

# Big Bang and Its Creator—The Nothingness

2014 © Cameron Rebigol

When referring to the theory of Big Bang, everyone knows who Steven Hawking is. According to Mr. Hawking, God is not needed, but just a set of laws of nature, in the creation of the universe. In his book *The Grand Design*, he said:

*Because there is a law such as gravity, the universe can and will create itself from nothing. Spontaneous creation is the reason there is something rather than nothing, why the universe exists, why we exist...*

This statement would immediately dismay its readers how the law of gravity could have been part of the nothingness before the universe is created by the nothingness. Do people need to redefine “nothingness” in philosophy as well as in English dictionary? Setting aside this puzzle of logic, if someone thinks it is not self-ridiculed, let’s further examine a few astronomical landscapes naturally portrayed by Big Bang’s advocacy.

Landscape (1), regarding how the Big Bang’s singularity completed its explosion in an extremely short time interval. Hubble’s observation has established that the majority of celestial objects are receding from us, signified as red shift movement. The further an object is located from us, the higher the speed in its receding. Using this as evidence, the Big Bang theory reasons that the universe is expanding. Because, according to this theory, the universe came to existence after the explosion of a singularity, the universe then must have an edge denoting its most frontal expansion. Celestial materials there must have been traveling at the highest speed leaving us, while those lagging behind would travel at lower speed, the further from the edge, the lower the speed. If this reasoning sounds, today, 13.8 billion years after the explosion, the material distribution along any line we look toward the edge of the universe must impress us with this phenomenon: the further along the line, the thinner the space density of material would become. Subsequently, given the inevitable isotropic character that the Big Bang theory must allow for the explosion, a geometrical point that could be referred as the center of universe would have easily suggested itself to us, because material distribution towards this point must be denser and denser. So far, all observations only suggest a homogeneous material distribution per unit volume all over in the space, although local irregularities are seen here and there. Such observed homogeneity must cast serious and nearly irreconcilable skepticism on the view that the expansion is a result of an explosion. Indeed, to reconcile, the Big Bang promoters suggest people to imagine how a loaf of bread would expand during the baking process. Such a loaf does maintain spatial homogeneity of material distribution while expanding. To have a model

matching this suggestion, the Big Bang supporters have necessarily led us to the next model of landscape.

Landscape (2), material is homogeneously distributed along any radial line centered from an observer. To realize such distribution, the source of explosion must control the exploding so well that material batches, regardless of its size, can leave the source with certain constant speed that is linearly decreasing according to each patch's leaving time. This model sure can maintain linear homogeneity along each radial line and between all these lines. However, such a distribution must cause different areal density of material distribution between surfaces of spheres of different radius. The bigger the radius a sphere has, the lower the material density per unit area on this sphere's surface would end up. Besides, unless the material spewing can permanently continue, an exhaustion void in the universe about where the source locate must sooner or later show up. So far, no such active source is ever reported. A model of well controlled explosion and a model of abrupt explosion, which is where Big Bang's faith stands, must remove each other. Sure, for the fun of it, we can also devise another model as illustrated in landscape (3) below to match the Big Bang's fantasy.

Landscape (3), *prior* (meaning time) to the explosion, density of mass and energy of every patch contained by the singularity had been distributed inversely proportional to each patch's distance from the center of the singularity. However, this model is very destructive to the fundamental concept of the Big Bang theory in two folds: (a) No dough of bread loaf before baked can be so devised as illustrated in this model if the expansion manner of the universe is to be compared with the bread's expansion manner. (b) Acceptance of this model means that dimension of space and time can exist before the singularity launched its explosion. The Big Bang theory must forbid such acceptance, which appears so fatal to the Big Bang's flagship idea that dimension of space and time cannot exist before the singularity's explosion.

No model regarding spatial material distribution can be devised to match what Big Bang fantasizes. Besides, other astronomy observations also directly challenge Big Bang's single explosion assertion, such as (a) blue-shift movement, meaning some celestial objects moving toward us, directly opposing the explosion's propelling force, (b) some of the stars in the Milky Way appear older than the age of the universe. Further, did the singularity contain limited or unlimited quantity of mass and energy before the explosion? Either limited or unlimited would embarrass the Big Bang theory. To extricate, this theory relies on a concept that dimension of space and time has no significance until it is created by the singularity's explosion.

One of the big challenges that Big Bang always encounters is how the singularity had found space for itself to stay when the universe is not yet created. If space was already so provided for the singularity, shouldn't this space belong to some universe of more seniority and make the singularity just part of it? So the Big Bang supporters ask people to accept that the singularity

had packed and monopolized with it everything that can be felt with our real sense, such as mass and energy, or imagined with abstract reasoning, such as space and time.

If their dogma works, space cannot exist beyond the outmost expansion front. Beyond this front, *nothing* must stay as nothing. If the dimension of space can be found beyond, something not created by Big Bang's singularity has existed, and the Big Bang theory must terminate itself right here. However, the idea that dimension of space is created by the explosion of the singularity would dreadfully remove the notion of explosion. As a product of the singularity's explosion, the dimension of space cannot be independent of the character of the universe's expansion, but must inherit the same elasticity as the expansion itself. The comparison between the dimension occupied by the entire expansion and any segment of this dimension must then forever maintain the same ratio—no expansion can be concluded. Simply imagine a kid growing with perfect proportion between all his body parts all the time. If he is allowed only to use his knuckle to measure his body length, he can never know how much he has grown, but permanently, say, 50 knuckle lengths. He would know only if he is allowed to use, say, the length of his first shoes in his life; the shoes are independent of his birth, a creation from some other source.

