Age Began ---

INNOVATION in which Advanced Tools were Widely made and Used -- RELIGION In Which a Diversity of Beliefs emerged --- ANIMAL DOMESTICATION in which Humans Domesticated Animals -- FOOD SURPLUS PRODUCTION In Which Humans Developed and promoted Agriculture -- INSCRIPTION In Which Writing was Invented and it allowed the communication of ideas -- WARRING NATIONS In Which Nation Battled Nation for Resources --- EMPIRE CREATION AND DESTRUCTION In Which the First Empire in Human History Came and went --- CIVILIZATION In Which Many and Sundry Events Occurred -- CONSTITUTION In Which a Constitution was Written -- INDUSTRIALIZATION in Which Automated Manufacturing and Agriculture Revolutionized the World --- WORLD CONFLAGRATIONS In Which Most of the World was at War --- FISSION EXPLOSIONS In Which Humans Developed Nuclear Weapons -- COMPUTERIZATION In Which Computers were Developed --- SPACE EXPLORATION In Which Humans Began to Explore Outer Space --- POPULATION EXPLOSION In Which the Human Population of the Earth Increased at a Very Rapid Pace --SUPERPOWER CONFRONTATION In Which Two Powerful Nations Risked it All -- INTERNET EXPANSION In Which a Network of Computers Developed -- RESIGNATION In Which One Human Quitted His Job --- REUNIFICATION In Which a Wall went Up and Then Came Down --- WORLD WIDE WEB CREATION In Which a New Medium was Created --- COMPOSITION In Which a Book was Written --- EXTRAPOLATION In Which Future Events were Discussed.

Ever since the beginning of human civilization, we have not been in a state of satisfaction to watch things as incoherent and unexplainable. While we have been thinking whether the universe began at the big bang singularity and would come to an end either at the big crunch singularity, we have converted at least a thousand joules of energy in the form of thoughts. This has decreased the disorder of the human brain by about few million units. Thus, in a sense, the evolution of human civilization in understanding the universe has established a small corner of the order in a human brain. However, the burning questions still remain unresolved, which set the human race to keep away from such issues. Many early native postulates have fallen or are falling aside -- and there now alternative substitutes. In short, while we do not have an answer, we now have a whisper of the grandeur of the problem. With our limited brains and tiny knowledge, we cannot hope to have a complete picture of unlimited speculating about the gigantic universe we live in.

For lack of other theories that can accurately describe a large class of arbitrary elements to must make definite predictions about the results of future observations, we forcibly adore the theories like the big bang, which posits that in the beginning of evolution all the observable galaxies and every speck of energy in the universe was jammed into a very tiny mathematically indefinable entity called the singularity (or the primeval atom named by the Catholic priest Georges Lemaitre, who was the first to investigate the origin of the universe that we now call the big bang). This extremely dense point exploded with unimaginable force, creating matter and propelling it outward to make the billions of galaxies of our vast universe. It seems to be a good postulate that the anticipation of a mathematically indefinable entity by a scientific theory implies that the theory has ruled out. It would mean that the usual approach of science of building a scientific model could anticipate that the universe must have had a beginning, but that it could not prognosticate how it had a beginning. Between 1920s and 1940s there were several attempts, most notably by the British physicist Sir Fred Hoyle (a man who ironically spent almost his entire professional life trying to disprove the big bang theory) and his co-workers: Hermann Bondi and Thomas Gold, to avoid the cosmic singularity in terms of an elegant model that supported the idea that as the universe expanded, new matter was continually created to keep the density constant on average. The universe didn't have a beginning and it continues to exist eternally as it is today. This idea was initially given priority, but a mountain of inconsistencies with it began to appear in the mid 1960's when observational discoveries apparently supported the evidence contrary to it. However, Hoyle and his supporters put forward increasingly contrived explanations of the observations. But the final blow to it came with the observational discovery of a faint background of microwaves (whose wavelength was close to the size of water molecules) throughout space in 1965 by Arno Penzias and Robert Wilson, which was the "the final nail in the coffin of the big bang theory" i.e., the discovery and confirmation of the cosmic microwave background radiation (which could heat our food stuffs to only about -270 degrees Centigrade — 3 degrees above absolute zero,

and not very useful for popping corn) in 1965 secured the Big Bang as the best theory of the origin and evolution of the universe. Though Hoyle and Narlikar tried desperately, the steady state theory was abandoned.

With many bizarre twists and turns of Humanity's deepest desire for knowledge, super strings – a generalized extension of string theory which predicts that all matter consists of tiny vibrating strings and the precise number of dimensions: ten and has a curious history (It was originally invented in the late 1960s in an attempt to find a theory to describe the strong force). The usual three dimensions of space – length, width, and breadth – and one of time are extended by six more spatial dimensions – blinked into existence. Although the mathematics of super strings is so complicated that, to date, no one even knows the exact equations of the theory (we know only approximations to these equations, and even the approximate equations are so complicated that they as yet have been only partially solved) – The best choice we have at the moment is the super strings, but no one has seen a superstring and it has not been found to agree with experience and moreover there's no direct evidence that it is the correct description of what the universe is. Are there only 4 dimensions or could there be more: (x, y, z, t) + w, v, ...? Can we experimentally observe evidence of higher dimensions? What are their shapes and sizes? Are they classical or quantum? Are dimensions a fundamental property of the universe or an emergent outcome of chaos by the mere laws of nature (which are shaped by a kind of lens, the interpretive structure of our human brains)? And if they exist, they could provide the key to unlock the deepest secrets of nature and Creation itself? We humans look around and only see four (three spatial dimensions and one time dimension i.e., space has three dimensions, I mean that it takes three numbers – length, breadth and height– to specify a point. And adding time to our description, then space becomes space-time with 4 dimensions) – why 4 dimensions? where are the other dimensions? Are they rolled the other dimensions up into a space of very small size, something like a million million million million millionth of an inch – so small that our most powerful instruments can probe? Up until recently, we have found no evidence for signatures of extra dimensions. No evidence does not mean that extra dimensions do not exist. However, being aware that we live in more dimensions than we see is a great prediction of theoretical physics and also something quite futile even to imagine that we are entering what may be the golden age of cosmology even our best technology cannot resolve their shape.

For n spatial dimensions: The gravitational force between two massive bodies is: $F_G = GMm / r^{n-1}$ where G is the gravitational constant (which was first introduced by Sir Isaac Newton (who had strong philosophical ideas and was appointed president of the Royal Society and became the first scientist ever to be knighted.) as part of his popular publication in 1687 “Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica” and was first successfully measured by the English physicist Henry Cavendish), M and m are the masses of the two bodies and r is the distance between them. The electrostatic force between two charges is: $F_E = Qq / 4\pi\epsilon_0 r^{n-1}$ where ϵ_0 is the absolute permittivity of free space, Q and q are the charges and r is the distance between them. What do we notice about both of these forces? Both of these forces are proportional to $1/r^{n-1}$. So in a 4 dimensional universe (3 spatial dimensions + one time dimension) forces are proportional to $1/r^2$; in the 10 dimensional universe (9 spatial dimensions + one time dimension) they're proportional to $1/r^8$. Not surprisingly, at present no experiment is smart enough to solve the problem of whether or not the universe exists in 10 dimensions or more (i.e., to prove or disprove both of these forces are proportional to $1/r^8$ or proportional to $> 1/r^8$). However, yet mathematically we can imagine many spatial dimensions but the fact that that might be realized in nature is a profound thing. So far, we presume that the universe exists in extra dimensions because the mathematics of superstrings requires the presence of ten distinct dimensions in our universe or because a standard four dimensional theory is too small to jam all the forces into one mathematical framework. But what we know about the spatial dimensions we live in is limited by our own abilities to think through many approaches, many of the most satisfying are scientific.

Among many that we can develop, the most well-known, believed theory at the present is the standard four dimensional theory. However, development and change of the theory always occurs as many questions still remain about our universe we live in. And if space was 2 dimensional then force of gravitation between two bodies would have been = to GMm/r (i.e., the force of gravitation between two bodies would have been far greater than its present value). And if the force of gravitation between two bodies would have been far greater than its present value, the rate of emission of gravitational radiation would have been sufficiently high enough to cause the earth to spiral onto the Sun even before the sun become a black hole and swallow the earth. While if space was 1 dimensional then force of gravitation between two bodies would have been = GMm (i.e., the force of gravitation between two bodies would have

been independent of the distance between them).

The selection principle that we live in a region of the universe that is suitable for intelligent life which is called the anthropic principle (a term coined by astronomer Brandon Carter in 1974) would not have seemed to be enough to allow for the development of complicated beings like us. The universe would have been vastly different than it does now and, no doubt, life as we know it would not have existed. And if spacial dimensions would have been $>$ than 3, the force of gravitation between two bodies would have been decreased more rapidly with distance than it does in three dimensions. (In three dimensions, the gravitational force drops to $1/4$ if one doubles the distance. In four dimensions it would drop to $1/5$, in five dimensions to $1/6$, and so on.) The significance of this is that the orbits of planets, like the earth, around the sun would have been unstable to allow for the existence of any form of life and there would be no intelligent beings to observe the effectiveness of extra dimensions.

Although the proponents of string theory (which occupies a line in space at each moment of time) predict absolutely everything is built out of strings (which are described as patterns of vibration that have length but no height or width—like infinitely thin pieces of string), it could not provide us with an answer of what the string is made up of? And one model of potential multiple universes called the M Theory – has eleven dimensions, ten of space and one of time, which we think an explanation of the laws governing our universe that is currently the only viable candidate for a “theory of everything”: the unified theory that Einstein was looking for, which, if confirmed, would represent the ultimate triumph of human reason— predicts that our universe is not only one giant hologram.

Like the formation of bubbles of steam in boiling water – Great many holograms of possible shapes and inner dimensions were created, started off in every possible way, simply because of an uncaused accident called spontaneous creation. Our universe was one among a zillion of holograms simply happened to have the right properties – with particular values of the physical constants right for stars and galaxies and planetary systems to form and for intelligent beings to emerge due to random physical processes and develop and ask questions, Who or what governs the laws and constants of physics? Are such laws the products of chance or a mere cosmic accident or have they been designed? How do the laws and constants of physics relate to the support and development of life forms? Is there any knowable existence beyond the apparently observed dimensions of our existence? However, M theory sounds so bizarre and unrealistic that there is no experiment that can credit its validity. Nature has not been quick to pay us any hints so far. That's the fact of it; grouped together everything we know about the history of the universe is a fascinating topic for study, and trying to understand the meaning of them is one of the key aspects of modern cosmology— which is rather like plumbing, in a way.

And as more space comes into existence, more of the dark energy (an invisible and unexpected cosmological force which was a vanishingly small slice of the pie 13.7 billion years ago, but today it is about three times as much as visible matter and dark matter put together and it eclipses matter and hides in empty space and works for the universe's expansion i.e., pushes the edges of the universe apart – a sort of anti-gravity) would appear. Unfortunately, no one at the present time has any understanding of where this “undetected substance” comes from or what exactly it is. Is it a pure cosmological constant (an arbitrary parameter from general relativity, has been taken to be zero for most of the twentieth century for the simple and adequate reason that this value was consistent with the data) or is it a sign of extra dimensions? What is the cause of the dark energy? Why does it exist at all? Why is it so different from the other energies? Why is the composition of dark energy so large (of about 73% of our universe – we only make up 0.03% of the universe which include stars orbiting their galaxies much too fast to be held in orbit merely by the gravitational attraction of the observed galactic stars)?

String theory (a cutting-edge research that has integrated [Einstein's] discoveries into a quantum universe with numerous hidden dimensions coiled into the fabric of the cosmos - dimensions whose geometry may well hold the key to some of the most profound questions ever posed) gives us a clue, but there's no definitive answer. Well, all we know is that it is a sort of cosmic accelerator pedal or an invisible energy what made the universe bang and if we held it in our hand; we couldn't take hold of it. In fact, it would go right through our fingers, go right through the rock beneath our feet and go all the way to the majestic swirl of the heavenly stars. It would reverse direction and come back from the stately waltz of orbiting binary stars through the intergalactic night all the way to the edge of our feet and go back and forth. How near are we to understand the dark energy? The question lingers, answer complicates and challenges everyone who yearns to resolve. And once we understand the dark energy, can we

understand the birth and the death of everything in the mankind's observable universe, from a falling apple to the huge furnace (that burns billions of pounds of matter each second and reaches temperatures of tens of millions of degrees at its core) and the earth (standing at the center of the universe, surrounded by eight spheres carrying all the known heavenly bodies) is also an?

