

Section 1 NON SENSE Exposed

**Everything you wanted to know about the Big Bang
but were afraid to ask
BECAUSE nothing before reported till now made any sense.**

**Here is the correct thinking.
NON-SENSE is exposed using ALL NEW HiTech
Observations in proper order.**

[10 pages of text] **8/1/2007** [11 pages of figures]
29 reference links all working today
Charles J. Sven

Science is based on our observations of our
natural world – when observations find change –
science must change.

[See: Flat Earth, Earth Centered Universe, &
Universe from Nothing].

The starting point of our quest is the Creation of our Universe
of which cosmologists up to now freely admit that they do not
understand. Currently new NASA and other equivalent
observations, *not yet incorporated in the public arena*, but
included in this paper, shed much light upon this basic question.

Unfortunately, 20th century cosmologists made many
unsupported assumptions [or bizarre nonsense] way before
technology advanced sufficiently to test their concepts and are now
so deeply imbedded that these assumptions are taken as fact,
pushing current observations into the sidelines, thereby
maintaining a difficult and very Unsatisfying Old Big Bang Model
as a starting point of analyzing our world.

Reporters love the bizarre.

What is so unsatisfactory?

The old model does not explain:

- How from NOTHING the “singleton” came to exist.
- What caused the Big Bang “singleton” to explode.
 - How galaxies are formed.
- Why the distribution of celestial objects is not homogeneous.
- Why space is flat, not curved as this old model demands.

**This paper will explain the above with NASA
observations and other equivalent evidence, plus:**

Provide evidence that the very slow moving Earth,
relatively speaking, is in the **Center of our Universe**,
due to an explosion IN SPACE.

Further, this paper will show supporting evidence, generated by the author, of the existence of an energy filled ARENA OF SPACE prior to the Big Bang.

Introduction:

The question of how our Universe came into existence can now be answered with the latest scientific findings, computing the life of the atom's **ageless** proton heart coupled with the speed of light.

A very simple demonstration:

Energy before Big Bang found with a kitchen match & ageless atoms*

Strike a match – ageless atoms push light/photons going off in all directions.

*Where is the atom's power coming from?
No fourteen billion year old batteries found.*

Source of power must be external to atom – like a wild current flowing in a giant, super-cooled, super-high frequency, circuit in the vastness of Space. [The huge Arena of Space prior to the Big Bang]

This same great energy source then can easily supply the power needed for the Big Bang. Stanford Labs in '97 created matter from light verifying that Einstein's famous equation $E=mc^2$ goes both ways, supporting all the above.

* - (atom = proton, neutron, & electron) Twenty five years of study noted NO proton decay, see: "...the non-observance of proton decays..."

<http://cerncourier.com/cws/article/cern/28651>

see also: *Search for Proton Decay via $p \rightarrow e^+ \pi^0$ in a Large Water Cherenkov Detector* – Nov. 19, 2006 Ref. – arXiv:hep-ex/9806014v1, page 6, – "We have no evidence of the proton decaying via the mode $p \rightarrow e^+ \pi^0$ in the 25.5 kton•year data."

http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/hep-ex/pdf/9806/9806014v1.pdf

http://leiwon.tripod.com/create_matter.htm

<http://www.allnewuniverse.com/EnergyANDArenaOFSpace.ppt>

Setting:

"This circumstance [of an expanding Universe] irritates me," by Einstein in an old letter to Willem de Sitter. And in another letter about the expanding Universe, "To admit such possibilities seems senseless." See R. Jastrow, *God and the Astronomers*, p.17

(Warner Books, New York, 1978.) **[Einstein says expanding space is senseless.]**

Assumptions [NON-SENSE exposed]:

Einstein's #1 Supporter - Arthur Eddington, in *Nature* 127, 1931, 450 wrote:

1st. "Philosophically, the notion of a beginning of the present order of Nature is repugnant to me. ... I should like to find a genuine loophole." **[loophole?]**

2nd. "Eddington also claimed that his version of events could explain something emerging from nothing, thanks to some rather dubious logic." Reported by Simon Singh in his book – "*Big Bang*" page 281 (Fourth Estate, NY, 2004.) **[Science From Nothing?]**

3rd. In 1923 "Friedmann formulates the results of his first cosmological paper in just a few sentences: ... "This brings to mind what the **Hindu mythology** has to say about cycles of existence, and it also becomes possible to speak about 'the creation of the world from nothing,' " " " Reported in the 1993 book: "*Alexander A Friedmann: The Man Who Made the Universe Expand*" page 156-7 by Tropp, Frenkel, and Chernin (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.) **[Hindu mythology – a scientific basis ?]**

4th. In his letter to the journal *Nature* in 1931, Lemaître noted that "If the world has begun with a single quantum, the notions of space and time would altogether fail to have any meaning at the beginning...if this suggestion is correct, the beginning of the world happened a little before the beginning of space and time." See *The Beginning of the World from the point of View of Quantum Theory.* *Nature* 127,706, 1931. **IF. IF. IF.**

5th. In 1932-3, Edward A. Milne formulated the "*cosmological principle*" describing a homogenous universe that looks the same regardless of one's position in our Universe. [NOTE: There was no acceptable way to test this so called *principle* with 20th century's technology. Like proving Earth is a sphere, HiTech Data presented herein kills homogeneity.] See: Gale, George, "*Cosmology: Methodological Debates in the 1930s and 1940s*", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2002 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.). **[Evidence presented herein shatters Milne's homogeneity.]**

Such is the unscientific mentality of our current Standard Big Bang Model Framers set from Einstein's general relativity in 1915 to its current plastered form that emerged in early 1940's. Namely these math based assumptions or other pseudoscientific theories are to be pruned from cosmology. [Note: these bizarre assumptions have no scientific basis, experimental findings, or observations – only elegant mathematical formulas.]

Unscientific Assumptions to be pruned:

- That the Big Bang created Space, Time, and Matter.
- That our Universe is curved but CENTERLESS and a straight line returns to its starting point from the opposite direction.
- That Space is expanding from NOTHING.
- That Earth has no preferred position.
- That the distribution of Matter is Homogeneous.
- The *cosmological principle* that every galaxy in our Universe will see the same view as any observer on Earth.

What survived:

- That the Big Bang Fireball IN energy filled SPACE forged Hydrogen, Helium.
- That our view of all celestial objects is isotropic [layered onion-like].

What's new:

A. The growing distance between galaxies can be more easily explained by a push from an explosion in energy-filled space (using everyday physics, easily demonstrated), than the unbelievable concept of expanding space. [See intro: **Energy - "Strike a Match".**]

Supporting this new energy-filled space concept is the fact that rapidly expanding space could not form any structure – only FOG! Expanding space is assumed to move Earth's local family of galaxies at 600 kilometers per second (=375 miles per second - documentation found in figure 4 on page 10 herein) and all other galaxies faster, with velocities reaching up to speed of light. Nothing could assemble under such powerful repulsion.

See what Michael S. Turner has to say about expanding space [also known as the cosmological constant.] "We want it [cosmological constant] here today and gone yesterday." K. C. Cole, *The Hole in the Universe*, p.200 (Harcourt, Inc, New York, 2001.) In a different interview he says: "However, the most intriguing possibility is that there is no dark energy at all, that we simply do not understand gravity and COSMIC ACCELERATION*^[see section 2] is the first clue to going beyond Einstein's theory." For complete interview see: http://chandra.harvard.edu/photo/2004/darkenergy/turner_interview.html