

The Big Bang – Second to None

How materialization could be considered to have appeared before the Big Bang happened.

Dec 5, 2004

Fredrick Schermer

The known facts on the Big Bang allow a different theory: not one coming out of a pea sized center, but one coming out of a large(r) area with an immaterialized center.

The Big Bang – Second to None

How materialization could be considered to have appeared before the Big Bang happened.

Everyone knows that matter in our universe is moving outwardly from one center, but when we are reading about the first moments that our universe came into being, we are reading about extrapolated facts, we are not reading about actual facts. The theory that everything came out of one center is not disputed, but when being told that everything came out of a center the size of a pea, then that is a theory that has a contender. This is a different version that can be applied to the same set of facts.

There is no evidence that our universe started from a pea; it may have been the size of a football, the size of our planet, it may have started hundred thousands of miles around and away from the 'center.' The center of the materialized area may have actually been empty. There are no facts that indisputably state the beginning of our universe either way.

Why have it all start at a center the size of a pea? It may be an easy answer, but it doesn't solve anything extra nor does it deliver less mystery than when our universe first started to appear in a larger area. Yet by having it start at the center the size of a pea, it is impossible to have a spatial segment in front of the Big Bang to which we can apply the theoretical laws of our universe. However, if materialization started in a larger area with an 'empty/immaterialized' center then we do have a spatial segment in front of materialization to which we can apply theory.

What if the outward movement was already ongoing in the immaterialized universe? Why not? In theory we are allowed this freedom as long as it fits the facts. And this fits the facts as easily as the pea-pod version. You may ask: then where did the immaterialized center come from, but you may as well ask where the pea-pod came from: different question, same answer. By creating space in front of the Big Bang we can at least use that space to theorize, while the pea-pod does not allow us to theorize.

By having the stage of materialization start after the outward movement began, we then also have a Big Bang that started after materialization took place. The materialization enabled the Big Bang — was the source of the Big Bang — while the Big Bang helped foment matter and delivered an extra push outward to the already outward movement of matter.

Let's look at the spatial — theoretical — stage before materialization. The outward movement already existed; this still means that a center spot is the point from which

the movement started. Yet instead of having materialization be the driving force of our expanding universe, we may find another reason. What is needed is a catapult to explain the outward movement. Just like a balloon under high pressure, once you put a needle in the skin all compressed molecules want one thing only: out!

But there were no molecules before materialization. What did exist? Was it something or was it nothing? This theory needs the idea that what existed before materialization had to be something, but this something also needed to be a something where nothing did not yet exist. Everything existed potentially in the *primordial* soup, but the full potential had not come out yet. The phenomenon of nothing had not come out either: this something was unified. The phenomenon of nothing — if it existed — was totally unimportant.

What is also needed is a pinned-up area of tension before materialization happened because a catapult means tension. Yet the moment of release can again be a simple one: letting go!

The phenomenon of nothing was not an active part of the primordial soup, but when it got first created at the center of the already mentioned tension, we then have our source for releasing the catapult: the creation of nothing — which in ordinary words means separation — allowed the catapult to be released. Separation comes naturally — *don't you agree* — when under high tension.

The creation of separation would have occurred at the center of our universe. Then, the catapulting primordial soup had to incorporate this phenomenon of separation and — on its way out — this delivers materialization. While the primordial soup moves outwardly the tension becomes fixed because of the now existing incorporated separation.

The next stage is that materialization gets into conflict with materialization itself: it is really difficult to incorporate separation when not everything falls in to place the same way. The Big Bang follows materialization. The extra blast of energy moves everything further apart.

Though the need of unification may be inherent to matter, the existence of unification as in a *theory of everything* may be just out of reach: separation is taking in the prime space. No other facts are required than the ones we already have to sustain this theory as much as the pea-pod theory.