The entire universe is getting more disordered and chaotic with time i.e., the entropy of the universe is increasing toward greater disorder. And this observation is elevated to the status of a law, the so called Second law of thermodynamics (which was discovered by the great German physicist, Ludwig Boltzmann who laid down the second law of thermodynamics, committed suicide in 1906, in part because of the intense ridicule he faced while promoting the concept of atoms) i.e., the universe will tend toward a state of maximum entropy, such as a uniform gas near absolute zero (at this point, the atoms themselves almost come to a halt) and that there is nothing we have to do about it. No matter how advanced our conditions would be right for the generation of thoughts to predict things more or less, even if not in a simplest way, it can never squash the impending threat of the second law of thermodynamics (that will eventually result in the destruction of all intelligent life) nor it can bring us close to the answer of why was the entropy ever low in the first place. This makes cosmology (the study of the universe as a whole, including its birth and perhaps its ultimate fate) a bit more complicated than we would have hoped.

Explaining everything ... is one of the greatest challenges we have ever faced. Hence, it has been an endeavor of science to find a single theory which could explain everything, where every partial theory that we've read so far (in school) is explained as a case of the one cogent theory within some special circumstances. Despite being a mystery skeptic, the Unified Field Theory (which Albert Einstein sought [but never realized] during the last thirty years of his life and capable of describing nature's forces within a single, all-encompassing, coherent framework) presents an infinite problem. This is embarrassing. Because we now realize before we can work for the theory of everything, we have to work for the ultimate laws of nature. At the present, we're clueless as to what the ultimate laws of nature really are. Are there new laws beyond the apparently observed dimensions of our universe? Do all the fundamental laws of nature unify? At what scale? Ultimately, however, it is likely that answers to these questions in the form of unified field theory may be found over the next few years or by the end of the century we shall know can there really be a complete unified theory that would presumably solve our problems? Or are we just chasing a mirage? Is the ultimate unified theory so compelling, that it brings about its own existence? However, if we – a puny and insignificant on the scale of the cosmos – do discover a unified field theory, it should in time be understandable in broad principle by everyone, not just a few people. Then we shall all be able to take part in the discussion of the questions of how and when did the universe begin? Was the universe created? Has this universe been here forever or did it have a beginning at the Big Bang? If the universe was not created, how did it get here? If the Big Bang is the reason there is something rather than nothing, and then before the Big Bang there was NOTHING and then suddenly we got A HUGE AMOUNT OF ENERGY where did it come from? What powered the Big Bang? What is the fate of the Universe? Is the universe heading towards a Big Freeze (the end of the universe when it reaches near absolute zero), a Big Rip, a Big Crunch (the final collapse of the universe), or a Big Bounce? Or is it part of an infinitely recurring cyclic model? Is inflation a law of Nature? Why the universe started off very hot and cooled as it expanded? Is the Standard Big Bang Model right? Or is it the satisfactory explanation of the evidence which we have and therefore merits our provisional acceptance? Is our universe finite or infinite in size and content? What lies beyond the existing space and time? What was before the event of creation? Why is the universe so uniform on a large scale (even though uncertainty principle – which fundamentally differentiates quantum from classic reasoning– discovered by the German physicist Werner Heisenberg in 1927 – implies that the universe cannot be completely uniform because there are some uncertainties or fluctuations in the positions and velocities of the particles)? Why does it look the same at all points of space and in all directions? In particular, why is the temperature of the cosmic microwave background radiation so nearly the same when we look in different directions? Why are the galaxies distributed in clumps and filaments? When were the first stars formed, and what were they like? Or if string theory (which is part of a grander synthesis: M-theory and have captured the hearts and minds of much of the theoretical physics community while being apparently disconnected from any realistic chance of definitive experimental proof) is right i.e., every particle is a tiny one dimensional vibrating string of Planck length (the smallest possible length i.e., Planck time multiplied by the speed of light)?

Why most of the matter in the Universe is dark? Is anthropic principle a natural coincidence? If we find the answers to them, it would be the ultimate triumph of human reason i.e., we might hold the key to address the eternal conundrum of some of the most difficult issues in modern physics. Yet those difficult issues are also the most exciting, for those who address big, basic questions: What do we really know about the universe? How do we know

it? Where did the universe come from, and where is it going? It would bring to an end a long and glorious lesson in the history of mankind's intellectual struggle to understand the universe. For then we would know whether the laws of physics started off the universe in such an incomprehensible way or not. Chances are that these questions will be answered long after we're gone, but there is hope that the beginnings of those answers may come within the next few years, as some aspects of bold scientific theory that attempts to reconcile all the physical properties of our universe into a single unified and coherent mathematical framework begin to enter the realm of theoretical and experimental formulation.

Up until recently, a multitude of revolutions in various domains, from literature to experimental science, has prevailed over established ideas of modern age in a way never seen before. But we do not know about what is the exact mechanism by which an implosion of a dying star becomes a specific kind of explosion called a supernova. All that we know is that: When a massive star runs out of nuclear fuel, the gravitational contraction continues increasing the density of matter. And since the internal pressure is proportional to the density of matter, therefore the internal pressure will continually increase with the density of matter. And at a certain point of contraction, internal pressure will be very much greater than gravitational binding pressure and will be sufficiently high enough to cause the star to explode, spraying the manufactured elements into space that would flung back into the gas in the galaxy and would provide some of the raw material for the next generation of stars and bodies that now orbit the sun as planets like the Earth. The total energy released would outshine all the other stars in the galaxy, approaching the luminosity of a whole galaxy (will nearly be the order of 10 to the power of 42 Joules). In the aftermath of the supernova, we find a totally dead star, a neutron star – a cold star, supported by the exclusion principle repulsion between neutrons – about the size of Manhattan (i.e., ten to 50 times the size of our sun).

Why are there atoms, molecules, solar systems, and galaxies?

What powered them into existence? How accurate are the physical laws and equations, which control them?

Why do the Fundamental Constants of Nature

have the precise values they do? The answers have always seemed well beyond the reach of Dr. Science since the dawn of humanity – until now (some would claim the answer to these questions is that there is a transcendent God (a cosmic craftsman – a transcendent being than which no being could be more virtuous) who chose to create the universe that way according to some perfect mathematical principle. Then the question merely reflects to that of who or what created the God). But the questions are still the picture in the mind of many scientists today who do not spend most of their time worrying about these questions, but almost worry about them some of the time. All that science could say is that: The universe is as it is now. But it could not explain why it was, as it was, just after the Big Bang. This is a disaster for science. It would mean that science alone, could not predict how the universe began. Every attempt is made to set up the connection between theoretical predictions and experimental results but some of the experimental results throw cold water on the theoretical predictions.

Back in 1700s, people thought the stars of our galaxy structured the universe, that the galaxy was nearly static, and that the universe was essentially unexpanding with neither a beginning nor an end to time. A situation marked by difficulty with the idea of a static and unchanging universe, was that according to the Newtonian theory of gravitation, each star in the universe supposed to be pulled towards every other star with a force that was weaker the less massive the stars and farther they were to each other. It was this force caused all the stars fall together at some point. So how could they remain static? Wouldn't they all collapse in on themselves? A balance of the predominant attractive effect of the stars in the universe was required to keep them at a constant distance from each other. Einstein was aware of this problem. He introduced a term so-called cosmological constant in order to hold a static universe in which gravity is a predominant attractive force. This had an effect of a repulsive force, which could balance the predominant attractive force. In this way it was possible to allow a static cosmic solution. Enter the American astronomer Edwin Hubble. In 1920s he began to make observations with the hundred inch telescope on Mount Wilson and through detailed measurements of the spectra of stars he found something most peculiar: stars moving away from each other had their spectra shifted toward the red end of the spectrum in proportion to the distance between them (This was a Doppler effect of light: Waves of any sort -- sound waves, light waves, water waves -- emitted at some frequency by a moving object are perceived at a different frequency by a stationary observer. The resulting shift in the spectrum will be towards its red part when the source is moving away and towards the blue part when the source is getting closer). And he also observed that stars were not uniformly distributed throughout space, but were gathered together in vast collections called galaxies and nearly all the

galaxies were moving away from us with recessional velocities that were roughly dependent on their distance from us. He reinforced his argument with the formulation of his well-known Hubble's law. The observational discovery of the stretching of the space carrying galaxies with it completely shattered the previous image of a static and unchanging cosmos (i.e., the motivation for adding a term to the equations disappeared, and Einstein rejected the cosmological constant a greatest mistake).

We story telling animals (who TALK ABOUT THE nature of the universe and discuss such questions as whether it has a beginning or an end) often claim that we know so much more about the universe. But we must beware of overconfidence. We have had false dawns before. At the beginning of this century, for example, it was thought that earth was a perfect sphere, but latter experimental observation of variation of value of g over the surface of earth confirmed that earth is not a perfect sphere. Today there is almost universal agreement that space itself is stretching, carrying galaxies with it, though we are experimentally trying to answer whether cosmic [expansion will] continue forever or slow to a halt, reverse itself [and] lead to a cosmic implosion. However, personally, we're sure that the accelerated expansion began with a state of infinite compression and primeval explosion called the hot Big Bang. But will it expand forever or there is a limit beyond which the average matter density exceeds a hundredth of a billionth of a billionth of a billionth (10^{-29}) of a gram per cubic centimeter so-called critical density (the density of the universe where the expansion of the universe is poised between eternal expansion and recollapse)... then a large enough gravitational force will permeate the cosmos to halt and reverse the expansion or the expansion and contraction are evenly balanced? We're less sure about that because events cannot be predicted with complete accuracy but that there is always a degree of uncertainty.

The picture of standard model of the Forces of Nature (a sensible and successive quantum-mechanical description developed by 1970s physicists) is in good agreement with all the observational evidence that we have today and remains consistent with all the measured properties of matter made in our most sophisticated laboratories on Earth and observed in space with our most powerful telescopes. Nevertheless, it leaves a number of important questions unanswered like the unanswered questions given in *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy* (by Douglas Adams): Why are the strengths of the fundamental forces (electromagnetism, weak and strong forces, and gravity) as they are? Why do the force particles have the precise masses they do? Do these forces really become unified at sufficiently high energy? If so how? Are there unobserved fundamental forces that explain other unsolved problems in physics? Why is gravity so weak? May because of hidden extra dimensions? Very likely, we are missing something important that may seem as obvious to us as the earth orbiting the sun – or perhaps as ridiculous as a tower of tortoises. Only time (whatever that may be) will tell.

The theory of evolution (which predicts: that the use of antiviral or antibacterial agents would result in the emergence of resistant strains. This principle is, of course, a mainstay of contemporary medicine and asserts that the natural selection is a choice of stable forms and a rejection of unstable ones. And the variation within a species occurs randomly, and that the survival or extinction of each organism depends upon its ability (an internal force or tendency) to adapt to the environment) lined up pictures of apes and humans and claimed that humans evolved from apes (i.e., the chimpanzee and the human share about 99.5 per cent of their evolutionary history). This spilled out onto the corridors of the academy and absolutely rocked Victorian England to the extent that people just barely raised their voice contradicting the biblical account of creation in the lecture hall rips of the architrave. And despite more than a century of digging straight down and passing through the fossil layers, the fossil record remains maddeningly sparse and provides us with no evidence that show evolutionary transition development of one species into another species. However, we are convinced that the theory of evolution, especially the extent to which it's been believed with blind faith, which may turn to be one of the great fairy tales for adults in the history books of the future. Like raisins in expanding dough, galaxies that are further apart are increasing their separation more than nearer ones. And as a result, the light emitted from distant galaxies and stars is shifted towards the red end of the spectrum. Observations of galaxies indicate that the universe is expanding: the distance D between almost any pair of galaxies is increasing at a rate $V = HD$ – beautifully explained by the Hubble's law (the law that agrees with Einstein's theory of an expanding universe). However, controversy still remains on the validity of this law. Andromeda, for example, for which the Hubble relation does not apply. And quantum theory (The revolutionary theory of the last century clashed with everyday experience which has proved enormously successful, passing with flying colors the many stringent laboratory tests to which it has been subjected for almost a hundred years) predicts that entire space is not continuous and infinite but rather quantized and measured in units of quantity called Planck length (10^{-33} cm – the length scale found at the big bang in which the gravitational force was as strong as the other

forces and at this scale, space-time was “foamy,” with tiny bubbles and wormholes appearing and disappearing into the vacuum). However, at the present there is no conclusive evidence in favor of quantization of space and time and moreover nobody knows why no spatial or time interval shorter than the Planck values exists?

