Gravity and the creation of the Universe

By : MichaelS76

I explore concepts of gravity, string theory, the big bang and my own theory of how the universe began and will continue to recycle itself.

Published on
Booksie

booksie.com/MichaelS76

Copyright © MichaelS76, 2015
Publish your writing on Booksie.com.

Gravity and the creation of the Universe

Today I have been thinking a lot, with something very heavy on my mind, gravity and the cosmos. I have been reading for quite some time that scientist are finding more and more that at the center of many many galaxies are black holes. I wonder if the creation of galaxies depends on black holes. At the beginning of the Big whatever you want to call it, when the two membranes of two different dimensions touched an enormous amount of energy was released in the form of heat, gas and abundant hydrogen filled the early cosmos. Galactic winds and the shock wave of the explosion formed the early stars, which in some cases stars became incredibly dense and formed black holes, thus collecting additional debris, dust, particles, elements from surrounding space and eventually forming galaxies. Black holes also must have something to do with the rotation of the galaxy at the event horizon, making the galaxy turn in a counter clockwise direction, instead of a clockwise direction. Of course spin is based on an observation point; anything can be seen as spinning from a certain vantage point. Most physicists say that gravity is a very weak force. For instance you can pick up an object like an apple that the entire earthâ s gravity is holding back. Well, if gravity is actually emanating from the neutrons of the atoms and atoms are generally nothing but empty space, would one not theorize that the gravity of even a relatively large object is small, compared to a neutron star, which is packed full of neutrons and has a gravity and mass that is so large that a teaspoon full of neutron star material would weigh as much as the pyramid of Giza. There is also another observation about gravity that I have taken into consideration and this is mere observation. The gravitational force on earth is said to be approximately 9.0666 m/s, but a new mapping of the Earthâ s magnetic field shows a great variance, especially in areas of lower density such as the oceans. So hypothetically a ball of rubber and a ball of lead dropped on a sailing vessel would both fall at the same rate and hit the deck at the same time but at a slightly slower speed then say in Paris off the Eiffel tower. There are also the planets of our solar system to consider. A man on Earth who weighs 150 pounds, lucky for him, would weigh a mere 9.3 pounds on poor Pluto, the has been planet. But if you were to be able to withstand the immense atmospheric pressures of Jupiter and descend to its surface you would weigh a whopping 354 pounds. Objects of heavier mass, whose neutrons are closer together, emit more gravity. A solidâ s atoms are at relative rest and spread apart relatively evenly. A liquidâ s atoms are moving more so and therefore the neutrons are in closer approximation of each other more often, then a gas the atoms are in rapid motion and the neutrons are in closer approximation even more then the liquid. So would a ball of gas have a larger effect on gravity then a ball that was solid? For instance the Sun is made of gas, but it is also incredible hot, it has an immense amount of gravity and effect on the fabric of space which Einstein said influences gravity, compared to the planets that are solid and have less influence on the fabric of space and less gravitational influence. But the other gravitational giant of our solar system is Jupiter which is made mostly of gas, so it would make sense that gravity has something to do with the neutrons and not an imaginary force or particle. If we were to assume this to be true and that gravity emanated from the neutron, not some imaginary particle so called the graviton, then the universe would make more sense. Unfortunately scientific observation does not always agree with the math and Physicist believe heavily that math is the language of the universe. Well, it is to us, but to an alien civilization their concepts of math or even a number may or may not even exists. They may have a completely different way of expressing the same thing, or perhaps they have gotten it right and express it as it really is. If our math does not work, has not worked, and hasnâ t for hundreds of years regarding celestial bodies then our math must be wrong about the cosmos as well. I think that is where new and bold concepts come to play such as M theory or brane theory, dark matter, multi universes, dark energy, and inflation. But considering the mind boggling math of M theory alone there is a fundamental idea in mathematics itself that troubles me. That is the word and concept of infinity. I cannot conceive of any natural occurrences of infinity, not on Earth, in our solar system, galaxy, globular cluster, home group or Cosmos itself. Everything has a finite number; even the life of an atom has a number. That number depends on the protons of the atom, carbon 15 only last 2.5 seconds after its creation. But other atoms with a stable number of protons and electrons last a long long time but nowhere near infinity. The proton is believed to have a half-life of approximately 1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 years. This

