

Dark Matter is Nonsense

The theories that space contains *dark matter*, un-measurable matter which is supposed to exist in space, and that gravity can create the universe, are highly misleading. This article explains why they are logically and scientifically erroneous.

To start, let us assert that the purpose of science is to provide evidence of the nature of the universe. The beneficial and constructive outcome would be to increase the sum of knowledge to benefit all human beings and all other inter-dependent life, plus the necessary environmental conditions, for a sustainable, symbiotic future. Anything else would be meaningless, both for human beings and for any real or ultimate purpose, in using a scientific method to increase predictability and knowledge. But first maybe we need to clear a common misunderstanding. *Understanding underpins knowledge, but is not knowledge itself.*

The first admission of this is that any thought based on assumption must be based on a lack of knowledge. We might gain understanding by creating assumptions that can then be scientifically tested but, until they are, the theory might become a basis for understanding but it cannot be asserted as knowledge. For example, technology, the science of human know-how, might theorise and share that chipping a flint with a hard rock could create a good cutting edge, but until the theory becomes knowledge by the fact that its purpose is fulfilled, it remains as understanding until it becomes known. Some would argue that knowledge is based on critical mass of acceptance. We could also assert, based on the same numerical argument, that a million lemmings cannot be wrong.

The second admission that understanding is incomplete is that words cannot conclude ultimate understanding or knowledge. This was proven by Wittgenstein in his groundbreaking work, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. Some would argue that philosophy, love of knowledge and wisdom, is not science. However, this is also illogical since philosophical system spawned scientific method and logical method in particular.

A final refutation could be that this is all a circular argument, but the only thing you can say about a circular argument is that it is not linear. This proves Wittgenstein's point. In other words, understanding can only be a path to knowledge based on assumptions. If understanding is incomplete, it cannot be asserted as knowledge. Multiple assumptions, or assumptions built upon assumptions, are likely to increase the error.

However, the underpinning structures within science can also lead to false theorems that claim to be universal. For example, scientific research is necessarily a study of a bounded system of interest. Any observation of a system is bounded, since a system is a bounded group of observable components that are not whole in their behaviour until the impact of their environment is included. Scientific method is therefore reductionist method. Reductionism based on a subset cannot encapsulate the entire performance of the system, which must be part of the universe or of the universe as an infinite. A bounded system, by the simple act of defining it, cannot therefore measure or explain the whole.

Also, observation is limited by the perspective that is given from any point of observation, plus the point of measurement used to measure changes in behaviour will impact the observation. For example, have you ever wondered why an aeroplane seems to be going

slower the further away it flies after take-off and yet we know it is accelerating? The obvious reason is that limited perspective creates illusion. If the universe is expanding what lies beyond it? Apply this to the universe at large and we can see the problem, i.e. what can possibly be beyond space? No human mind can explain it within the theory of Big Bang or by gravity creating the universe, so you see my point.

Human observation is limited by a bounded perspective, both the physical and conceptual senses, plus a limited observation point within the solar system. Measuring the universe, the conceptual infinite, is therefore impossible. A simple analogy might be that you cannot measure the length of a needle from two places on its point. Therefore, at best, scientific theories can only observe a subset of the nature of universal reality and cannot explain it as a whole.

For example, physics is the study of observable energy patterns in nature, but we also know that these patterns do not necessarily hold at all levels of system. For example, a Grand Unifying Theory has not been given to unite quantum mechanics with the theory of relativity *without multiple layers of assumption*. Patterns in physics do appear to reliably work at different levels of bounded system, however even this is not consistent, for example the observation of energy as waves and/or point particles.

Add the branch or level of science known as chemistry, and we can observe that the same energy collaborates to form new structures, the elemental nature of atoms collaborating to form molecules. On top of this, biology teaches that molecules collaborate to form organic structures through DNA strands. We also know that the Earth and explorable space is made from the same atomic structure. Therefore logically all observable organic and inorganic matter is made from the same energy working at different levels of form. However, the behaviour of each defined system is unique and dependent upon its' observable components. In other words, energy collaborates to create form or matter, but at different levels of system that are uniquely observable but cannot explain everything *or the whole*, which is the universe.

There is another interesting observation. Erwin Schrodinger has stated that the atomic weight of the human body is the same as air. If that is the case then why do human bodies not 'float' in the atmosphere? The reason is simply that the very same attractive energy within the Earth and the human body binds them. Some call this gravity. Some call it the Law of Attraction. The universe is made from the same observable energy, so all diverse matter and form within the universe is bound and interacts in the same way, including planetary bodies, stars and the energy of light.

The universe literally means everything, including space. The universe is therefore both infinite and infinitesimal. Therefore there can be no logical concept of multiple 'universes'. They cannot by definition be defined, simply because there is no human thought concept to define them. The word definitions would be a contradiction, and therefore false. The best we have are mathematical symbols, tautologies with multiple and unverifiable assumptions trying to describe the mentally unknowable.

Now we come to the crux of the problem: Big Bang theory, the underlying basis of the misleading and erroneous dark matter theory. The Big Bang theory has so many levels of assumption that it cannot be logically reliable. Human Beings are a speck in the universe,

even smaller than one observation point on the pinpoint of a needle. The assumption that there are also multiple 'universes' is also a contradiction and therefore nonsense.

So what is the proposal?

The logical conclusion is that what human beings have observed is 'A Big Bang' and not 'The Big Bang', a creation or recycling of energy within infinitesimal and infinite space.

Energy creates form, so what is the purpose of space? The answer to this is relatively simple. Energy is observably dynamic, never still. Energy moves within space, at both cosmological and quantum levels, creating form by attraction or collaboration of other energy. Gravity is nothing more than a localised observation of attractive energy. Without the dimensionality of infinite and infinitesimal space, energy cannot logically exist as dynamic form.

Which leads to the question why anyone would want to assert, based on the multiple assumptions of Big Bang theory, that the space in space consists of dark matter, or that there are multiple 'universes'.

Firstly, such theories, of no direct benefit to Earth, surely cannot help the constructive and benevolent reputation of science when our planet is in such an immediate mess and there is so much suffering within it. Secondly, I for one would not support any scarce resources being spent on funding or finding universal solutions outside our sustainable environment to enable a move to another planet to enable human beings to do it again, if that is indeed the unstated purpose of this science.

If I am alone in this, then I question the very purpose and morality of science within the realm of understanding and knowledge that is meant to benefit human beings whose survival is in the very balance.

Maybe that is a question everyone should ask.

Stephen Ridley has a Masters degree in Technology Management, is a Fellow of the RSA, and a founder of The One Project (www.The-One-Project.net)