

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R3PwcWEcvw0>

## New Hypothesis Explains How the Big Bang Possibly Never Occurred!

**Nová hypotéza vysvětluje, jak velký třesk pravděpodobně nikdy nenastal!**



[TheSimplySpace](#)

839 tis. odběratelů

24 844 zhlédnutí 23. 10. 2023

Does the James Webb Telescope finally offer us the key to the true origin of the universe? A groundbreaking hypothesis challenges the existence of the Big Bang and could revolutionize our understanding of space and time. Theories more than a century old could be collapsing before our eyes, and the universe we thought we knew is being revealed in a whole new light.

Nabízí nám teleskop Jamese Webba konečně klíč ke skutečnému původu vesmíru? **Převratná hypotéza zpochybňuje existenci velkého třesku a mohla by způsobit revoluci v našem chápání prostoru a času.** Teorie staré více než století se nám mohou hroutit před očima a vesmír, o kterém jsme si mysleli, že ho známe, se odhaluje ve zcela novém světle.

0:00

**(01)-** [Music] does the James Webb Telescope finally offer us the key to the true origin of the universe a groundbreaking hypothesis challenges the existence of the big bang and could revolutionize our understanding of space and time theory is more than a century old could be collapsing before our eyes and the universe we thought we knew is being revealed in a whole new light James web shocks science the new images of the cosmos taken by the James web Space Telescope are breathtaking star clusters quasars and Cosmic nebulae are appearing sharper and more accurately before our eyes than ever before but most astronomers and cosmologists are shocked and that concerns one particular image this innocuous looking image which shows a colorful smorgus Board of a few brightly shining stars in the foreground and many thousands of galaxies glowing red in the background has it all possibly the oldest galaxies of the universe are to be seen here can you already imagine what can be so terrible about a few old galaxies that scientists are nervous since this discovery we'll tell you these galaxies break the rules of previous physical assumptions and overthrew the cosmological worldview and the theory of the Big Bang virtually overnight too old too dense too massive and too luminous was the conclusion these galaxies can certainly not help it that they do not fit into the worldview of the astronomers they are simply what they are or were with an age of 13.5 billion years and more they existed allegedly at the beginning of time we remember now the Big Bang is supposed to have happened 13.8 billion years ago and after that there was not much for a long time if we follow previous model calculations to Star formation and Galaxy formation the first Stars appeared some hundred million years after the big bang until the first complex galaxies were born actually billions of years must have passed you might already be thinking here something is not right because these galaxies shown fixed and ready plump with stars 200 to 300 million years after the big bang but it gets better because the galaxies which got the nickname Universe Crusher show a very high degree of order and very probably they

are based on Elements which actually should not have existed at this time and in that form the scientists thought fine it's over with model calculations and theories James Webb presented the unpleasant truth to astronomers and cosmologists of this world Panic among scientists there are many surprises of which not all are always Pleasant the title of an article from the time shortly after the publication of the first measurement data begins therefore with a direct exclamation panic it's not difficult even for laymen to understand why these numerous old and brightly radiating galaxies are not compatible with the Big Bang Theory nevertheless researchers pedal argue calculate and simply don't want to admit it how in Heavens could these galaxies be explainable after all some scientists find it difficult to say goodbye to hard one theories the idea was too beautiful to know almost everything about the universe but how did the astronomers actually come to it well that is quite simple astronomers and cosmologists took the standard rules of physics which to this day are a mixture of Newtonian physics Einstein's general theory of relativity and real observations then they compare calculate infer and create equations nowadays cosmologists feed computers with the data and come up with model scenarios that are consistent with all known values and rules The Big Bang Theory came about through observations of the expanding Universe Edwin Hubble a renowned astronomer of the early 20th century made an exciting Discovery when he observed the red shift of light from distant galaxies according to the rules of science at the time it looked very much as if galaxies were moving away from each other the farther away a Galaxy was the faster it seemed to be moving away from us this was taken as the first concrete evidence that the Universe was expanding the idea that the Universe was expanding led to the logical conclusion that it must have been smaller in the past if you run time backwards you come to a point where the entire universe was concentrated in an extremely hot and dense State this point has been called The Big Bang George lamt a Belgian priest and astrophysicist came up with the idea a few years before Hubble that the Universe originated from an original primordial atom or primordial egg and then expanded in 1927 lamt published his work based on the equations of Einstein's general theory of relativity in 1931 he expanded the hypothesis to include calculations reporting an extremely hot and dense primordial soup that wafted through space immediately after the big bang LT described this initial State as a primordial atom or Cosmic egg that broke in a violent explosion marking the beginning of the universe

