

Before the Big Bang? – Paper I

On re-reading an old article in New Scientist (No. 2601) entitled *The Universe Before Ours*, I remembered why it had dropped so completely out of the reckoning for what is a central part of my current research. For while seeming to disagree with the consensus, the author of the article (as, I must admit, is usual these days) had searched around for a series of what I would call “safe alternatives”. That is, theories that initially seemed to be addressing the significant unanswered questions posed by the Standard Model of the Big Bang, without, in any way, abandoning the usual approach and all its assumptions. But, I should have known better that to expect anything else.

It is now a classic ploy to make a big noise about *revolutionary new positions* while ending up saying basically the same sort of things as the supposed targets of criticism - at least in the important areas of standpoint and method. I always remember the quite famous book, *The Art of Motorcycle Maintenance* by Pirsig, which was supposed to be very revolutionary, and though it was a great book, and set me initially on my writing career, it still ended up in the same Positivist camp as everybody else (merely wearing a different coloured jacket).

This article was of a similar ilk in its relationship to the standard Model of the Big Bang.

Though it put forward two or three alternative pre-Big Bang scenarios, all were just as impossible as the main model, and used identical methods of development – those of **maths-led speculation!**

We were offered a Multiple Black Hole merged-Birth, a collision of Membranes (out of a development of String Theory) and a broken off fragment of another earlier Universe, which then developed into our little Effort.

My contention is that all of these (even the more interesting last contribution) accept the maths-led speculation that currently dominates Modern Cosmology. The same idealist speculations that have dominated these and related areas for many decades..

How to be a Conservative Revolutionary would seem to be the credo of these armchair creators of “wonder and imagination”. Notice also that they all imply, yet avoid addressing *The-Chicken-and-the-Egg* infinite regression problem, in that they don’t EXPLAIN the pre-Big Bang situations own origins.

It always amazes me when the answer to the Origin of Life on Earth is purported to be solved with “It must have arrived on a meteorite”, so that the question becomes, “Yes but, how did it get there?”

Surely, it has to be admitted that this latter question is much more difficult to address than the original one of Life starting from scratch on the Earth. The possibilities for variation are infinitely more on the Earth near the Sun, than on a tiny lump of rock & ice isolated in the middle of space – limited minerals, very cold, little or no water - indeed, certainly NO conducive circumstances at all!

And the Big Bang precursor scenarios outlined in this article have similar damning weaknesses!

To *ever* answer the question, “What preceded the Big Bang?”, we should never start up to our necks in the mire of speculative, maths-led theory. For if you do, you will only end up with yet another Parallel Universe, Magic Membrane or other such twaddle.

There is *surely* only one place to start – **Known and clearly edisting Galactic Explosions! Where Else?**

Now, I am not saying that the Big Bang was merely one of these, but I am saying that studying them is the place to start - Novae and Supernovae as really-occurring explosions, and Black Holes and Super Black Holes as really-occurring Sinks

But, notice that the mention of these areas **does not** terminate the discussion. It initiates it!

Studying these will give us some sort of a handle on what they are like and what our Giant case might involve.

Questions like,

“Is the Big Bang an explosion?”,

“If it is, what form does it take?”.

“What would the prior circumstances be like?”,

“What could cause the Cataclysm?”,

and other similar ones are certainly paramount.

To be continued

(683 words)