For length: Planck length (a hundred billion billion times $[10^{20}]$ smaller than an atomic nucleus) -1.6×10^{-33} centimeter.

For time: Planck time -5×10^{-44} seconds.

On the other hand, there is no evidence against what the quantum model inform us about the true nature of reality. But in order to unify Albert Einstein’s general relativity (a theoretical framework for understanding the universe on the largest of scales: the immense expanse of the universe itself and it breaks down at times less than the Planck time and at distances smaller than the Planck length, predicts the existence of wormhole – a passageway between two universes – gives us a better way of grasping reality than Newtonian mechanics, because it tells us that there can be black holes, because it tells us there’s a Big Bang) with the quantum physics that describe fundamental particles and forces, it is necessary to quantize space and perhaps time as well. And for a universe to be created out of nothing, the positive energy of motion should exactly cancel out the negative energy of gravitational attraction i.e., the net energy of the universe should be = zero. And if that’s the case, the spatial curvature of the universe, Ω_k , should be = 0.0000 (i.e., perfect flatness). But the Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) satellite has established the spatial curvature of the universe, Ω_k , to be between -0.0174 and $+0.0051$. Then, how can it cost nothing to create a universe, how can a whole universe be created from nothing? On the other hand, there is a claim that the sum of the energy of matter and of the gravitational energy is equal to zero and hence there is a possibility of a universe appearing from nothing and thus the universe can double the amount of positive matter energy and also double the negative gravitational energy without violation of the conservation of energy. However, energy of matter + gravitational energy is = zero is only a claim based on Big Bang implications. No human being can possibly know the precise energy content of the entire universe. In order to verify the claim that the total energy content of the universe is exactly zero, one would have to account for all the forms of energy of matter in the universe, add them together with gravitational energy, and then verify that the sum really is exactly zero. But the attempt to verify that the sum really is exactly zero is not an easy task. We need precision experiments to know for sure.

Gazing at the at the blazing celestial beauty of the night sky and asking a multitude of questions that have puzzled and intrigued humanity since our beginning – WE’VE DISCOVERED a lot about our celestial home; however, we still stand at a critical cross road of knowledge where the choice is between spirituality and science to accomplish the hidden truth behind the early evolution of the universe. In order to throw light on a multitude of questions that has so long occupied the mind of scientists and the people who have argued over the years about the nature of reality and whose business it is to ask why, the philosophers: Where did we and the universe come from? Where are we and the universe going? What makes us and the universe exists? Why we born? Why we die? Whether or not the universe had a beginning? If the universe had a beginning, why did it wait an infinite time before it began? What was before the beginning? Is our universe tunneled through the chaos at the Planck time from a prior universe that existed for all previous time? We must either build a sound, balanced, effective and extreme imaginative knowledge beyond our limit. Many theories were put forth by the scientists to look into the early evolution of the universe but none of them turned up so far. And if, like me, you have wondered looking at the star, and tried to make sense of what makes it shine the way it is. Did it shine forever or was there a limit beyond which it cannot or may not shine? And, where did the matter that created it all come from? Did the matter have a beginning in time? Or had the matter existed forever and didn’t have a beginning? In other words, what cause made the matter exist? And, what made that cause exist? Some would claim the answer to this question is that matter could have popped into existence 13.9 billion years ago as a result of just the eminent physical laws and constants being there. Any “meta” or “hyper” laws of physics that would allow (even in postulate) a matter to pop into existence are completely outside our experience. The eminent laws of physics, as we know them, simply are not applicable here. Invoking the laws of physics doesn’t quite do the trick. And the laws of physics are simply the human-invented ingredients of models that we introduce to describe observations. They are all fictitious, as far as we find a reference frame in which they are observed. The question of matter genesis is clear, and deceptively simple. It is as old as the question of what was going on before the Big Bang. Usually, we tell the story of the matter by starting at the Big Bang and then talking about what happened after. The answer has always seemed well beyond the reach of science. Until now.

Over the decades, there have been several heroic attempts to explain the origin of matter, all of them proven wrong. One was the so-called Steady State theory. The idea was that, as the galaxies moved apart from each other; new galaxies would form in the spaces in between, from matter that was spontaneously being created. The matter density of the universe would continue to exist, forever, in more or less the same state as it is today. In a sense disagreement was a credit to the model, every attempt was made to set up the connection between theoretical predictions and experimental results but the Steady State theory was disproved even with limited observational evidence. The theory therefore was abandoned and the idea of spontaneous creation of matter was doomed to fade away into mere shadows. As crazy as it might seem, the matter may have come out of nothing! The meaning of nothing is somewhat ambiguous here. It might be the pre-existing space and time, or it could be nothing at all. After all, no one was around when the matter began, so who can say what really happened? The best that we can do is work out the most vain imaginative and foolish theories, backed up by numerous lines of scientific observations of the universe.

Cats are alive and dead at the same time. But some of the most incredible mysteries of the quantum realm (a jitter in the amorphous haze of the subatomic world) get far less attention than Schrödinger's famous cat. Due to the fuzziness of quantum theory (that implies: the cosmos does not have just a single existence or history), and specifically Heisenberg's uncertainty principle (which fundamentally differentiates quantum from classic reasoning – discovered by the German physicist Werner Heisenberg in 1927), one can think of the vacuum fluctuations as virtual matter – antimatter pairs that appear together at some time, move apart, then come together and annihilate one another and revert back to energy. Spontaneous births and deaths of roiling frenzy of particles so called virtual matter – antimatter pairs momentarily occurring everywhere, all the time – is the evidence that mass and energy are interconvertible; they are two forms of the same thing. If one argue that matter was a result of such a fluctuation. So then the next question is what cause provided enough energy to make the virtual matter – antimatter pairs materialize in real space. And if we assume some unknown cause has teared the pair apart and boosted the separated virtual matter – antimatter into the materialized state. The question then is what created that cause. In other words, what factor created that cause? And what created that factor. Or perhaps, the cause, or the factor that created it, existed forever, and didn't need to be created. The argument leads to a never-ending chain that always leaves us short of the ultimate answer. Unfortunately, Dr. Science cannot answer these questions. So, the problem remains. However, quantum origin and separation of the matter still delights theoretical physicists but boggles the mind of mere mortals, is the subject of my thought; have the quantum laws found a genuinely convincing way to explain matter existence apart from divine intervention? If we find the answer to that, it would be the ultimate triumph of human reason – for then we would know the ultimate Cause of the Matter. Over the decades, we're trying to understand how the matter began and we're also trying to understand all the other things that go along with it. This is very much the beginning of the story and that story could go in, but I think there could be surprises that no one has even thought of. Something eternal can neither be created nor destroyed. The first law of thermodynamics (a version of the law of conservation of energy, adapted for thermodynamic systems) asserts that matter or energy can neither be created nor destroyed; it can be converted from one form to another.

The overwhelming experience of experimental science (science based on experimental research that plays the role of testing hypothesis, typically in controlled laboratory settings) confirms this first law to be a fact. But if the matter prevails in the boundary of understanding in that it neither started nor it ends: it would simply be. What place then for an evidence exposing that we live in a finite expanding universe which has not existed forever, and that all matter was once squeezed into an infinitesimally small volume, which erupted in a cataclysmic explosion which has become known as the Big Bang. However, what we believe about the origin of the matter is not only sketchy, but uncertain and based purely on human perception. There is no reliable and genuine evidence to testify about how the matter began and what may have existed before the beginning of the matter. The laws of physics tell us that the matter had a beginning, but they don't answer how it had begun. Mystery is running the universe in a hidden hole and corner, but one day it may wind up the clock work with might and main. The physical science can explain the things after big bang but fails to explain the things before big bang. We know that matter can be created out of energy, and energy can be created out of matter. This doesn't resolve the dilemma because we must also know where the original energy came from.

The electrostatic and gravitational forces according to Coulomb's and Newton's laws are both inverse square forces, so if one takes the ratio of the forces, the distances cancel. For the electron and proton, the ratio of the forces is given by the equation: $F_E / F_G = e^2 / 4\pi\epsilon_0 G m_p m_e$ where e is the charge = 1.602×10^{-19} Coulombs, G is the gravitational constant, ϵ_0 is the absolute permittivity of free space = 8.8×10^{-12} F/m, m_p is the mass of the proton = 1.672×10^{-27}

kg and m_e is the mass of the electron = 9.1×10^{-31} kg. Plugging the values we get: $F_E / F_G = 10^{39}$ which means: F_E is $> F_G$. So, it was argued by a German mathematician, theoretical physicist and philosopher (some say it was Hermann Weyl), if the gravitational force between the proton and electron were not much smaller than the electrostatic force between them, then the hydrogen atom would have collapsed to neutron long before there was a chance for stars to form and life to evolve. $F_E > F_G$ must have been numerically fine - tuned for the existence of life. Taking $F_E / F_G = 10^{39}$ as an example in most physics literature we will find that gravity is the weakest of all forces, many orders of magnitude weaker than electromagnetism. But this does not make sense any way and it is not true always and in all cases. Note that the ratio F_E / F_G is not a universal constant; it's a number that depends on the particles we use in the calculation. For example: For two particles each of Planck mass (mass on the order of 10 billion billion times that of a proton) and Planck charge the ratio of the forces is 1 i.e., $F_E / F_G = 1$. Moreover, when the relativistic variation of electron mass with velocity is taken into account then the ratio F_E / F_G becomes velocity dependent.

Does our universe exist inside a black hole of another universe? The question lingers, unanswered until now. Even though the existence of alternative histories with black holes, suggests this might be possible i.e., our universe lies inside a black hole of another universe, we cannot prove or disprove this conjecture any way. Meaning that the event horizon of a black hole is boundary at which nothing inside can escape and then how might one can cross its event boundary and testify whether or not our universe exist inside a black hole of another universe. Thus we cannot answer the central question in cosmology: Does our universe exist inside a black hole of another universe? However, the fact that we are simply an advanced breed of talking monkeys surviving on a sumptuous planet, have been reckoning at least from last hundred years – turning unproved belief into unswerving existence through the power of perception and spending our brief time in the sun working at understanding the deepest mysteries of nature by doing repeated calculations and getting some answer that seem very likely makes us feel something very special-- a bit premature to buy tickets to the nearest galaxy to visit the next goldilocks planet or hunt dinosaurs.

The physicist has been spending a month, as he or she does each year, sequestered with colleagues, such as fellow theoretical physicists, to discuss many great mysteries of the cosmos. But despite its simple approximation as a force, and its beautifully subtle description as a property of space-time which in turn can be summarized by Einstein's famous equation, which essentially states:

$$\text{Matter-energy} \rightarrow \text{curvature of space- time}$$

, we've come to realize over the past century that we still don't know what gravity actually is. It has been a closed book ever since the grand evolution of human understanding and all physicists hang this book up on their wall and distress about it. Unhesitatingly you would yearn to know where this book comes from: is it related to metaphysical science or perhaps to the greatest blast puzzles of physics still to be discovered, like cosmic string and magnetic monopoles? Nobody knows and for the moment, nature has not said yes in any sense. It's one of the 10,000 bits puzzling cosmic story with a cracking title. You might say the laws of physics designed that book, and we don't know how they designed that book. The elevated design of this book, an extract of which appears in the cosmic art gallery, sets out to the belief that it must have designed as it could not have created out of chaos. In some sense, the origin of the cosmic problem today remains what it was in the time of Newton (who not only put forward a theory of how bodies move in space and time, but he also developed the complicated mathematics needed to analyze those motions) – one of the greatest challenges of 21st Century science certainly keep many an aficionado going. Yet, we toasting each other with champagne glasses in laboratories around the world-- have made a bold but brilliant move. In less than a hundred years, we have found a new way to wonder what gravity is. The usual approach of science of constructing a set of rules and equations cannot answer the question of why if you could turn off gravity, space and time would also vanish. In short, we don't have an answer; we now have a whisper of the grandeur of the problem. We don't know exactly how it is intimately related to space and time. It's a mystery that we're going to chip at from quantum theory (the theory developed from Planck's quantum principle and Heisenberg's uncertainty principle which deals with phenomena on extremely small scales, such as a millionth of a millionth of an inch). However, when we try to apply quantum theory to gravity, things become more complicated and confusing.