.....  
**(01)-** [Music] James Webb's telescope finally offers us the key to the true origin of the universe and a groundbreaking hypothesis challenges the existence of the big bang and could cause a **revolution in our understanding of the theory of space and time**, I've been lecturing on the Internet for 20 years his "revolution" about what was before the big bang, how the big bang took place and how matter was formed after the big bang. And no one responds to it...20 years !! NO ONE. (except those who suffer from the need to gratify and need to humiliate and insult).

- [http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng\\_101.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_101.pdf)
- [http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng\\_098.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_098.pdf)
- [http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng\\_097.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_097.pdf)
- [http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng\\_093.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_093.pdf)
- [http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng\\_095.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_095.pdf)
- [http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng\\_092.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_092.pdf)
- [http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng\\_094.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_094.pdf)
- [http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng\\_087.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_087.pdf)

[http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng\\_082.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_082.pdf)  
[http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng\\_079.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_079.pdf)  
[http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng\\_075.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_075.pdf)  
[http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng\\_071.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_071.pdf)  
[http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng\\_069.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_069.pdf)  
[http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng\\_059.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_059.pdf)

.....  
**Genesis →**

[http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/g/g\\_080.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/g/g_080.pdf)  
[http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng\\_009.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_009.pdf) ;  
[http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/aa/aa\\_078.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/aa/aa_078.pdf) ;  
[http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/aa/aa\\_112.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/aa/aa_112.pdf) ;  
[http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng\\_096.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_096.pdf)  
[http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/g/g\\_041.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/g/g_041.pdf)      pyramidální geneze  
[http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/g/g\\_049.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/g/g_049.pdf)      genesis of compounding

is over a hundred years old **could be crumbling before our eyes** and the universe we thought we knew is being revealed in a whole new light. James Webb shocks science new images of the universe taken by the James Webb Space Telescope are breathtaking star clusters, quasars and cosmic nebulae appear sharper and more precisely before our eyes than ever before, but most astronomers and cosmologists are shocked, and this is about one particular image, this harmless looking image that shows a colorful smorgasbord of a few bright stars in the foreground and many thousands of galaxies glowing red in the background it all has possibly the oldest galaxies in the universe seen here, you can already imagine what might be on a few old galaxies so terrible that scientists are nervous about this discovery, we will tell you that these galaxies violate the rules of previous physical assumptions and overthrew the cosmological worldview and the big bang theory practically overnight too old too dense too massive and too luminous was the conclusion that **these galaxies definitely cannot for the fact that they do not fit into the world view of astronomers, they are simply as they are or were 13.5 billion years old and more, they supposedly existed at the beginning of time,** now we remember that the Big Bang should have happened 13.8 billion years ago and after that a long time it wasn't much, **if we follow the previous model, the Hubble linear expansion model...**, but the space-time immediately after the bang was extremely curved, a foam of dimensions. It began to expand gradually, but to expand (!) then the distance "on an arc" is different from "on a straight line". Here is a failed hint of the curvature [http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c\\_239.jpg](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_239.jpg) . Therefore, astronomers evaluated the age (and the distance from the bang) according to the linear Hubble differently than they had according to the model, where the **distance in an arc** is. Before the horizon of observability, the curvature of space-time is already so great that the quasar shows a very large redshift..., the age is also different, the 13.8 billion years will be correct in reality 14.24 billion years. (14.24 minus 13.8 = 420 million years there is extra). And so the galaxies had a little more time to form after all. **Calculations** to the formation of stars and the formation of galaxies the first stars appeared about a hundred million years after the big bang until the first complex galaxies were born, in fact billions of years must have passed, you may already be thinking that something is wrong because these galaxies are shown firmly and ready **chubby with stars 200 to 300 million years after the big bang** but it's better because the galaxies nicknamed the Universe Crusher show a very high degree of order and are very likely based on elements that would actually have they were not supposed to exist and in this form the scientists thought well that **there is an end to**

