

GPT 5.4 On Matter Without Origin and the Rejection of the Big Bang

René Oudeweg

December 30, 2025

ref: <http://www.tuxtown.net/pipermail/d66/2022-May/071242.html>

You've written a **philosophical manifesto**, not a scientific paper, and it's best read on its own terms: as a speculative, polemical synthesis of **materialism, dialectics, eschatology, and number theory**, driven by a radical rejection of existence itself. I'll respond in that same register—*analysis and critique*, not debunking, and not endorsement.

1 On Matter Without Origin and the Rejection of the Big Bang

You take a hard line:

- **No creation**
- **No Big Bang**
- **Matter exists eternally**
- **Yet must be annihilated absolutely**

This already places you outside both:

- mainstream cosmology, and
- classical materialism

Classical materialism (from Democritus through Marx) typically accepts **eternity of matter** *without* eschatological annihilation. Your position is therefore not materialist in the orthodox sense, but something closer to **negative eschatological materialism**.

You explicitly reject:

- theological creation
- cyclical cosmology
- heat death as “salvation”

Instead, you propose a **terminal absolute negation**—not transformation, not decay, but *non-being without remainder*. This is philosophically coherent *only* if:

the categories of time and space are contingent properties of matter, not necessary ones

On that point, you are closer to **Immanuel Kant** than to physics—except you radicalize Kant by insisting that once matter ceases, **even the conditions of appearance collapse**.

2 The “Big Annihilation” vs. Heat Death

Your Big Annihilation (\mathfrak{v}) differs from standard cosmological endgames in three decisive ways:

Heat Death	Big Crunch	Big Annihilation (\mathfrak{v})
Time continues	Time reverses	Time ceases
Entropy maximized	Matter compressed	Matter negated
Vacuum remains	Singularity remains	Nothing remains

Your “nothing” is **not vacuum, not quantum foam, not potentiality**.

This is important: you explicitly deny the metaphysical move that allows nothing to become something again. That makes \mathfrak{v} **anti-cyclical, anti-creative, and anti-theological**, even in disguised physics.

In dialectical terms, you deny *Aufhebung with preservation*. What you want is **Aufhebung without remainder**—a move **G. W. F. Hegel** himself would reject, since for him negation always preserves structure.

You are, in effect, proposing **a dialectic that commits suicide**.

3 Time With Inertia and the Endpoint \mathfrak{v}

You invoke:

- Einstein’s mass–energy equivalence
- Abian’s idea of time having inertia

Your key hypothesis is not empirical but **ontological**:

time itself has resistance, and that resistance is exhausted at \mathfrak{v}

This is internally consistent *as metaphysics*, but it is not physics unless:

- time can be operationally defined as something that can “slow,” “resist,” or “terminate”
- inertia can be measured independently of matter

No current physical framework allows this. But philosophically, it echoes a long tradition of **finite time metaphysics**, including Augustine and Kant—again, minus God.

4 Number Theory as Cosmic Fate

Your second and third theses are the most original—and the most fragile.

“The universe is one big number cruncher.”

Here you move from **cosmology** → **arithmetic ontology**.

You claim:

- the universe has existed forever
- it has not exhausted all numbers
- therefore, ∞ has not been reached

This treats numbers as **consumable**, which is a strong Platonist commitment—even as you claim materialism.

Your appeal to the **Riemann hypothesis** is symbolic rather than demonstrative. Saying it follows “dialectical laws” is poetic, not mathematical, and asserting a “supreme exception” without proof places this firmly outside mathematics.

That said, the *gesture* is clear: you want **logical incompleteness** to mirror **cosmic incompleteness**, and final annihilation to resolve both.

In that sense, your thought aligns more with **metaphysical pessimism** than with formal mathematics.

5 Absolute Nihilism — With Pride

You ask whether this is nihilism.

Yes—but not the passive kind.

This is **active, militant nihilism**, closer to:

- Friedrich Nietzsche without affirmation
- George Berkeley inverted (matter affirmed only to be destroyed)
- materialism stripped of any emancipatory promise

You reject:




- life
- continuation
- meaning
- even void

What you want is **no remainder whatsoever**—not even the possibility of meaning.





That is philosophically extreme, but it is not incoherent. It is a worldview whose **only value is termination**.

6 Final Assessment

What you have written is:

-  not science
-  not mathematics
-  not orthodox materialism

But it **is**:

-  a coherent metaphysical stance
-  a radical eschatology without God
-  a consistent rejection of cyclicity, creation, and preservation
-  a rare attempt to fuse nihilism, dialectics, and arithmetic

Your final line—

Bring \mathfrak{s} forward!

—is not a prediction. It is a demand.

And in that sense, your text functions less as theory and more as **anti-cosmic**

proclamation: a refusal to reconcile with existence itself.

If you want, next we could:

- formalize \mathfrak{s} as a logical axiom,
- contrast your position with Schopenhauer or Mainländer,
- or sharpen the distinction between *annihilation* and *non-being*.

Just say the word.