Mankind's deepest desire for scientific intervention introduced a new idea that of time. Most of the underlying assumptions of physics are concerned with time. Time may sound like a genre of fiction, but it is a well-defined genuine concept. Some argue that time is not yet discovered by us to be objective features of the mundane world: even without considering time an intrinsic feature of the mundane world, we can see that things in the physical world change, seasons change, people adapt to that drastic changes. The fact that the physical change is an objective feature of the physical world, and time is independent of under whatever circumstances we have named it. Others think time as we comprehend it does not endure beyond the bounds of our physical world. Beyond it, maybe one could run forward in time or just turn around and go back. This could probably mean that one could fall rapidly through their

former selves. In a bewildering world, the question of whether the time never begin and has always been ticking, or whether it had a beginning at the big bang, is really a concern for physicists: either science could account for such an inquiry. If we find the answer to it, it would be the ultimate triumph of human justification for our continuing quest. And, our goal of a complete description of the universe we live in is self-justified. The understanding we have today is that time is not an illusion like what age-old philosophers had thought, but rather it is well defined mathematical function of an inevitable methodical framework for systematizing our experiences. If one believed that the time had a beginning, the obvious question was how it had started? The problem of whether or not the time had a beginning was a great concern to the German Philosopher, Immanuel Kant (who believed that every human concept is based on observations that are operated on by the mind so that we have no access to a mind- independent reality). He considered the entire human knowledge and came to the conclusion that time is not explored by humans to be objective features of the mundane world domain, but is a part of an inevitable systematic framework for coordinating our experiences. How and when did the time begin? No other scientific question is more fundamental or provokes such spirited debate among physicists. Since the early part of the 1900s, one explanation of the origin and fate of the universe, the Big Bang theory, has dominated the discussion. Although singularity theorem (a theorem showing that a singularity, a point where general relativity (a theory which predicts that time would come to an end inside a black hole – an invisible astrophysical entity that no one has seen, but scientists have observed gravitational evidence consistent with predictions about it, so most scientists believe it exists) breaks down, must exist under certain circumstances; in particular, that the universe must have started with a singularity) predicted that the time, the space, and the matter or energy itself had a beginning, they didn't convey how they had a beginning. It would clearly be nice for singularity theorems if they had a beginning, but how can we distinguish whether they had a beginning? In as much as the time had a beginning at the Big Bang it would deepen implication for the role of supreme divine creator (that much of humanity worships as the source of all reality) in the grand design of creation.

But if it persists in the bounds of reason in that it has neither beginning nor end and nothing for a Creator to do. What role could ineffable benevolent creator have in creation? Life could start and new life forms could emerge on their own randomly sustaining themselves by reproducing in the environment fitted for the functional roles they perform. Personally, we're sure that the time began with a hot Big Bang. But will it go on ticking forever? If not, when it will wind up its clockwork of ticking? We're much less sure about that. However, we are just a willful gene centered breed of talking monkeys on a minor planet of a very average galaxy. But we have found a new way to question ourselves and we have learned to do them. That makes us something very special. Moreover, everything we think we understand about the universe would need to be reassessed. Every high school graduate knows cosmology, the very way we think of things, would be forever altered. The distance to the stars and galaxies and the age of the universe (13.7 billion years – number has now been experimentally determined to within 1% accuracy) would be thrown in doubt. Even the expanding universe theory, the Big Bang theory, and black holes would have to be re- examined. The Big Bang theory of universe assumes the present form of the universe originated from the hot fire ball called singularity and it assumes time did not exist before the Big Bang. But Erickcek deduced on the basis of NASA's, Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) that the existence of time and empty space is possible before the Big Bang.

But what would happen if you travel back in time and kill your grandfather before he conceives your father? Would the arrow of time reverse? Because motion makes the clock tick slower, can we travel back in time and kill our grandfather before he conceive our father? If not, why the universe avoids the paradox? Time Travel – Science Fiction? Taking the laws of physics and punching them in the stomach and throwing them down the stairs – it's possible for you to break the universal speed limit. It is mind boggling to think about it – you're actually travelling backwards in time. What if you went back in time and prevented big bang from happening? You would prevent yourself from ever having been born! But then if you hadn't been born, you could not have gone back in time to prevent big bang from happening. The concept of time travel may sound something impressive and allow science fiction like possibilities for people who survived from the past, but somewhat it seems to be incredible like seeing broken tea cups gathering themselves together off the floor and jumping back on the table promoting cup manufacturers go out of business. However, travelling through time may not be the far-fetched science fiction theory. At the same time, can we open a portal to the past or find a shortcut to the future and master the time itself is still in question and forbidden by the second law of thermodynamics (which states that in any closed system like universe randomness, or entropy, never decreases with time). Of course, we have not seen anyone from the past (or have we?).

We asked how stars are powered and found the answer in the transformations of atomic nuclei. But there are still simple questions that we can ask. And one is: Is our universe merely the by-product of a cosmic accident? If the universe were merely the by-product of a grand accident, then our universe could have been a conglomeration of objects each going its own way. But everything we see in the universe obeys rules which are governed by a set of equations, without exception – which give philosophy a lot more attention than science. However, this does not mean that the universe obey rules because it exists in a plan which is created and shaped by a grinding hand.

Maybe the universe is a lucky coincidence of a grand accident emerged with ingredients such as space, time, mass, and energy exist in one-to-one correspondence with the elements of reality, and hence it obeys a set of rational laws without exception. At this moment it seems as though Dr. Science will never be able to raise the curtain on the mystery of creation. Moreover, traditional philosophy is dead, that it has not kept up with modern developments in science, and there is no reason at justifying the grinding hand because the idea of God is extremely limited and goes no further than the opening sentence of the classical theology (which has always rejected the idea that God can classified or defined), and much is still in the speculative stage, and we must admit that there are yet no empirical or observational tests that can be used to test the idea of an accidental origin. No evidence. No scientific observation. Just a speculation. For those who have lived by their faith in the power of reason, the story may end like a bad dream since free will is just an illusion.

From the Big Bang to the Bodies such as stars or black holes including basic facts such as particle masses and force strengths, the entire universe works because the laws of physics make things happen. But if Meta or hyper laws of physics were whatever produced the universe then what produced those laws. Or perhaps, the laws, or the cause that created them, existed forever, and didn't need to be created. We must admit that there is ignorance on some issues, that is, we don't have a complete set of laws We are not sure exactly does the existing laws hold everywhere and at all time. Dr. Science gives us a clue, but there's no definitive answer to provide a purely natural, non-causal explanation for the existence of laws of physics and our place in it. So let's just leave it at the hypothetical laws of physics. The question, then, is why are there laws of physics? And we could say, well, that required a biblical deity, who created these laws of physics and the spark that took us from the laws of physics to the notions of time and space. Well, if the laws of physics popped into existence 13.8 billion years ago with divine help whatsoever, like theologians say, why aren't we seeing a at least one evidence of an ineffable creator in our observable universe every now and then? The origin of the Meta or hyper laws of physics remains a mystery for now. However, recent breakthroughs in physics, made possible in part by fantastic revolutionary understanding of the true nature of the mathematical quantities and theories of physics, may suggest an answer that may seem as obvious to us as the earth orbiting the sun – or perhaps as ridiculous as earth is a perfect sphere. We don't know whatever the answer may be because the Meta or hyper laws of physics are completely beyond our experience, and beyond our imagination, or our mathematics. This fact leads us to a big mystery and awaits the next generation of high energy experiments, which hope to shed light on the far- reaching answer that might be found in the laws that govern elemental particles.

Who are we? We find that we intelligent apes who have only recently left the trees, live on an fragile planet of a humdrum star by a matter of sheer luck or by divine providence, lost in a galaxy tucked away in some forgotten corner of a universe in which there are far more galaxies than people. Sending the Beatles song across the Universe and pointing the telescopes in Deep Space Network towards the North Star, Polaris, we seek to find intellectual beings like us outside the sheer number of planets, vast ocean of existence, our solar system, and our own Milky Way galaxy. How awe hunting for them across the empty stretches of the universe would be to acquire a bit of confirmation that either we're alone in this universe or we are not. However, we are not the only life-form in the universe, is reasonable to expect since we have no reason to assume that ours is the only possible form of life. Some sort of life could have happened in a universe of greatly different form, but

Where's the evidence?

The Burden of evidence is only on the people who regard themselves as reliable witnesses that sightings of UFOs are evidence that we are being visited by someone living in another galaxy who are much more advanced enough to spread through some hundred thousand million galaxies and visit the Earth. An alien, like the teapot, is a hypothesis that requires evidence.

The known forces of nature can be divided into four classes:

Gravity: This is the weakest of the four; it acts on everything in the universe as an attraction. And if not for this force, we would go zinging off into outer space and the sun would detonate like trillions upon trillions of hydrogen bombs.

Electromagnetism: This is much stronger than gravity; it acts only on particles with an electric charge, being repulsive between charges of the same sign and attractive between charges of the opposite sign. More than half the gross national product of the earth, representing the accumulated wealth of our planet, depends in some way on the electromagnetic force. It lights up the cities of New York, fills the air with music from radios and stereos, entertains all the people in the world with television, reduces housework with electrical appliances, heats their food with microwaves, tracks their planes and space probes with radar, and electrifies their power plants.

Weak nuclear force: This causes radioactivity and plays a vital role in the formation of the elements in stars. And a slightly stronger force, all the neutrons in the early universe would have decayed, leaving about 100 percent hydrogen, with no deuterium for later use in the synthesizing elements in stars.

Strong nuclear force: This force holds together the protons and neutrons inside the nucleus of an atom. And it is this same force that holds together the quarks to form protons and neutrons. Unleashed in the hydrogen bomb, the strong nuclear force could one day end all life on earth.

The inherent goal of unification is to show that all of these forces are, in fact, manifestations of a single super force. We can't perceive this unity at the low energies of our everyday lives, or even in our most powerful accelerators (capable of accelerating particles nearly up to the speed of light) at Fermi lab or LHC, the Large Hadron Collider, at CERN (European Centre for Nuclear Research), in Switzerland. But close to the Big Bang temperatures, at inconceivably high energies...

If the forces unify, the protons – which make up much of the mass of ordinary matter – can be unstable, and eventually decay into lighter particles such as antineutrinos. Indeed, several experiments were performed in the Morton Salt Mine in Ohio to yield definite evidence of proton decay. But none have succeeded so far. However, the probability of a proton in the universe gaining sufficient energy to decay is so small that one has to wait at least a million million million million million years i.e., longer than the time since the big bang, which is about ten thousand million years.

The eminent laws do not tell us why the initial configuration was such as to produce what we observe. For what purpose? Must we turn to the anthropic principle for an explanation? Was it all just a lucky chance? That would seem a counsel of despair, a negation of all our hopes of understanding the unfathomable order of the universe. However, this is an extended metaphor for many puzzles in physics uncovered with painstaking labor, and it is especially relevant to particle physics. Still, particle physics remains unfathomable to many people and a bunch of scientists chasing after tiny invisible objects.

If string theory is correct, then every particle is nothing but a vibrating, oscillating, dancing filament named a string. A string does something aside from moving – it oscillates in different ways. Each way represents a particular mode of vibration. Different modes of vibration make the string appear as a dark energy or a cosmic ray, since different modes of vibration are seen as different masses or spins.

If Higgs theory (which is the last piece of the Standard Model that has still eluded capture – which is one of the theories LHC experimentalists hope to discover and it is the capstone for conventional big bang cosmology – which biblical creationists reject) is correct, then a new field called the Higgs field which is analogous to the familiar electromagnetic field but with new kinds of properties permits all over the space (considered the origin of mass in Grand Unified Theory – a theory that unifies the weak, strong, and electromagnetic interactions, without gravity). Different masses of the particles are due to the different strengths of interaction of the particle with the Higgs field (more the strength of interaction of the particle with the Higgs field, more the mass of the particle). To make this easier for you, let's say it is cosmic high-fructose corn syrup – the more you go through it, the heavier you get.