model calculations according to Hubble and theories. It's the new HDV. James Webb presented the astronomers and cosmologists of this world with an unpleasant truth. The truth that titled physicists are puffballs who won't read some riddles and phantasmagoria of some layman. HDV is unfinished, it has a lot of bugs and flaws... but all physicists have to help to remove it. Panic among scientists there are many surprises, not all of them always pleasant. The title of the article from the time shortly after the publication of the first measured data therefore begins with a direct exclamatory panic, it is not difficult even for laymen to understand why these numerous old and brightly shining galaxies are not compatible with the big bang theory, however, researchers argue the pedal to calculate and simply do not want admit how in the heavens could these galaxies be explainable, after all, some scientists find it hard to say goodbye to hard theories, the idea was too beautiful to know almost everything about the universe, but how astronomers actually came to it, it's pretty good simple astronomers and cosmologists took the standard rules of physics which are still today a mixture of Newtonian physics, Einstein's general relativity and actual observations, then they compare, calculate and create equations, nowadays cosmologists feed data to computers and come up with model scenarios that are in accordance with all known values and rules. The big bang theory arose from Edwin Hubble's observations of the expanding universe, and here is the error. Hubble is linear up to the big-bang, but space-time in the early universe is massively curved, and unfolds... [http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c\\_032.gif](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_032.gif) ; [http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c\\_240.jpg](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_240.jpg) this is conclusive evidence of the post-big bang ultracurved plasma unwrapping into a state of "local dimensional curvatures". Space-time simultaneously expands and collapses. The packaging takes place in the boiling plasma, where elementary particles are born, and subsequently on the scales  $10^{-27}\text{m} - 10^{-33}\text{m}$ , interactions = dynamic changes in the curvature of dimensions are realized. Linearity already applies here. In the macrocosm not... a renowned astronomer in the early 20th century, made an exciting discovery when he observed the red shift of light from distant galaxies according to the rules of science at the time looked very much like galaxies were moving away from each other, the further away a galaxy was, the faster it appeared to be moving away from us, it was considered the first concrete evidence that the universe is expanding the idea that the Universe was expanding, leading to the logical conclusion that it must have been smaller in the past if you run backwards in time, you get to a point where the entire universe was concentrated in an extremely hot and dense state, yes, but dense was space-time (the universe) and dense was the curvature of dimensions (the universe) this point is called the Big a bang. **George Lemaitre** a Belgian priest and astrophysicist came up with the idea a few years before Hubble that the universe originated from an original primordial atom or primordial egg and then expanded in 1927. **Lemaitre** published his work based on the equations of Einstein's general theory of relativity in 1931. And soon the whole world community of physicists and astronomers was reading it !!! Expanding the hypothesis to include calculations indicating an extremely hot and dense primordial soup that flowed through the universe immediately after the big bang, LT described this initial state as a primordial atom or cosmic egg that shattered in the violent explosion marking the beginning of the universe..

.....

**(02)-** initially Albert Einstein was skeptical of It's idea of an expanding Universe Einstein believed in a static Universe however after more and more evidence of the expansion of the universe was found especially by Hubble's observations Einstein finally accepted It's Theory and abandoned his own idea of a static Universe Einstein had originally introduced a

