ECRONICON OPEN ACCESS

EC PSYCHOLOGY AND PSYCHIATRY
Short Communication

On "the Origin of Time"

Patrice Fitzgerald Dassonville*

Freelance Researcher, France

***Corresponding Author:** Patrice Fitzgerald Dassonville, Freelance Researcher, France.

Received: October 24, 2023; **Published:** November 16, 2023

Abstract

A review of a book titled "The Origin of Time", subtitled "The Hawking's Final Theory", which is based on a top-down cosmology.

Keywords: *Big Bang; Fate; Randomness*

The bottom-up cosmology (or ascending cosmology) consists of observing the sky from further and further away. The top-down cosmology (or descending cosmology) is the reverse by starting from the Big Bang, and even a little before, to build hypotheses.

The top-down cosmology is based on a series of unproven assertions on the following subjects: the laws of nature, the dichotomy space/time (From the Greek dikha: in two; tomos: portion), the constants of nature, the arrow of time, the beginning of time and the universe, the randomness, the cosmic intention, the universe conducive to life, and ultimately, a divine involvement.

Nota Bene: sentences between inverted commas are from the book.

The laws of nature and the universe

"The Big Bang is the origin of physical laws"; "Laws of nature"; "Laws govern the universe"; "Why laws are what they are?" [1]: Physical laws result from the observation of the universe and from the mathematical modeling. The diachrony (change with time, not because of time; from the Greek dia: through and Krônos: time) of physical laws proves that they don't exist in the universe. The appropriate expressions are laws of physics, physical laws, laws of electromagnetism, etc. Laws describe, they don't prescribe.

The dichotomy space/time

"Time should have a beginning"; "A space nucleus is the origin of time"; "Time changes into space as we approach the beginning"; "The flow of time" [1]: These contradictions and these obvious difficulties are caused by the lack of definition of the space and time. We have demonstrated that space has no materiality and that time is not a phenomenon; none have physical properties, they are both mathematical concepts [2]; the "flow of time" is a wrong metaphor, because the flow supposes that time has a speed; but the speed of time in relation to time is a sophism.

The constants of nature

“The fundamental constants of nature”; “The pre-determined constants” [1]: The constants don’t exist in the nature; they are mathematical concepts intended for completing the mathematical models. The diachrony of the constants is widely exemplified in the various proceedings published by the BPMI [3]. As an example, the speed of light is a real constant since its exact value has been decided by the BIPM in 1983. The right expression is constant of physics instead of constant of nature or constant of the universe.

The arrow of time

“There is a direction in the sequence of events”; “This arrow of time is a powerful organizing principle of the physical world” [1].

We observe the classical confusion between the events and time: an event is a phenomenon, whereas time is not a phenomenon [2]. The arrow result from a technical effect of field, whereas many events have no particular direction, when they alternate, like tides, lunations, solar alternations, sunspots, change in energy level of the electron inside the atom. We have defined the month, the day, the year and the second from alternative phenomena [2]. In addition, time is a scalar instead of a vector: use the expression “arrow of time” is really misleading. Once again, metaphors undermine science; we don’t make science with metaphors.

The beginning

“The need for a beginning” [1].

Time has no phenomenality; therefore, there is no beginning of anything. The notion of beginning is conventional. So far, there is no argument for the beginning of the universe. The Latin poet Aulus Persius) (34 CE-62) (CE: common era) sums it up brilliantly in Satires: ex nihilo nihil (from nothing, nothing comes). The universe could have always existed; it’s a possibility. We are allowed to say that its size is undefined (not infinite, which is a mathematical concept without a match in the universe).

The randomness

“The man struggling between fate and randomness’’; “By the fact of randomness”; “Chance constantly comes to play spoilsport [1].

The “fate” belongs to the field of metaphysics instead of physics. Fate and randomness are not phenomena; they are concepts. For example, during a dice game, we see the dice, not the randomness. The mistakes would be avoided thanks to a basic definition: Randomness is a concept corresponding to a stochastic event (from the Greek stokhasticos: conjectural).

The cosmic intention

“The enigma of the cosmic design”; “The great cosmic design”; “The apparent design that underlies physical reality”; “A design in favor of life”; “The enigma of the design in the mathematical landscape”; “Anthropic cosmology”; “The quantum observation introduces a form of teleology”; “The evolution to come, governed by a technological and intellectual design both on Earth and beyond” [1].

The expression, “the enigma of the design”, is repeated sixteen times. “Teleology”, from the Greek telos: goal, means: study towards a goal; Does “beyond” means the afterlife? We leave the field of physics to enter into that of metaphysics, through a wave of unverified claims.

The univers conducive to life

“Laws of physics conducive to life”; “The bio-favorable universe”; “The universe owns physical properties adapted to the appearance of life”; “The universe develops its own capacity for life” [1].

The reasoning, quite elementary, is repeated fifteen times. We know that the universe has existed for a long time without life, and it will continue to exist when life has disappeared. Contrary to this anthropocentric approach, the universe has no particular goal; a serious researcher should not forget that.

A divine involvement

“If we could find a comprehensive theory, we would know the thought of God”; “Does physics provide the divine foundations which are at work at the origin of time during the Big Bang”; “Physics is supposed to prove that divine foundations are at work”; “Everything happens as if an act of God had intervened to set our bio-favorable universe in motion” [1].

In one word, physics is supposed to prove the existence of a divine intervention for the creation of the universe and time. We are totally outside the field of physics: divine considerations should be denied.

The so-called theory of Hawking is based on a teleonomy (From the Greek nomos: law): a law towards a goal. At each step of the theory, the top-down cosmology requires to suppose, to presume, to postulate, to invent, to imagine, to believe, to fantasize, with no proof. It leads to a series of reasoning flaws, including the phenomenality of space and time, and the fake anthropic principle [4].

Such a metaphysical drift is quite astonishing in such a scientific research. The untoward preaching paves the way for the introduction of ideologies into sciences.

Bibliography

1. Hertog T. “On the Origin of Time: Stephen Hawking’s Final Theory”. Bantam Books, an imprint of Random House, a division of Penguin Random House LLC, New York (2023).
2. Dassonville P. “The Invention of Time & Space”. Springer Verlag (2017).
3. BIPM: Bureau International des Poids et Mesures. International Bureau of Weights and Measures.
4. Dassonville P. “The Anthropic Principle”. *Journal of Forensic Sciences and Criminal Investigations* (2018).

Volume 12 Issue 11 December 2023