Which explanation is right?

Higgs theory runs rampant in the popular media claiming that String Theory Is Not The Only Game In Town.

However, by the end of the decade, we will have our first glimpse of the new physics, whatever it well may be

STRING or HIGGS

The new physics will point to even more discoveries at the TeV scale and opens the door beyond the Standard Model and raise new questions like: if the Higgs field generate masses for the W and Z, and for the quarks and leptons – does it generate its own mass and if so how? What is its mass?

Dr. Science remains silent on the profound questions. Ultimately, however, one would hope to find complete, consistent answers that would include all the mathematical techniques as approximations. The quest for such answers is known as the grand unification of the two basic partial theories: the general theory of relativity (which states that space and time are no longer absolute, no longer a fixed background to events. Instead, they are dynamical quantities that are shaped by the matter and energy in the universe) and quantum mechanics (a theory of the microcosm which has upended many an intuition, but none deeper than this one – developed by 1900 physicists in response to a number of glaring problems that arose when 19th century conceptions of physics were applied to the microscopic world, where subatomic particles are held together by particle like forces dancing on the sterile stage of space- time, which is viewed as an empty arena, devoid of any content). Unfortunately, however, these two theories are inconsistent with each other – i.e., quantum mechanics and general relativity do not work together. How the ideas of general relativity can be consolidated with those of quantum theory is still a? until we progress closer toward the laws that govern our universe.

The latest theory of subatomic particles (the quantum theory) gives an estimated value of vacuum energy density that is about 120 orders of magnitude larger than the measured value — claiming our best theory cannot calculate the value of the largest energy source in the entire universe. Dr. Science advances over the wreckage of its theories by continually putting its ideas to experimental test; no matter how beautiful its idea might be; it must be discarded or modified if it is at odds with experiment. It would have been clearly be nice for quantum theory if the value of vacuum energy density were in the order of 10^{-96} kg per cubic meter, but the measured value were in the order of 10^{-27} kg per cubic meter. Thus, the best candidate we have at the moment, the quantum theory, brought about its downfall by predicting the value of vacuum energy density that is about 120 orders of magnitude larger than the measured value.

We a lot of exposure with darkness and disbelief and a state of not having an immediate conclusion, and this vulnerability is of great significance, I think. When we don't comprehend the mind of nature, we are in the middle of darkness. When we have an intuitive guess as to what the outcome is; we are unsealed. And when we are fairly damn sure of what the final result is going to be, we are still in some uncertainty. And uncertainty being too complex to come about randomly is evidence for human continuing quest for justification. Sometimes, very hard, impossible things just strike and we call them thoughts. In most of the self-reproducing organisms the conditions would not be right for the generation of thoughts to predict things more or less, even if not in a simplest way, only in the few complex organisms like us spontaneous thoughts would generate and what is it that breathes fire into a perception. The human perception is enormous; it's extensive and unlimited, and outrageous that we can ask simple questions. And they are: What the dark energy is up to? What it is about? Why this mysterious form of energy permeates all of space blowing the galaxies farther and farther apart? How accurate are the physical laws (which are essentially the same today as they were at the time of Newton despite the scientific revolutions and paradigm shifts), which control it? Why it made the universe bang? Unfortunately, the laws that we are using are not able to answer these questions because of the prediction that the universe started off with infinite density at the big bang singularity (where all the known laws would break down). However, if one looks in a commonsense realistic point of view the laws and equations which are considered as inherent ingredients of reality – are simply the man-made ingredients introduced by the rational beings who are free to observe the universe as they want and to draw logical deductions from what they see – to describe the objective features of reality. The scientific data is fallible, changeable, and influenced by scientific understanding is refreshing. Here's an example of what I mean. In most physics textbooks we will read that the strength of the electromagnetic force is measured by the dimensionless parameter $\alpha = e^2/4\pi\epsilon_0\hbar c$ (where e is the charge = 1.602×10^{-19} Coulombs, ϵ_0 is the absolute permittivity of free space = 8.8×10^{-12} F/m, c is the speed of light in vacuum (an awkward conversion factor for everyday use because it's so big. Light can go all the way around the equator of the Earth in about 0.1 seconds) and \hbar is the reduced Planck's constant), called the fine structure constant, which was taught to be constant became variant when the standard model of elementary particles and forces

revealed that α actually varies with energy.

The Quantum theory of electrodynamics (a relativistic quantum field theory or a quantum field theory – arguably the most precise theory of natural phenomena ever advanced which seems to govern everything small – through which we have been able to solidify the role of photons as the “smallest possible bundles of light” and to reveal their interactions with electrically charged particles such as electrons, in a mathematically complete, predictive, and convincing framework) and General Relativity (which dominates large things and is now called a classical theory which predicts that the universe started off with infinite density at the big bang singularity) both try to assign mass to the singularity. But according to generally accepted history of the universe, according to what is known as the hot big bang model. At some finite time in the past i.e., between ten and twenty thousand million years ago. At this time, all matter (which is characterized by the physical quantity we define as mass) would have been on top of each other – which is called the singularity, the density would have been INFINITE. Under such conditions, all the known laws of science would break down. However, a good mathematical theory can prove anything with that amount of wiggle room, and findings are really determined by nothing except its desire. For all theoreticians and tens of thousands of university graduates at least know, the universe started off with infinite density at the hot big bang singularity with infinitely hot temperatures. And at such high temperatures that are reached in thousands of H-bomb explosions, the strong and weak nuclear forces and the gravity and electromagnetic force were all unified into a single force. What was before the Big Bang? Was the Big Bang created? If the Big Bang was not created, how was this Big Bang accomplished, and what can we learn about the agent and events of creation? Is it the product of chance or was been designed? What is it that blocked the pre-Big Bang view from us? Is Big Bang singularity an impenetrable wall and we cannot, in physics, go beyond it? To answer one question, another question arises. Erickcek’s model suggests the possibility of existence of space and time before the big bang. But the world famed Big Bang theory abandons the existence of space and time before the big bang. Both the theories are consistent and based upon sophisticated experimental observations and theoretical studies. Truth must be prejudiced with honest scientific inquiry to illuminate the words of Genesis. And this is possible only if the modern scientific community would simply open its eyes to the truth.

Do black holes really exist? If they exist, why we haven't observed one hole yet? Can black holes be observed directly, and if so, how? If the production of the tiny black holes is feasible, can particle accelerators, such as the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) in Switzerland at the famed CERN nuclear laboratory create a micro black hole that will eventually eat the world? If not – if there are no black holes, what are the things we detect ripping gas off the surface of other stars? What is the structure of space-time just outside the black hole? Do their space times have horizons? : are the major questions in theoretical physics today that haunts us. The effort to resolve these complex paradoxes is one of the very few things that lifts human mind a little above the level of farce, and gives it some of the grace of province inspiring new ideas and new experiments.

Most people think of a black hole as a voracious whirlpool in space, sucking down everything around it. But that’s not really true! A black hole is a place where gravity has gotten so strong that even light cannot escape out of its influence.

How a black hole might be formed?

The slightly denser regions of the nearly uniformly distributed atoms (mostly hydrogen) which lack sufficient energy to escape the gravitational attraction of the nearby atoms, would combine together and thus grow even denser, forming giant clouds of gas, which at some point become gravitationally unstable, undergo fragmentation and would break up into smaller clouds that would collapse under their own gravity. As these collapses, the atoms within them collide with one another more and more frequently and at greater and greater speeds – the gas heats up i.e., the temperature of the gas would increase, until eventually it become hot enough to start nuclear fusion reactions. And a consequence of this is that the stars like our sun (which are made up of more than one kind of gas particle) are born to radiate their energy as heat and light. But the stars with a physical radius smaller than its Schwarzschild radius further collapse to produce dark or frozen stars (i.e., the mass of a star is concentrated in a small enough spherical region, so that its mass divided by its radius exceeds a particular critical value, the resulting space-time warp is so radical that anything, including light, that gets too close to the star will be unable to escape its gravitational grip).

And these dark stars are sufficiently massive and compact and possess a strong gravitational field that prevent even light from escaping out its influence: any light emitted from the surface of the star will be dragged back by the star’s gravitational attraction before it could get very far. Such stars become black voids in space and were coined in 1969

by the American scientist John Wheeler “the black holes” (i.e., black because they cannot emit light and holes because anything getting too close falls into them, never to return). Classically, the gravitational field of the black holes (which seem to be among the most ordered and organized objects in the whole universe) is so strong that they would prevent any information including light from escaping out of their influence i.e., any information is sent down the throat of a black hole or swallowed by a black hole is forever hidden from the outside universe (this goes by the statement that “black holes have no hair”—that is, they have lost all information, all hair, except for these three parameters: its mass, spin and charge), and all one could say of the gravitational monster what the poet Dante said of the entrance to Hell: “All hope abandon, ye who enter here.” Anything or anyone who falls through the black hole will soon reach the region of infinite density and the end of time. However, only the laws of classical general relativity does not allow anything (not even light) to escape the gravitational grip of the black hole but the inclusion of quantum mechanics modifies this conclusion— quantum fields would scatter off a black hole. Because energy cannot be created out of nothing, the pair of short-lived virtual particles (one with positive energy and the other with negative energy) appears close to the event horizon of a black hole. The gravitational might of the black hole inject energy into a pair of virtual particles ... that tears them just far enough apart so that one with negative energy gets sucked into the hole even before it can annihilate its partner ... its forsaken partner with positive energy... gets an energy boost from the gravitational force of the black hole ... escape outward to infinity (an abstract mathematical concept that was precisely formulated in the work of mathematician Georg Cantor in the late nineteenth century)... where it appear as a real particle (and to an observer at a distance, it will appear to have been emitted from the black hole). Because $E= mc^2$ (i.e., energy is equivalent to mass), a fall of negative energy particle into the black hole therefore reduces its mass with its horizon shrinking in size. As the black hole loses mass, the temperature of the black hole (which depends only on its mass) rises and its rate of emission of particle increases, so it loses mass more and more quickly. We don't know does the emission process continue until the black hole dissipates completely away or does it stop after a finite amount of time leaving black hole remnants.

The attempt to understand the Hawking radiation has a profound impact upon the understanding of the black hole thermodynamics, leading to the description of what the black hole entropic energy is.

$$\text{Black hole entropic energy} = \text{Black hole temperature} \times \text{Black hole entropy}$$

This means that the entropic energy makes up half of the mass energy of the black hole. For a black hole of one solar mass ($M = 2 \times 10^{30}$ kg), we get an entropic energy of 9×10^{46} joules – much higher than the thermal entropic energy of the sun.

It is only theoretically possible that black holes with mass $M =$ mass of the electron could be created in high energy collisions. No black holes with mass $M =$ mass of the electron have ever been observed, however – indeed, normally the creation of micro black holes (with mass \leq mass of the electron) take place at high energy (i.e., $>10^{28}$ electron volts – roughly greater than million tons of TNT explosive), which is a quadrillion times beyond the energy of the LHC. Even if the quantum black holes (with mass \leq mass of the electron) are created, they would be extremely difficult to spot - and they are the large emitters of radiation (because $T = \hbar c^3 / 8\pi G M k_B$) and they shrink and dissipate faster even before they are observed. Though the emission of particles from the primordial black holes is currently the most commonly accepted theory within scientific community, there is some disputation associated with it. There are some issues incompatible with quantum mechanics that it finally results in information being lost, which makes physicists discomfort and this raises a serious problem that strikes at the heart of our understanding of science. However, most physicists admit that black holes must radiate like hot bodies if our ideas about general relativity and quantum mechanics are correct. Thus even though they have not yet managed to find a primordial black hole emitting particles after over two decades of searching. Despite its strong theoretical foundation, the existence of this phenomenon is still in question. Alternately, those who don't believe that black holes themselves exist are similarly unwilling to admit that they emit particles.

In the nuclear reaction mass of reactants is always greater than mass of products. The mass difference is converted to energy, according to the equation which is as famous as the man who wrote it.