cosmological constant into his equations to support a static Universe after the expansion of the universe was accepted Einstein referred to this constant as his biggest mistake interestingly LT argued that this constant could have a real physical meaning and in modern cosmology the idea of a cosmological constant in the form of dark energy has regained importance The Big Bang Theory was later supported by other observations such as the Apparently also expanding cosmic background radiation but it never quite made the sense that we humans so desperately seek what was before where does the universe develop and why did all this come into being none of the astrophysicists and cosmologists could explain these question so far what would you say if I claim that all these calculations and equations have always been a bit thin because there were just as many theories which assumed something completely different if these scientists had been right the cosmological worldview would look possibly completely different let's take Fritz swii for example the Swiss American interpreted the red shift of Light which goes out from very old objects in the universe completely differently he saw in the shift of light frequency into the the reddish no indication that galaxies move away from us zwicki recognized a fatigue of light during its long journey through space there are meanwhile just as many observations which speak against the expansion of the universe only these are still measured at the yard stick of the old rules and theories but this could be at an end now the impossible galaxies Big Bang theorists have known for years that images from the Hubble Space Telescope already point to the existence of very unusually old and well-developed galaxies the Galaxy gnz11 spotted by Hubble had an age of 13.4 billion years remember we talked earlier in the video about galaxies taking billions of years to evolve but 13.4 billion years is only 400 million years from the supposed Big Bang well gnz11 could have been an outlier or the first real Galaxy the pictures of Hubble were also not quite as good as those of James Webb gnz11 is also very small and it could have been one of these mini galaxies which by merging with other small galaxies produced even larger formations nevertheless the development was actually foreseeable only no astronomer had really reckoned with the surprise and shock the new Space Telescope delivered James web made things much worse at least for those who want to continue to hold on to Old theories James web saw galaxies as large bright and existing as smooth discs and perfect spiral shapes long before gnz11 the article mentions that researchers discovered about 10 times more smooth spiral galaxies than researchers would have expected at the beginning of Galaxy formation this evidence not only challenges the big bang and theories of the evolution of first stars but also completely destroys the merger theory is the Big Bang still tenable does the existence of these galaxies now prove that that the Big Bang did not happen at all possibly we don't know yet the discoveries have been studied for months now but researchers may need years to get to the bottom of the mystery of galaxies and the cosmos the Big Bang is the idea that our universe was initially a hot dense and uniform Point particles flew around freely and it was far too hot for bonds and matter to form as it expanded the primordial soup is said to have cooled the first molecules were formed gas dust and finally the elementary forces of nature appeared electromagnetism radiations and the gravitation formed with time and all that we can see today in the cosmos stars planets moons black holes and much more until now the theories made sense along with most of these observations but not anymore rendra Gupta is a Canadian Indian researcher who presented a study that brings the theory of the Big Bang together with the observations of the impossible galaxies after all only then the universe is at least 27 or even 40 billion years old and a few changes would have to be made to cosmological constants and the interpretation of red shift so that everything is red again but then will we have the truth well no we would have a new theory that might be valid until real

observations find otherwise with the shock In classical science Quantum theorists are now stepping forward particle scientists have long said that the Big Bang is a idea and that the Multiverse is much more likely according to this the Big Bang may not have been the absolute beginning of everything that exists but it could be the origin of our universe and that could be in a larger universe or have many neighboring universes the idea that the universe is neither temporarily or spatially limited is also not yet completely off the table fact is that we have found at present still no single reference to a spatial end we meanwhile survey more than 93 billion light years of seemingly endless universe and now we look back 13.5 billion years into the past and find as it looks also no clear end if you love exciting videos like this about astronomy and science then subscribe to our Channel now and press the like

11:19

Button

---

**(02)-** at first Albert Einstein was skeptical of his idea of an expanding universe, Einstein believed in a static universe, but after more and more evidence of the expansion of the universe was found, especially through Hubble observations, Einstein finally accepted his theory and abandoned his own idea of a static universe. Einstein originally introduced the cosmological constant into his equations to support a static universe after the expansion of the universe was accepted. In modern cosmology, the idea of a cosmological constant >in the form of dark energy< has regained importance. **Again in line with HDV... because according to this model "dimensional warping" is matter-forming ! The boiling vacuum on the Planck scales of  $10^{-40}$  m is "full of energy", and better said: the boiling dimensions on these scales are directly energy. How else when every warping of dimensions is matter-forming and energy is another form of matter.** The big bang theory was later supported by other observations such as Apparently also the expanding cosmic background radiation **but it never made sense that we humans so desperately we are looking for what was before, where the universe is evolving and why it all came to be, HDV explains it beautifully and logically : Before the big bang there was a state of flat 3+3D spacetime. If it is flat - non-curved, there is neither matter nor energy in it, and logically, time does not run there and expansion does not take place. Then came the "change of state" - a sudden (!) big-bang jump, and the previous flat state shifted to a state with extreme curvature of dimensions. This subsequently triggered not only the flow-flow of time, but also the gradual unfolding of curvatures on the macro-level, but also the packing of dimensions in this boiling foam into (relatively simple) "packages" that became elementary particles of matter. (only three particles were enough for the baryon mass, right (!), quark U, D, and lepton electron). In the end, about 25 elemental packages (from tangled dimensions) were born for all matter and the construction of fields, four basic forces. So even the strings = packed "twins" are almost identical to the packages in HDV. In HDV there are packs "from dimensions"; In string theory, bundles are "out of nothing".** **None of the astrophysicists and cosmologists have been able to explain this question yet, because they haven't read HDV...** what would you say if I said that all these calculations and equations were always a bit thin because they existed as well as many theories that assumed something completely else, if these scientists were right, the cosmological worldview would look maybe completely different, take for example **\*Fritz Zwicky\***, the Swiss-American interpreted the red shift of light that comes from very old objects in space completely differently. He saw in the redshift of the light frequency no indication that the galaxies were moving away from us, **Zwicky** recognized the fatigue of light during its long journey through