seems to be an eternity to us, since our species will be long long long gone, not to mention our planet, sun and even galaxy, but again there is no infinity. The current theory of how our universe came into being is not even infinitely long. The first hypothesis which is also the current accepted theory that the universe was infinitely small and then for whatever reason unknown to man it exploded, expanding rapidly into pretty much itâ s form today. But there are major problems with this theory. It does explain expansion and may even hint to eventual contraction, but it does nothing to explain why and before. That is where religion comes in to fill in the gaps for most people due to the lack of scientific knowledge with the idea that God commanded the bang and created the universe. But if you take that one step further then you have to ask, who created God? And then there is an infinite progression of who created who and so on, so the answer may as well be that God or the Cosmos has always existed. I am not debating the idea that God created the universe since I was not around to see it and since I have no special knowledge otherwise so itâ s just as valid today as any other theory with some exceptions. A more current hypothesis is that two separate universes in the form of flat branes, touched, producing an enormous amount of energy in the form of heat that expanded and cooled, going from very, very small and very, very hot, to the size and temperature of our current universe. Now if the model relies on one membrane being completely devoid of substance before the collision and the other membrane similar to the cosmos we know of today then that raises a question similar to the big bang theory, what was the cosmos like before the two branes collided. Was one membrane always full and the other always empty, a sort of never ending balancing act where the two branes want to be in a form of equilibrium or sort of homeostasis? My own theory is that the branes are actually one, and since space time is also a fabric, it can be wrinkled or even twisted upon itself. When this happens huge fluctuations in gravity at the point where the universe is now no longer expanding but contracting and black holes are more abundant then the once were stars, the fabric of space folds upon itself and when two of its surfaces collide, the result is the release of an enormous amount of energy inside that brane. Einstein himself said that gravity is nothing more than the bending of space and time due to its influence on the fabric of space or in other words the fabric of space could be considered a membrane or brane. After the folding of the brane and the release of energy, the energy flattens out the brane back into its original shape which would be similar to how the big bang spread material out evenly. After the brane has been reshaped into a flat brane and spread back out, the point in which the energy was released now spreads outwards, not in a nice concentric circle but outwards filling the empty void of the brane, then our universe as we know it today comes into existence. Slowly over time, the amount of energy in the universe reaches a critical phase where the expansion which on a cosmic scale was instantaneous but on a human scale took an infinity long time, now contracts due to the slowing of particles and the increase in gravity at the Cosmosâ s center where the abundance of remaining black holes exists. These black holes form a super-giant black hole with a super singularity at its center and with nothing to support the branes surface from beyond the center of the super-giant black hole, the brane crumples or folds upon itself and then the cycle repeats itself over and over again. This cycle would be a continuing cycle of bangs and deaths, but for how long. The brane may even take the shape of the singularity or black hole momentarily, which is why some scientist agree the universe is shaped like a flatten horn stretched out into a long funnel, flaring into a bell-like shape at one end. The thin end would be infinitely long but finite. I do not know if this is true but it does have a similar shape to a black hole. If the membrane was momentarily crumpled into the shape of a black hole caused by an immensely large singularity then the explosion would result in the flattening of the brane, so why do our current scientific observations show the brane or universe to be horn shaped now and not round, or uniform in shape as it would after a birth of the cosmos? The only logical answer is that we are close to another annihilation and rebirth. Well, if we do not invite religion into the equation and only use our understanding of the Cosmos as we know it today, then we can skip creation completely and say that the universe has always been here. That the cosmos really is all there was, all there is and all there ever shall be. Now, if I believe in such a theory, which is my own theory of how the universe came into existence then I would have to believe in Infinity, but not necessarily mathematically, since we can only write the representation of infinity on any indelible surface or even our minds and not infinity as far as the Cosmos is concerned, because human and cosmological time are completely different and not comparable at all. Therefor infinity is more of reality in the minds of humans then it is in the mind of the Cosmos. It might be why Einsteinâ s theory of relativity works extremely well on the very small scale of atoms, but not the

extremely large scale of the cosmos. The two are not the same and have different expressions due to their different interpretations from the human perspective to the cosmic perspective, or Godâ s perspective if you believe in creation as the means in which the cosmos came into being. Space is not just emptiness but has its own unique reality, unlike our own, Einstein even mentioned that himself. Big Bang, Creation, Inflation, Cyclic Universe, String theory, and M theory it all boils down to one word, theory. The true answer lies within the Cosmos and we cannot unlock that door with our human minds but perhaps with our soul and the transference of our collective being to the next dimension when we physically die. Perhaps then all the questions and all the answers will be known, then again thatâ s just a theory!

Created from Booksie.com

Generated: 2015-05-05 12:21:08