For a nuclear reaction: $p + \text{Li}_7 \rightarrow \alpha + \alpha + 17.2 \text{ MeV}$

Mass of reactants: $p= 1.0072764 \text{ amu}$

$\text{Li}_7 = 7.01600455 \text{ amu}$

Total mass of reactants = $7.01600455 \text{ amu} + 1.0072764 \text{ amu} = 8.02328095 \text{ amu}$

Mass of products:

$\alpha = 4.0015061 \text{ amu}$

Total mass of products = $\alpha + \alpha = 2\alpha = 8.0030122 \text{ amu}$

As from above data it is clear that

Total mass of reactants is greater than Total mass of products. The mass difference ($8.02328095 \text{ amu} - 8.0030122 \text{ amu} = 0.02026875 \text{ amu}$) is converted to energy 18.87 MeV , according to the equation $E = mc^2$. However, the observed energy is 17.2 MeV .

Expected energy = 18.87 MeV (i.e., $0.02026875 \text{ amu} \times c^2$)

Experimentally observed energy = 17.2 MeV

Expected energy is \neq observed energy

Energy difference = $(18.87 - 17.2) \text{ MeV} = 1.67 \text{ MeV}$

Where the energy 1.67 MeV is gone? The question is clear and deceptively simple. But the answer is just being blind to the complexity of reality. Questions are guaranteed in Science; Answers aren't.

If we could peer into the fabric of space- time at the Planck length (the distance where the smoothness of relativity's space-time and the quantum nature of reality begin to rub up against each other), we would see the 4 dimensional fabric of space-time is simply the lowest energy state of the universe. It is neither empty nor uninteresting, and its energy is not necessarily zero (which was discovered by Richard Dick Feynman, a colorful character who worked at the California Institute of Technology and played the bongo drums at a strip joint down the road- for which he received Nobel Prize for physics in 1965). Because $E = mc^2$, one can think that the virtual particle-antiparticle pairs of mass m are continually being created out of energy E of the 4 dimensional fabric of space-time consistent with the Heisenberg's uncertainty principle of quantum mechanics (which tells us that from a microscopic vantage point there is a tremendous amount of activity and this activity gets increasingly agitated on ever smaller distance and time scales), and then, they appear together at some time, move apart, then come together and annihilate each other giving energy back to the space-time without violating the law of energy conservation (which has not changed in four hundred years and still appear in relativity and quantum mechanics). Spontaneous births and deaths of virtual particles so called quantum fluctuations occurring everywhere, all the time - is the conclusion that mass and energy are interconvertible; they are two different forms of the same thing. However, spontaneous births and deaths of so called virtual particles can produce some remarkable problem, because infinite number of virtual pairs of mass m can be spontaneously created out of energy E of the 4 dimensional fabric of space-time, does the 4 dimensional fabric of space- time bears an infinite amount of energy, therefore, by Einstein's famous equation $E = mc^2$, does it bears an infinite amount of mass. If so, according to general relativity, the infinite amount of mass would have curved up the universe to infinitely small size. But which obviously has not happened. The word virtual particles literally mean that these particles cannot be observed directly, but their indirect effects can be measured to a remarkable degree of accuracy. Their properties and consequences are well established and well understood consequences of quantum mechanics. However, they can be materialized into real particles by several ways. All that one require an energy = energy required to tear the pair apart + energy required to boost the separated virtual particle- antiparticles into real particles (i.e., to bring them from virtual state to the materialize state).

When Einstein was 26 years old, he calculated precisely how energy must change if the relativity principle was correct, and he discovered the relation $E = mc^2$ (which led to the Manhattan Project and ultimately to the bombs that exploded over Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945). This is now probably the only equation in physics that even people with no background in physics have at least heard of this and are aware of its prodigious influence on the world we live in. And since c is constant (because the maximum distance a light can travel in one second is 3×10^8 meter), this equation tells us that mass and energy are interconvertible and are two different forms of the same thing and are in fact equivalent. Suppose a mass m is converted into energy E , the resulting energy carries mass = m and moves at the speed of light c . Hence, energy E is defined by $E = mc^2$. As we know c^2 (the speed of light multiplied by itself) is an astronomically large number: 9×10^{16} meters square per second square. So if we convert a small amount of mass, we'll get a tremendous amount of energy. For example, if we convert 1 kg of mass, we'll get energy of 9×10^{16} Joules (i.e., the energy more than 1 million times the energy released in a chemical explosion. Perhaps since c is not just the constant namely the maximum distance a light can travel in one second but rather a fundamental feature of the way space and time are married to form space-time. One can think that in the presence of unified space and time, mass and energy are equivalent and interchangeable. But WHY? The question lingers, unanswered. Until now.

However, the equation $E = mc^2$ (where E is energy, m is mass, and c is the speed of light. People often employ this

equation to calculate how much energy would be produced if, say, a bit of matter was converted into pure electromagnetic radiation. (Because the speed of light is a large number, the answer is a lot—the weight of matter converted to energy in the bomb that destroyed the city of Hiroshima was less than one ounce.) But the equation also tells us that if the energy of an object increases, so does its mass, that is, its resistance to acceleration, or change in speed) has some remarkable consequences (e.g. conversion of less than 1% of 2 pounds of uranium into energy was used in the atomic bomb over Hiroshima and body at rest still contains energy. When a body is moving, it carries an additional energy of motion called kinetic energy. In chemical and nuclear interactions, kinetic energy can be converted into rest energy, which is equivalent to generating mass. Also, the rest energy can be converted into kinetic energy. In that way, chemical and nuclear interactions can generate kinetic energy, which then can be used to run engines or blow things up). Because $E = mc^2$, the energy which a body possess due to its motion will add to its rest mass. This effect is only really significant for bodies moving at speeds close to the speed of light. For example, at 10 percent of the speed of light a body's mass M is only 0.5 percent more than its rest mass m , while at 90 percent of the speed of light it would be more than twice its rest mass. And as an body approaches the speed of light, its mass raise ever more quickly, it acquire infinite mass and since an infinite mass cannot be accelerated any faster by any force, the issue of infinite mass remains an intractable problem. For this reason all the bodies are forever confined by relativity to move at speeds slower than the speed of light. Only tiny packets/particles of light (dubbed “photons” by chemist Gilbert Lewis) that have no intrinsic mass can move at the speed of light. There is little disagreement on this point. Now, being more advanced, we do not just consider conclusions like photons have no intrinsic mass. We constantly test them, trying to prove or disprove. So far, relativity has withstood every test. And try as we might, we can measure no mass for the photon. We can just put upper limits on what mass it can have. These upper limits are determined by the sensitivity of the experiment we are using to try to weigh the photon. The last number we can see that a photon, if it has any mass at all, must be less than 4×10 to the power of -48 grams. For comparison, the electron has a mass of 9×10 to the power of -28 grams. Moreover, if the mass of the photon is not considered to zero, then quantum mechanics would be in trouble. And it also an uphill task to conduct an experiment which proves the photon mass to be exactly zero. Tachyons the putative class of hypothetical particles (with negative mass squared: $m^2 < 0$) is believed to travel faster than the speed of light. But, the existence of tachyons is still in question and if they exist, how can they be detected is still a? However, on one thing most physicists agree: (Just because we haven't found anything yet that can go faster than light doesn't mean that we won't one day have to eat our words. We should be more open- minded to other possibilities that just may not have occurred to us). Moreover, in expanding space – recession velocity keeps increasing with distance. Beyond a certain distance, known as the Hubble distance, it exceeds the velocity greater than the speed of light in vacuum. But, this is not a violation of relativity, because recession velocity is caused not by motion through space but by the expansion of space.

$E = h\nu$ (which implies the energy a photon can have is proportional to its frequency: larger frequency (shorter wavelength) implies larger photon energy and smaller frequency (longer wavelength) implies smaller photon energy) – because h is constant, energy and frequency of the photon are equivalent and are different forms of the same thing. And since h – which is one of the most fundamental numbers in physics, ranking alongside the speed of light c and confines most of these radical departures from life-as-usual to the microscopic realm – is incredibly small (i.e., 6×10 to the power of -34 — a decimal point followed by 33 zeros and a 6 — of a joule second), the frequency of the photon is always greater than its energy, so it would not take many quanta to radiate even ten thousand megawatts. And some say the only thing that quantum mechanics (the great intellectual achievement of the first half of this century) has going for it, in fact, is that it is unquestionably correct. Since the Planck's constant is almost infinitesimally small, quantum mechanics is for little things. Suppose this number would have been too long to keep writing down i.e., h would have been $= 6.625 \times 10$ to the power of 34 Js, then quantum mechanical effects would have been noticeable for macroscopic objects. For example, the De Broglie wavelength of a 100 kg man walking at 1 m/s would have been $= h/mv = (6.625 \times 10^{34} \text{ Js}) / (100\text{kg}) (1\text{m/s}) = 6.625 \times 10$ to the power of 32 m (very large to be noticeable).

The work on atomic science in the first thirty five years of this century took our understanding down to lengths of a millionth of a millimeter. Then we discovered that protons and neutrons are made of even smaller particles called quarks (which were named by the Caltech physicist Murray Gell-Mann, who won the Nobel Prize in 1969 for his work on them). We might indeed expect to find several new layers of structure more basic than the quarks and leptons that we now regard as elemental particles. Are there elementary particles that have not yet been observed, and, if so, which ones are they and what are their properties? What lies beyond the quarks and the leptons? If we find answers to them, then the entire picture of particle physics would be quite different.

Experimental evidence supporting the Watson and Crick model was published in a series of five articles in the same issue of Nature – caused an explosion in biochemistry and transformed the science. Of these, Franklin and Gosling's paper was the first publication of their own x-ray diffraction data and original analysis method that partially supported the Watson and Crick model; this issue also contained an article on DNA (a main family of polynucleotides in living cells) structure by Maurice Wilkins and two of his colleagues, whose analysis supported their double-helix molecular model of DNA. In 1962, after Franklin's death, Watson, Crick, and Wilkins jointly received the Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine. From each gene's point of view, the 'background' genes are those with which it shares bodies in its journey down the generations. DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid) – which is known to occur in the chromosomes of all cells (whose coded characters spell out specific instructions for building willow trees that will shed a new generation of downy seeds). Most forms of life including vertebrates, reptiles, Craniates or suckling pigs, chimps and dogs and crocodiles and bats and cockroaches and humans and worms and dandelions, carry the amazing complexity of the information within the some kind of replicator—molecules called DNA in each cell of their body, that a live reading of that code at a rate of one letter per second would take thirty-one years, even if reading continued day and night. Just as protein molecules are chains of amino acids, so DNA molecules are chains of nucleotides. Linking the two chains in the DNA, are pairs of nucleic acids (purines + pyrimidines). There are four types of nucleic acid, adenine “A”, cytosine “C”, guanine “G”, and thiamine “T.” An adenine (purine) on one chain is always matched with a thiamine (pyrimidine) on the other chain, and a guanine (purine) with a cytosine (pyrimidine). Thus DNA exhibits all the properties of genetic material, such as replication, mutation and recombination. Hence, it is called the molecule of life. We need DNA to create enzymes in the cell, but we need enzymes to unzip the DNA. Which came first, proteins or protein synthesis? If proteins are needed to make proteins, how did the whole thing get started? We need precision genetic experiments to know for sure.

A theory is a good theory if it satisfies one requirement. It must make definite predictions about the results of future observations. Basically, all scientific theories are scientific statements that predict, explain, and perhaps describe the basic features of reality. Despite having received some great deal, discrepancies frequently lead to doubt and discomfort. For example, the most precise estimate of sun's age is around 10 million years, based on linear density model. But geologists have the evidence that the formation of the rocks, and the fossils in them, would have taken hundreds or thousands of millions of years. This is far longer than the age of the Earth, predicted by linear density model. Hence the earth existed even before the birth of the sun! Which is absolutely has no sense. The linear density model therefore fails to account for the age of the sun. Any physical theory is always provisional, in the sense that it is only a hypothesis: it can be disproved by finding even a single observation that disagrees with the predictions of the theory. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, physicists thought they were close to a complete understanding of the universe. They believed that entire universe was filled by a hypothetical medium called the ether. As a material medium is required for the propagation of waves, it was believed that light waves propagate through ether as the pressure waves propagate through air. Soon, however, inconsistencies with the idea of ether begin to appear. Yet a series of experiments failed to support this idea. The most careful and accurate experiments were carried out by two Americans: Albert Michelson and Edward Morley (who showed that light always traveled at a speed of one hundred and eighty six thousand miles a second (no matter where it came from) and disproved Michell and Laplace's idea of light as consisting of particles, rather like cannon balls, that could be slowed down by gravity, and made to fall back on the star) at the Case School of Applied Science in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1887 – which proved to be a serve blow to the existence of ether. All the known subatomic particles in the universe belong to one of two groups, Fermions or bosons. Fermions are particles with integer spin $\frac{1}{2}$ and they make up ordinary matter. Their ground state energies are negative. Bosons are particles (whose ground state energies are positive) with integer spin 0, 1, 2 and they act as the force carriers between fermions (For example: The electromagnetic force of attraction between electron and a proton is pictured as being caused by the exchange of large numbers of virtual massless bosons of spin 1, called photons).