space, meanwhile there are just so many observations that speak against the expansion of the universe, only they are still measured per meter old rules and theories, but that could now be the end impossible galaxies that big bang theorists have known for years Hubble Space Telescope images already show the existence of very unusually old and well-developed galaxies galaxy gnz11 seen by Hubble was 13.4 billion years old years, remember earlier in the video we talked about galaxies evolving over billions of years, but 13.4 billion years is only 400 million years since the supposed big bang well, gnz11 might have been an outlier or the first real galaxy the hbl images weren't either as good as James Webb's images gnz11 is also very small and could have been one of these mini galaxies that merged with other small galaxies to form even larger formations, however the development was actually predictable, only no astronomer really anticipated the surprise and shock, which the new space telescope brought. James web has made things much worse, at least for those who want to continue to cling to the old theories. james web saw galaxies as large bright and existing as smooth disks and perfect spiral shapes long before the gnz11 article mentions that researchers discovered about 10 times smoother spiral galaxies than researchers would have expected at the beginning of galaxy formation, this evidence not only casts doubt on the big bang HDV : the big bang was not just one (!). Singularities, billions of singularities are all around us. In the microworld on the scales of  $10^{-44}$  m, in the boiling vacuum, there is an emergence from 3+3D, a space-time with a curvature of dimensions is "born". The same could have been the case with the "classic recognized Bang", which originated in an infinite flat 3+3D space-time as a "locality" with curved dimensions, as a final locality, or billions of final localities (n- big-bangs) ... ; in the entire infinite flat 3+3D space-time, n-number of locations with crooked dimensions were created... even today they are all around us..., emerging everywhere and unfolding. Today, elementary particles are no longer born in stormy style, only pairs of particles that instantly annihilate... and the theory of the evolution of the first stars, but also completely destroys the merger theory is that the big bang is still tenable, the existence of these galaxies now proves that to the big bang didn't happen at all, or there were n-billion big bangs "in a huge locality" of the previous flat spacetime... we may not know yet, the discoveries have been studied for months, but it may take years for researchers to get there. The basis of the mystery of galaxies and the Big Bang universe is the idea that our universe was initially hot, dense and uniform, so as I say in HDV the idea that it was flat 3+3D and "in it, by leap" the "great locality" was born our universe with crooked dimensions. Etc. Point particles that flew around freely and was too hot for bonds and matter to form as it expanded the primordial soup. It is said that they have cooled The "cooling phenomenon" is not entirely clear to me...

the first molecules became gaseous dust and finally the elemental forces of nature appeared, the radiation of electromagnetism and gravity formed with time and everything we can see today in the universe stars planets moons black holes and much more. The theories made so far make sense along with most of these observations, but no longer \*Rendra Gupta\* is a Canadian Indian researcher who presented a study, when ? and where ? which combines the big bang theory with the observation of impossible galaxies, after all, only then is the universe at least 27 or even 40 billion years old, and it would be necessary to >make a few changes in the cosmological constants and redshift interpretation, yeah... to make everything red again, but then we'll be right well no, we'd have a new theory, HDV, that might hold true until actual observations prove otherwise with a shock. In classical science now quantum theorists are moving forward, particle scientists have long been saying that the Big Bang is an idea and that a Multiverse is much more likely, ??? i don't believe A multiverse would bring a lot of trouble

and questions and "supernatural" phenomena... that the big bang wasn't. The absolute beginning of all that exists, but it could be the origin of our universe and could be in a larger universe or have many neighboring universes. Having neighboring universes is a worse vision, a worse speculation than having a HDV, i.e. a two-dimensional universe, infinite, etc., where "inside" the finite Locality = our genetic Universe in the most diverse evolutionary creation is "born". currently we are still haven't found a single link you're lying, you didn't look for it! to the spatial end, meanwhile we explore over 93 billion light years of seemingly endless space and now look back 13.5 billion years into the past and find out what it looks like, no clear end either, if you love exciting similar astronomy and science videos please subscribe to our channel and hit like  
11:19 a.m. button

JN, 28/10/2023

.....