Self-contradictions invoked by the Big Bang theory are so overwhelming that its promoters feel the need of putting up many “indisputable” Band-Aids for rescue. The bread-loaf expansion manner is only one of these Band-Aids. The main idea of all these Band-Aids still relies on their flagship avocation that something can come from nothing, and nothingness does warrants the emerging of something.

One of the Band-Aids is the concept of multiverse: *“Science predicts that many different kinds of universes will be spontaneously created out of Nothing. It is a matter of chance which we are in...”* This is only a different appearance of the same version of idea that nothingness, with some laws from the nature, such as the law of gravity, can create universe—upon the maturity of some random combination of nature's laws and cosmic constants is born a universe. Therefore, accordingly, the universe and the nature are separate entities. How much rationality, or irrationality, can be found in this “science” logic?

It requires energy for any random shuffling of anything into new combination. Where does the energy come from if a universe is not yet created? Another Band-Aid thus shows up: Random fluctuation in the nothingness creates negative energy and then allows positive energy to be generated for a universe to form. Negative energy and positive energy well balance each other, thus law of energy conservation is not violated. Perfect! But fluctuation contrasts to what backdrop, time, matter, space, light or heat intensity...? Even more to the point, what is fluctuating? Yes, they say quantum. But what is quantized before anything is created?

Some of the Band-Aids even claim to have found material evidence in observation witnessing something coming out of nothing, both in experimental and astronomical environments. However, there are two catches against such claim. (1) Is the space from which the source identified as nothingness but producing something part of the universe we live in? Or is it part of some other universe from which we are absolutely isolated? (2) How do they identify the source capable of producing something as having been genuinely nothing? What degree of perfectness can their instrument and method achieve in identifying absolute nothingness? At least, it is said nowadays that dark matter and dark energy have permeated in our universe so thorough through that no one can live anywhere without their embracement, save the mentioning of neutrinos, which is said to have an abundance of 65 billion ( $6.5 \times 10^{10}$ ) solar neutrinos/second/cm<sup>2</sup> penetrating the earth. Does the Big Bang theory support or oppose the idea of dark matter and dark energy, how about neutrinos? Human beings have been fooled many times by nothingness in their history of understanding the nature. One of the most typical puzzles of nothingness in ancient time was what had caused the spread of epidemic disease. The bacteria or virus in those eras were so undetectable and thus appeared so matching their concept of nothingness.

The most inconceivable price the Big Bang supporters are willing to pay for all this Band-Aids is their volunteering sacrifice of Einstein's relativity, relying on which the Big Bang theory develops its mathematical validity. To maintain that the outmost expanding front enabled by the Big Bang can proceed beyond any speed barrier, they claim that general relativity allows the movement of the "edge" of the universe to exceed any speed limit. If they don't bestow general relativity with such privilege, they have hard time to match (1) the universe's age with the age of many remote celestial objects that tell us different story with their virtue light frequency and redshift character, (2) the speed limit affirmed by Special relativity and the concept that an infinitely expanding universe has to have infinite speed for its outmost expanding front. Any slowing down must indicate the inevitable ultimate happening of Big Crunch, immediately terminating Big Bang's idea that dimension of time is created by the Big Bang. In claiming that general relativity allows light speed to be exceeded, do they remember that speed limit of light affirmed by special relativity is the steadfast principle for general relativity to gain its validity? Even more to the point, how serious are these so called scientists in doing science research?

Surely relativity is an invalid theory, but not in the way shown by the frivolous and reckless arbitration commanded by the promoters of the Big Bang theory, by those who ask people to believe the universe can come out from nothing. Relativity is invalid because its own cored mathematical derivation is self-defeating. For this, if a reader feeling interested in more details, he can refer to Rebigol's article *A Simple Question from but against Relativity* in the website [www.huntune.net](http://www.huntune.net), where an award of **\$100,000** is posted for successful refutation against Rebigol's argument.

Allowing, or even relying on self-defeated ideas and logic, Big Bang theory supporters have also encouraged the birth of many more other “theories” that people with ordinary mind cannot conceive. One of such typical theories is the Big Crunch. According to its supporters, Big Bang and Big Crunch just happen alternatively in a long history line of time. They succeed one another, with each succession being longer in period and lower in magnitude when each of the new one happens. The manner of their proceeding is like a damping oscillation. This picture would so simply tell people that *time* is perpetual—nothing has created the dimension of time like what Big Bang theory says nor the time ever dies. If the supporters of this theory care to answer a few simple questions here, they would certainly qualify themselves of profound gratitude from people who search for mankind wisdom. (1) Will this theory tolerate the existence of one most initial and thus the grandest event that started this series of Bang-Crunch? Was such event a Big Bang or a Big Crunch? (2) If the concept of multiverse is valid, will this theory tolerate the coexistence of multi-series of such Bang-Crunch? (3) If the Big Bang theory allows the dimension of time to exist only after the explosion of the singularity, what is to be used to measure the period of the immediate Big Crunch before the Big Bang that brought us to existence, and how?

All in all, the promoters of the Big Bang theory advocate their theory with this faith: Owning the laws of nature and some cosmic constants, nature itself is nothingness but would inevitably create universes, namely, multiverse. The central theme of this faith is: The existence of universe needs a creator, but only a creator of their version, a creator that is an absolute synonym of nothingness! All this self-defeating and irrational arguments can only serve as a confession that they fail to explain the origin of the universe. So failing, they cannot help but leave room for other’s faith to stay and prevail—At least, for example, theistic creation has a source, which is God or other deity, but Big Bang theory’s creation either has no source or its source is self-removed.