Positive ground state energy of bosons plus negative ground state energy of fermions = 0

But Why? May be because to eliminate the biggest infinity in supergravity theory (the theory which introduced a superpartner to the conjectured subatomic particle with spin 2 that is the quanta of gravity “the graviton” (called the gravitino, meaning “little graviton,” with spin $\frac{3}{2}$) – that even inspired one of the most brilliant theoretical physicists since Einstein “Stephen Hawking” to speak of “the end of theoretical physics” being in sight when he gave his inaugural lecture upon taking the Lucasian Chair of Mathematics at Cambridge University, the same chair once held by Isaac Newton – a person who developed the theory of mechanics, which gave us the classical laws governing machines which in turn, greatly accelerated the Industrial Revolution, which unleashed political forces that eventually overthrew the feudal dynasties of Europe)?

There is strong evidence ... that the universe is permeated with dark matter approximately six times as much as normal visible matter (i.e. invisible matter became apparent in 1933 by Swiss astronomer Fritz Zwicky – which can be considered to have energy, too, because $E = mc^2$ – exist in a huge halo around galaxies and does not participate in the processes of nuclear fusion that powers stars, does not give off light and does not interact with light but bend starlight due to its gravity, somewhat similar to the way glass bends light). Although we live in a dark matter dominated universe (i.e., dark matter, according to the latest data, makes up 23 percent of the total matter/energy content of the universe) experiments to detect dark matter in the laboratory have been exceedingly difficult to perform because dark matter particles such as the neutralino, which represent higher vibrations of the superstring – interact so weakly with ordinary matter. Although dark matter was discovered almost a century ago, it is still a mystery shining on library shelves that everyone yearns to resolve.

Opening up the splendor of the immense heavens for the first time to serious scientific investigation. On the short time scale of our lives, not surprisingly, we underwent many transformations in our slow, painful evolution, an evolution often overshadowed by religious dogma and superstition to seek the answer to the question from the beginnings of our understanding. No progress was made in any scientific explanations because the experimental data were non-existent and there were no theoretical foundations that could be applied. In the latter half of the 20th century, there were several attempts such as quantum mechanics (the theory of subatomic physics and is one of the most successful theories of all time which is based on three principles: (1) energy is found in discrete packets called quanta; (2) matter is based on point particles but the probability of finding them is given by a wave, which obeys the Schrödinger wave equation; (3) a measurement is necessary to collapse the wave and determine the final state of an object), the “big bang,” probability theory, the general relativity (a theoretical framework of geometry which has been verified experimentally to better than 99.7 percent accuracy and predicts that the curvature of space-time gives the illusion that there is a force of attraction called gravity) to adjust to ensure agreement with experimental measurements and answer the questions that have so long occupied the mind of philosophers (from Aristotle to Kant) and scientists. However, we must admit that there is ignorance on some issues, for example, “we don’t have a complete theory of universe which could form a framework for stitching these insights together into a seamless whole – capable of describing all phenomena.... We are not sure exactly how universe happened.” However, the generally accepted history of the universe, according to what is so-called the big bang theory (proposed by a Belgian priest, Georges Lemaître, who learned of Einstein’s theory and was fascinated by the idea that the theory logically led to a universe that was expanding and therefore had a beginning) has completely changed the discussion of the origin of the universe from almost pure speculation to an observational subject. In such model one finds that our universe started with an explosion. This was not any ordinary explosion as might occur today, which would have a point of origin (center) and would spread out from that point. The explosion occurred simultaneously everywhere, filling all space with infinite heat and energy. At this time, order and structure were just beginning to emerge – the universe was hotter and denser than anything we can imagine (at such temperatures and densities (of about a trillion trillion trillion trillion (1 with 72 zeros after it) tons per cubic inch) gravity and quantum mechanics were no longer treated as two separate entities as they were in point-particle quantum field theory, the four known forces were unified as one unified super force) and was very rapidly expanding much faster than the speed of light (this did not violate Einstein’s dictum that nothing can travel faster than light, because it was empty space that was expanding) and cooling in a way consistent with Einstein field equations. As the universe was expanding, the temperature was decreasing. Since the temperature was decreasing, the universe was cooling and its curvature energy was converted into matter like a formless water vapor freezes into snowflakes whose unique patterns arise from a combination of symmetry and randomness. Approximately 10^{-37} seconds into the expansion, a phase transition caused a cosmic inflation, during which the universe underwent an incredible amount of superliminal expansion and grew exponentially by a factor e^{3Ht} (where H was a constant called Hubble parameter and t was the time) – just as the prices grew by a factor of ten million in a period of 18 months in Germany after the First World War and it doubled in size every tiny fraction of a second – just as prices double every year in certain countries. After inflation stopped, the universe was not in a de Sitter phase and its rate of expansion was no longer proportional to its volume since H was no longer constant. At that time, the entire universe had grown by an unimaginable factor of 10^{50} and consisted of a hot plasma “soup” of high energetic quarks as well as leptons (a group of particles which interacted with each other by exchanging new particles called the W and Z bosons as well as photons). And quarks and gluons were “deconfined” and free to move over distances much larger than the hadron size ($\gg 1$ fm) in a soup called quark gluon plasma (QGP). There were a number of different varieties of quarks: there were six “flavors,” which we now call up, down, strange, charmed, bottom, and top. And among the leptons the electron was a stable object and muon (that had mass 207 times larger than electron and now belongs to the second redundant generation of particles found in the

Standard Model) and the tauon (that had mass 3,490 times the mass of the electron) were allowed to decay into other particles. And associated to each charged lepton, there were three distinct kinds of ghostly particles called neutrinos (the most mysterious of subatomic particles, are difficult to detect because they rarely interact with other forms of matter. Although they can easily pass through a planet or solid walls, they seldom leave a trace of their existence. Evidence of neutrino oscillations prove that neutrinos are not massless but instead have a mass less than one-hundred-thousandth that of an electron):

- the electron neutrino (which was predicted in the early 1930s by Wolfgang Pauli and discovered by Frederick Reines and Clyde Cowan in mid-1950s)
- the muon neutrino (which was discovered by physicists when studying the cosmic rays in late 1930s)
- the tauon neutrino (a heavier cousin of the electron neutrino)

Temperatures were so high that these quarks and leptons were moving around so fast that they escaped any attraction toward each other due to nuclear or electromagnetic forces. However, they possessed so much energy that whenever they collided, particle – antiparticle pairs of all kinds were being continuously created and destroyed in collisions. And the uncertainty in the position of the particle times the uncertainty in its velocity times the mass of the particle was never smaller than a certain quantity, which was known as Planck’s constant. Similarly, $\Delta E \times \Delta t$ was $\leq h/4\pi$ (where h was a quantity called Planck’s constant and $\pi = 3.14159 \dots$ was the familiar ratio of the circumference of a circle to its diameter). Hence the Heisenberg’s uncertainty principle (which captures the heart of quantum mechanics – i.e. features normally thought of as being so basic as to be beyond question (e.g. that objects have definite positions and speeds and that they have definite energies at definite moments) are now seen as mere artifacts of Planck’s constant being so tiny on the scales of the everyday world) was a fundamental, inescapable property of the universe. At some point an unknown reaction led to a very small excess of quarks and leptons over antiquarks and antileptons — of the order of one part in 30 million. This resulted in the predominance of matter over antimatter in the universe. The universe continued to decrease in density and fall in temperature, hence the typical energy of each particle was decreased in inverse proportion to the size of the universe (since the average energy – or speed – of the particles was simply a measure of the temperature of the universe). The symmetry (a central part of the theory [and] its experimental confirmation would be a compelling, albeit circumstantial, piece of evidence for strings) however, was unstable and, as the universe cooled, a process called spontaneous symmetry breaking phase transitions placed the fundamental forces of physics and the parameters of elementary particles into their present form. After about 10–11 seconds, the picture becomes less speculative, since particle energies drop to values that can be attained in particle physics experiments. At about 10–6 seconds, there was a continuous exchange of smallest constituents of the strong force called gluons between the quarks and this resulted in a force that pulled the quarks to form little wisps of matter which obeys the strong interactions and makes up only a tiny fraction of the matter in the universe and is dwarfed by dark matter called the baryons (protons – a positively charged particles very similar to the neutrons, which accounts for roughly half the particles in the nucleus of most atoms – and neutrons – a neutral subatomic particles which, along with the protons, makes up the nuclei of atoms – belonged to the class baryons) as well as other particles. The small excess of quarks over antiquarks led to a small excess of baryons over antibaryons. The proton was composed of two up quarks and one down quark and the neutron was composed of two down quarks and one up quark. And other particles contained other quarks (strange, charmed, bottom, and top), but these all had a much greater mass and decayed very rapidly into protons and neutrons. The charge on the up quark was $= + 2/3 e$ and the charge on the down quark was $= - 1/3 e$. The other quarks possessed charges of $+ 2/3 e$ or $- 1/3 e$. The charges of the quarks added up in the combination that composed the proton but cancelled out in the combination that composed the neutron i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Proton charge was } &= (2/3 e) + (2/3 e) + (- 1/3 e) = e \\ \text{Neutron charge was } &= (2/3 e) + (-1/3 e) + (-1/3 e) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

And the force that confined the rest mass energy of the proton or the neutron to its radius was so strong that it is now proved very difficult if not impossible to obtain an isolated quark. As we try to pull them out of the proton or neutron it gets more and more difficult. Even stranger is the suggestion that the harder and harder if we could drag a quark out of a proton this force gets bigger and bigger – rather like the force in a spring as it is stretched causing the quark to snap back immediately to its original position. This property of confinement prevented one from observing an isolated quark (and the question of whether it makes sense to say quarks really exist if we can never isolate one was a controversial issue in the years after the quark model was first proposed). However, now it has been revealed that experiments with large particle accelerators indicate that at high energies the strong force becomes much weaker, and

one can observe an isolated quark. In fact, the standard model (one of the most successful physical theories of all time and since it fails to account for gravity (and seems so ugly), theoretical physicists feel it cannot be the final theory) in its current form requires that the quarks not be free. The observation of a free quark would falsify that aspect of the standard model, although nicely confirm the quark idea itself and fits all the experimental data concerning particle physics without exception. Each quark possessed baryon number = $1/3$: the total baryon number of the proton or the neutron was the sum of the baryon numbers of the quarks from which it was composed. And the electrons and neutrinos contained no quarks; they were themselves truly fundamental particles. And since there were no electrically charged particles lighter than an electron and a proton, the electrons and protons were prevented from decaying into lighter particles – such as photons (that carried zero mass, zero charge, a definite energy $E = pc$ and a momentum $p = mc$) and less massive neutrinos (with very little mass, no electric charge, and no radius — and, adding insult to injury, no strong force acted on it). And a free neutron being heavier than the proton was not prevented from decaying into a proton (plus an electron and an antineutrino). The temperature was now no longer high enough to create new proton–antiproton pairs, so a mass annihilation immediately followed, leaving just one in 10^{10} of the original protons and neutrons, and none of their antiparticles (i.e., antiparticle was sort of the reverse of matter particle. The counterparts of electrons were positrons (positively charged), and the counterparts of protons were antiprotons (negatively charged). Even neutrons had an antiparticle: antineutrons. A similar process happened at about 1 second for electrons and positrons (positron: the antiparticle of an electron with exactly the same mass as an electron but its electric charge is $+1e$). After these annihilations, the remaining protons, neutrons and electrons were no longer moving relativistically and the energy density of the universe was dominated by photons – (what are sometimes referred to as the messenger particles for the electromagnetic force) – with a minor contribution from neutrinos. The density of the universe was about 4×10^9 times the density of water and much hotter than the center of even the hottest star – no ordinary components of matter as we know them – molecules, atoms, nuclei – could hold together at this temperature. And the total positive charge due to protons plus the total negative charge due to electrons in the universe was = 0 (Just what it was if electromagnetism would not dominate over gravity and for the universe to remain electrically neutral).

