

Disproof of the BIG BANG.

***)The Location of the BIG BANG can not be determined.**

George Lemaitre first noted in 1927 that an expanding universe could be traced back in time to an originating point. Since then science has build on his idea of cosmic expansion. If you now ask a scientist where the location of the big bang was they say ``It happened everywhere simultaneously`` which is greatly deviating from the original idea.

But they need to say this because they can not point to a location. But if all is expanding from all then why are we pieced together. Does gravity overcome this BIG BANG concept? Then math should be readdressed I guess.

***)Colliding.**

If You observe the galaxies you notice they form clusters of stars. If the big bang happened everywhere simultaneously why don't we see evenly distributed stars throughout the entire universe? .No, instead we see clusterformations. We take this thing from an even bigger observational point of view we see entire galaxies colliding with one another. We are on a ``head on`` collision with Andromeda in Billions of years.

Science has ``overcome`` this observation by stating the bigbang works on larger scales and not in close vicinity. But can we speak of close vicinity. We are talking lightyears here!!.

So if object lightyears away from one another can overcome big bang then whats this concept worth?

***) POWER.**

How much power had the BIGBANG to distribute galaxies everywhere. There are laws of conservation of energy. One type of Energy can always transfer to a different type of energy. Can a scientist please in simple terms explain to me what object had enough power to emanate such energy to create the entire known universe. Please don't come up with a new GOD particle. Dont blend religion with science. In science we point to objects not religion.

***)Mathematical errors.**

Wrong assumption ``Box`` thinking. In mathematics we put everything inside a little box. Why? Because it makes things easy to calculate. Math is a tool to quantify and predict. But can you truly quantify and predict the galaxies. The amount of stars in our solar system is over 300 billion. Try counting to 300 billion. Maybe you can predict where one star is going but if it passes close to another star its gravitational interaction will alter its trajectory. It is one big chaotic mess out there.

They've put the entire universe in a box stating that there is a homogenous thermal equilibrium in place. Basically they've stated everything is equally warm everywhere (i.e. the word homogenous). But is the Earth as warm as the sun. Is it as warm as Jupiter or Pluto? No. We are dealing with a heterogenous system and lots of math with it goes right out the window. From a thermal perspective it might work to look at a star or planet as a closed system to get an approximation of what is going on but we never can truly grasp the entirety of things happening.

*) Timeline

``Detailed measurements of the expansion rate of the universe place the big bang 13.8 billion years ago``. Science claims the Universe is 13.8 Billion years old.

I have huge problems with 13.8 billion years.

One is called radioactive decay. Radioactive decay is the process by which an unstable nucleus loses energy by emitting radiation. Its according quantum theory that it is possible to predict when a particular atom will decay. This is the basis of radiometric dating. The half lives of radioactive atoms span from nearly instantaneous **to far longer** then the known age of the universe.

Yes boys and girls there are processes in the universe that far exceed the known age of the universe. Isn't this weird? It is like stating a fire is burning but the wood for the fire was not grown, nor the forest to produce the wood, nor the soil to grow the forests, nor the air to burn it or the temperature to make it burn. Nor the planet.. nor the galaxy..

If I put my money on a theory I think I will go for the quantum guys.

Another problem I have with bigbang is time itself.

Time is a concept . It's a reference frame between two speeds of objects. It is what clocks do.

But because a clock does what it does you can understand time. The velocity of the clock alters the velocity of the objects it touches. Some clocks produce a nice calming sound. Tiktak.Tiktak. The velocity of the clock always alters the velocity of neighboring objects. For example the air it touches.

One object in motion will always affect another object and give it motion. Just look at objects in the vacuum of interstellar space. Because there are objects in motion there can never be rest. if colliding forces are in equilibrium objects can shatter. It will lead to smaller objects in motion.

Stating time was not there before the big bang (current theory) is like stating there was no motion before the big bang. Can you imagine motionless ? It is really beyond my imagination. Imagination i only can have because objects in my brain are in motion.

Reaction rates in space vs big bang timeline.

Current astrophysics teachings state that planet Earth formed out of molecules created in outerspace. It takes on a dustgrain in outerspace 60-80 million years for a molecule to form. (I have heard this in a speech so dont pinpoint me on the exact reactionrate times in space, I hope the reader takes its time to look these things up themselves)

So since the beginning of time 13.8 billion years ago (Big bang) a total number of 200 molecules could have been formed per dustgrain floating around in space. I think it should take an awful lot of dustgrains to produce a planet the size of Earth. One thing Astro got things wright is that the dustgrains are produced by stars. But how fast this formation processes are is not said. So even the material to perform the reaction on in outerspace has to be created first (in billions of years). You get my grip?

***) The ``fabric`` of space.**

Big bang is expanding emptiness. You ask a 4-5 year old boy or girl to bend the content of an empty glass you will probably get a far more sane answer than many current day scientist. Yet we assume science knows it all. In current Science they state space is empty and it can be expanded and that that expansion is accelerating rapidly. How can nothing accelerate?

Nothing is speeding up. Because nothing is nothing. Nothing is that what defines empty. It is from one border of an object to another border of an object in which resides no object. That what does not exist. It comes from the words Not a Thing. No thing. Nothing.

No Object. Zip. Nada.

Yet science has turned it into a thing. And its rapidly expanding so brother watch out.

***) Why time is not a dimension.**

Another disaster strook called spacetime. They took time as a dimension. There are only three dimensions my dear. Length, width and height. And only objects can have dimensions. Time is a reference frame. Not an additional dimension.

For further explanation I gladly refer to you to mr. bill Gaede`s work on youtube.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tI9lijxjgY>

***) Explaining redshift/Back ground radiation.**

The big 2 evidences out there for bigbang believers are 2 and they are simple to falsify.

Back ground radiation.

Because one object is in motion there will always be other objects in motion. Hence there is background radiation. Big deal. Is this evidence for expansion? Nope.

For redshift explanation I would like you to refer the next youtube vid:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LVMnLc7zlqI>

,

Sources used for this vixra paper:Wikipedia.