

The Big Bang Theory – and its Physical Evidence


A paper by: Dipl. Ing. Matthias Krause, (CID) Cosmological Independent Department, Germany, 2009

A review of the big bang theory using circuit technique

When applying the strictly logical rules of computer science or circuit technology to check for the physical feasibility of the big bang theory, a sober inventory reveals the following results. The expressed reasons (evidence) for a big bang were initially divided into categories:

- Invention (dark energy)
- Ad hoc Assumptions (inflationary phase)
- Assumptions (heat dissipation from dust free accretion discs)
- Incorrect Calculations (dark matter)
- Ignoring of measureable facts (angular extension of early galaxies)
- Circular reasoning (composition of primordial matter)
- Misinterpretation (background radiation)
- Ignoring of uncomfortable facts

The tests were conducted with so-called AND-links commonly used in the field of circuit technology. A physical necessity is placed on each end of the AND-link and the validity is tested.



The red shifted early galaxies, for example, must expel a particular angle in an ever expanding cosmos. The particular red shift has to match the angular dimension. If a big bang occurred, the following logical relation has to be true:

The greater the red shift, the greater the angular dimension. This is founded in the timely process of the big bang model. The higher the red shift of a galaxy, the more we can see it in the earlier times of the universe. The sooner the time in an ever expanding cosmos, the smaller is the extension of space in the universe. The smaller the extension of space, the larger is the angular dimension of the observed galaxy.

This criterion alone excludes itself. The measured angular extension of early galaxies is only a tenth of the expected level, and therefore, stays in contrast to the big-bang theory. Hence, this logical link leads to a definitive NO.

The result of an AND-link is only a YES, if both ends are logical and do not violate any physical or spatial laws.

After testing all categories with the AND-link model, the big bang theory could not be proved. In fact, not a single combination of categories could provide evidence for the big bang theory. Instead, other criteria with logical exclusivity were found (for example, the pulling forces of the universe's border area cause the galaxy escape).

Result of logical Test

No evidence for the big bang theory can withstand logical scrutiny. The big bang model has turned into an easy to believe myth. However, there is no scientific evidence for it.

Addendum

What do scientists have to say about the ease of proving the big bang theory?

“According to Eric J Lerner, the mathematician Michael Ibison of Earthtech.org, and dozens of other scientists around the world, the dominance of the big bang theory is based on conventions rather than scientific methods. Therefore, they wrote this open letter, which has been published in *New Scientist* (22.-28. May, 2004, p.20).

The big bang theory is based on a large number of hypothetical entities, on things we have never observed – bloating, mysterious matter, and dark energy are the most striking examples. Without them, the observations of astronomers and predictions of the big bang theory would contradict each other. No other field of physical science would accept the constant refuge into hypothetical objects as means to close the gap between theory and observation. Eventually, serious questions about the accuracy of the underlying big bang theory have to be asked! However, the big bang theory cannot survive without these fictional factors [...]” (Mahag, 2004, para. 19ff).

What do scientists who support the big bang theory have to say?

Even they confirm with their statements that the big bang could not have happened. The scientists usually use a linguistic smoke screen to conceal the errors in their work. Instead of using the terms *error* and *physical impossibilities*, they simply say *issues*. Consequently, one obtains the impression that once the issues are resolved, the big bang is undoubtedly true. Are these *issues* really only small problems? Definitely not! They are a whole package of intractable problems. Strictly speaking, the whole big bang is a single bundle of issues, for example

- The flatness problem
- The horizon problem
- The asymmetry of matter and antimatter problem
- The monopoly problem

(visit <http://homepages.physik.uni-muenchen.de/~Otmar.Biebel/dm-seminar/GReiter-stat.pdf>)

Conclusion

In the end, it does not matter whether or not one believes in the big bang theory. Scientific facts will always contradict the big bang.

References

Mahag (2004). Die Urknall-Hypothese. Retrieved, June 9, 2010, from
<http://www.mahag.com/allg/urknall.php>