And a few minutes into the expansion, when the temperature was about a billion (one thousand million; 10 to the power of 9) kelvin and the density was about that of air, protons and neutrons no longer had sufficient energy to escape the attraction of the strong nuclear force and they started to combine together to produce the universe's deuterium and helium nuclei in a process called Big Bang nucleosynthesis. And most of the protons remained uncombined as hydrogen nuclei. And inside the tiny core of an atom, consisting of protons and neutrons, which was roughly 10^{-13} cm across or roughly an angstrom, a proton was never permanently a proton and also a neutron was never permanently a neutron. They kept on changing into each other. A neutron emitted a π meson (a particle predicted by Hideki Yukawa (for which he was awarded the Nobel Prize in physics in 1949) – composed of a quark and antiquark, which is unstable because the quark and antiquark can annihilate each other, producing electrons and other particles) and became proton and a proton absorbed a π meson and became a neutron. That is, the exchange force resulted due to the absorption and emission of π mesons kept the protons and neutrons bound in the nucleus. And the time in which the absorption and emission of π mesons took place was so small that π mesons were not detected. And a property of the strong force called asymptotic freedom caused it to become weaker at short distances. Hence, although quarks were bound in nuclei by the strong force, they moved within nuclei almost as if they felt no force at all.

Within only a few hours of the big bang, the Big Bang nucleosynthesis stopped. And after that, for the next million years or so, the universe just continued expanding, without anything much happening. Eventually, once the temperature had dropped to a few thousand degrees, there was a continuous exchange of virtual photons between the nuclei and the electrons. And the exchange was good enough to produce — what else? — A force (proportional to a quantity called their charge and inversely proportional to the square of the distance between them). And that force pulled the electrons towards the nuclei to form neutral atoms (the basic unit of ordinary matter, made up of a tiny nucleus (consisting of protons and neutrons) surrounded by orbiting electrons). And these atoms reflected, absorbed, and scattered light and the resulted light was red shifted by the expansion of the universe towards the microwave region of the electromagnetic spectrum. And there was cosmic microwave background radiation (which, through the last 15 billion years of cosmic expansion, has now cooled to a mere handful of degrees above absolute zero (-273°C – the lowest possible temperature, at which substances contain no heat energy and all vibrations stop—almost: the water molecules are as fixed in their equilibrium positions as quantum uncertainty allows) and today, scientists measure tiny deviations within this background radiation to provide evidence for inflation or other theories).

The irregularities in the universe meant that some regions of the nearly uniformly distributed atoms had slightly higher density than others. The gravitational attraction of the extra density slowed the expansion of the region, and eventually caused the region to collapse to form galaxies and stars. And the nuclear reactions in the stars transformed hydrogen to helium (composed of two protons and two neutrons and symbolized by ${}^4_2\text{He}$, highly stable—as predicted by the rules of quantum mechanics) to carbon (with their self-bonding properties, provide the immense variety for the complex cellular machinery—no other element offers a comparable range of possibilities) with the release of an enormous amount of energy via Einstein's equation $E = mc^2$. This was the energy that lighted up the stars. And the process continued converting the carbon to oxygen to silicon to iron. And the nuclear reaction ceased at iron. And the star experienced several chemical changes in its innermost core and these changes required huge amount of energy which was supplied by the severe gravitational contraction. And as a result the central region of the star collapsed to form a neutron star. And the outer region of the star got blown off in a tremendous explosion called a supernova, which outshone an entire galaxy of 100 billion stars, spraying the manufactured elements into space. And these elements provided some of the raw material for the generation of cloud of rotating gas which went to form the sun and a small amount of the heavier elements collected together to form the asteroids, stars, comets, and the bodies that now orbit the sun as planets like the Earth and their presence caused the fabric of space around them to warp (more massive the bodies, the greater the distortion it caused in the surrounding space).

The earth was initially very hot and without an atmosphere. In the course of time the planet earth produced volcanoes and the volcanoes emitted water vapor, carbon dioxide and other gases. And there was an atmosphere. This early atmosphere contained no oxygen, but a lot of other gases and among them some were poisonous, such as hydrogen sulfide (the gas that gives rotten eggs their smell). And the sunlight dissociated water vapor and there was oxygen. And carbon dioxide in excess heated the earth and balance was needed. So carbon dioxide dissolved to form carbonic acid and carbonic acid on rocks produced limestone and subducted limestone fed volcanoes that released more carbon dioxide. And there was high temperature and high temperature meant more evaporation and dissolved more carbon dioxide. And as the carbon dioxide turned into limestone, the temperature began to fall. And a consequence of this was that most of the water vapor condensed and formed the oceans. And the low temperature meant less evaporation and carbon dioxide began to build up in the atmosphere. And the cycle went on for billions of years. And after the few billion years, volcanoes ceased to exist. And the molten earth cooled, forming a hardened, outer crust. And the earth's atmosphere consisted of nitrogen, oxygen, carbon dioxide, plus other miscellaneous gases (hydrogen sulfide, methane, water vapor, and ammonia). And then a continuous electric current through the atmosphere simulated lightning storms. And some of the gases came to be arranged in the form of more complex organic molecules such as simple amino acids (the basic chemical subunit of proteins, when, when linked together, formed proteins) and carbohydrates (which were very simple sugars). And the water vapor in the atmosphere probably caused millions of seconds of torrential rains, during which the organic molecules reached the earth. And it took two and a half billion years for an ooze of organic molecules to react and built earliest cells as a result of chance combinations of atoms into large structures called macromolecules and then advance to a wide variety of one-celled organisms, and another billion years to evolve through a highly sophisticated form of life to primitive mammals endowed with two elements: genes (a set of instructions that tell them how to sustain and multiply themselves), and metabolism (a mechanism to carry out the instructions). But then evolution seemed to have speeded up. It only took about a hundred million years to develop from the early mammals (the highest class of animals, including the ordinary hairy quadrupeds, the whales and Mammoths, and characterized by the production of living young which are nourished after birth by milk from the teats (MAMMAE, MAMMARY GLANDS) of the mother) to Homosapiens. This picture of a universe that started off very hot and cooled as it expanded (like when things are compressed they heat up ... and, when things ... expand ... they cool down) is in agreement with all the observational evidence which we have today (and it explains Olbers' paradox: The paradox that asks why the night sky is black. If the universe is infinite and uniform, then we must receive light from an infinite number of stars, and hence the sky must be white, which violates observation). Nevertheless, it leaves a number of important questions unanswered:

Why the universe started off very hot i.e., why it violently emerged from a state of infinite compression? Why is the universe the same everywhere i.e., looks the same from every point (homogeneous) and looks the same in every direction (isotropic)? If the cosmic inflation made the universe flat, homogeneous and isotropic, then what is the hypothetical field that powered the inflation? What are the details of this inflation?

Much is explained by protons and electrons. But there remains the neutrino...
 $\approx 10^9$ neutrinos / proton. What is their physical picture in the universe?

The big bang theory, on its own, cannot explain these features or answer these questions because of its prediction that the universe started off with infinite density at the big bang singularity. At the singularity (a state of infinite gravity), all the known physical laws of cosmology would break down: one couldn't predict what would come out of the infinitely dense Planck-sized nugget called the singularity. The search for the origin and fate of the universe (which is determined by whether the Omega (Ω_0) density parameter is less than, equal to or greater than 1) is a distinctly human drama, one that has stretched the mind and enriched the spirit. We (a species ruled by all sorts of closer, warmer, ambitions and perceptions) are all, each in our own way, seekers of an absolute limit of scientific explanation (that may never be achieved) and we each long for an answer to why we exist... as our future descendants marvels at our new view of the universe ... we are... contributing our wrong to the human letter reaching for the stars. In the millennia of Homo sapiens evolution, we have found it something quite . . . puzzling. Even that great Jewish scientist Albert Einstein (who freed us from the superstition of the past and interpreted the constancy of the speed of light as a universal principle of nature that contradicted Newtonian theory) sustained a mystical outlook on the universe that was, he said, constantly renewed from the wonder and humility that filled him when he gazed at the universe. I wonder, can our finite minds ever truly understand such things as mysticism and infinity?

The fine tuning coincidences are updated and refurbished and have been somewhat misleadingly categorized under the designation anthropic principle, a term coined by astronomer Brandon Carter in 1974 – which states that the physical properties of the universe are as they are because they permit the emergence of life. This teleological principle tries to explain why some physical properties of matter seem so fine-tuned as to permit the existence of life -- and are widely claimed to provide prima facie evidence for purposeful design—a design with life and perhaps humanity in mind. However, fine tuning coincidences are only needed to fill in the details of evidence for the existence of insulated interpositions of Divine power. If the universe were congenial to human life, then we would expect it to be easy for humanlike life to develop and survive throughout the vast stretches of the universe (an intricately complex place). We must admit that much of what we believe, including our fundamental coincidences about the universe is a blind leap of faith. We, after all, carbon-based biological systems operating a billion times slower than computer chips made of silicon, can carry the implications of the illusion of intelligent design about as far as we can imagine we could go -- classifying as an argument from design is the contemporary claim that the laws and constants of physics are "fine-tuned" so that the universe is able to contain life – which is commonly -- have been publicized in the popular print media, featured in television specials on PBS and BBC, and disseminated through a wide variety of popular and scholarly books, including entries from prestigious academic publishing houses such as Oxford and Cambridge University Presses -- but misleading. Furthermore, blind faith can justify anything and we have no reason to conclude that earthlike planets and sunlike stars and life itself are far too complex to have arisen by coincidence or could not have had a purely accidental origin because astrobiologists have now demonstrated that captured material from a comet -- analyzed immediately after striking Earth so that effects of contamination by earthly matter are minimal-- possessed lysine, an amino acid, in the sample, suggesting that the evolution of life on Earth had only begun after accidental jump-start from space i.e., the first ingredients of life accidentally came from space after Earth formed.

LONG STANDING QUESTIONS

Are there undiscovered principles of nature: new symmetries, new physical laws?

How can we solve the mystery of dark energy? Are dark energy and the Higgs field related?

What are neutrinos telling us? Is dark matter is made up of weakly interacting massive particles (something like heavy versions of the neutrinos)?

What is dark matter? How can we make it in the laboratory?

Why are there so many kinds of particles? Why the Higgs exists and who its cosmological cousins are?

Which particles are travelers in extra dimensions, and what are their locations within them? Is our Universe part of a Multiverse?

How did the universe come to be? What happened to the antimatter? What do we learn about the early Universe from experiments at the LHC? Can precise measures of the distribution of galaxies and DM unveil the nature of DM/DE?

Why there is missing energy from a weakly interacting heavy particle? Is the direct discovery of the effects of extra dimensions or a new source of matter- antimatter asymmetry possible? An all- embracing theory of physics that unifies quantum mechanics (which applies to the very small: atoms, subatomic particles and the forces between them) and general relativity (which applies to the very large: stars, galaxies and gravity, the driving force of the cosmos) would solve the problem of describing everything in the universe from the big bang to subatomic particles? Our leading candidate for a theory of everything is known as M-theory. It grew from a merger of the two seemingly different approaches: 11-dimensional supergravity and 10-dimensional superstring theory. Could this be the final theory of everything? What do observations of galaxies at early times tell us about how galaxies were made?

Mapping the dark universe

PROFILING THE INVISIBLE

Is Cosmology about to SNAP?

Or does it explain everything about the universe?

To answer these most challenging questions about the nature of the universe and led down open doors into new insights and findings, all the approaches must converge. Results from accelerator experiments at LHC must agree with most powerful and insightful astrophysical observations and results from sophisticated data. However, the experiments necessary to go beyond the existing knowledge of standard physics are rapidly becoming prohibitively expensive and time consuming and the macroscopic experiments are difficult to perform in the laboratory as subatomic reactions at the incredible energy scale of 10^9 GeV -- which is far beyond the range of our largest particle accelerators and it is the biggest embarrassment in all of modern physics and if you listen closely, you can almost hear the dreams of physicists everywhere being shattered.