

Re: The big bang theory [ The Red Shift ]

# Re: The big bang theory [ The Red Shift ]

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2005-06/msg01016.html>

---

- *From:* Ralph Hertle <[ralph.hertle@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:ralph.hertle@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 14 Jun 2005 05:09:56 GMT
- 

William:

I'll try to provide some answers to your comments.

William McHale wrote:

Ralph Hertle <[ralph.hertle@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:ralph.hertle@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Brian:

Brian Tung wrote:

Ralph Hertle wrote:

[clip]

There is another theory that better explains the RS, and, that uses all the same set of original empirical facts and identifications of proper and consequences as the Doppler-Euclid-Hubble explanation.

Re: The big bang theory [ The Red Shift ]

It has nothing at all to do with Euclid,

That's a direct lie. In science lies are not valid forms of refutation or proof. Proof is reserved for identification of the facts and logic.

The cosmological Red Shift concludes that everything, on balance, is moving away from everything else. By projecting lines from all said moving entities to an origin point, it was necessary to use the Euclidean proved concepts of the extension of a straight line, and that the ends of a line are points, for example.

Except you can't use Euclidean Geometry in the Universe.

You are changing context. I've read the thirteen books of Euclid's "Elements" at least four times, and in my writings for a future book that is based upon the geometry of the Ancient Greeks, possibly more. Euclidean geometry in the sense that Euclid wrote about geometry was entirely a matter of epistemological concepts. That is, it was concerned entirely with the ideas that are used to measure other ideas and also physical things. Euclid's geometry which was a highly edited and refined compendium of the geometrical works of prior geometers and philosophers.

A triangle is an epistemological concept, and it can exist anywhere in the realm of ideas and be demonstrated by means of logic.

Euclid's geometry did not directly identify physical existents. Ideas that do so are of a different scientific class, that of metaphysical

## Re: The big bang theory [ The Red Shift ]

concepts.

The identification of the physical Sun is a metaphysical concept. It is, it has substance, and it has properties, e.g., location and size relative to other physical objects. It is not an idea only like a physical Platonist infinity.

Switching context is a fallacy of logic that violates the Law of Non-Contradiction, that was identified by Aristotle.

You have produced a contradiction.

Euclidean geometry only applies to space that is flat;

That is totally untrue. You must have stopped reading Euclid during Book I of the "Elements". Had you continued you would have found that Books XI, XII, and XIII deal expressly with problems that require three dimensional models for demonstration, or that have concepts that can only be defined or conveniently proved in solid geometry terms. With more reading, or thinking, or both, you would have found that Euclid intended that all the concepts in geometry either are, or can be, used in a three dimensional context. E.g., a straight line may be placed in a selected three-dimensional solid location.

Not flat.

The so called "flat geometrical space" term devised by the modern mathematicians is pure contradictory anti-conceptual whitewash. The "Elements" identifies a geometry that is "solid" through and through.

Get your facts straight.

Re: The big bang theory [ The Red Shift ]

Einstein showed that the Universe is curved such that parrallel lines might converge or diverge.

Baloney.

You deny the definition of parallel lines, and Euclid provides a good one. Basically, for parallel straight lines in a two-dimensional plane all perpendiculars extended from one straight line and that touch another straight line are of equal length. The parallel lines are of equal distance from one another. He further universalizes the definition, and he includes that parallel straight lines are equidistant even in a three-dimensional solid context.

To say otherwise is to deny some basic fundamental concepts: e.g., that one straight can be equal in in length to another, or that right angles are equal to one another.

Definitions are contextual, and the contexts must be specified in order to prove the definitions.

Further Euclidean geometry only deals with space;

Thanks for agreeing with me. I never said otherwise. I gather that by "space" you mean the concept of a three-dimensional solid.

## Re: The big bang theory [ The Red Shift ]

the Big Bang theory deals with space time.

The Big Bang theory deals not just with solid geometry mathematical concepts, meaning epistemological concepts, rather it deals presumably with time. Time is the identified relationship of the specific dimensional motions of physical things in a ratio to the dimensional motions of other physical things that are considered to be standard references of motion, and the ratio is expressed a ratio of motions, distances traversed, or rotations. Any concept of time that does not rely upon or identify the motions of physical existents, or of geometrical existents that are simplified mental equivalents of same, is hokum.

[ I said ]

Try to explain the BB origin point without the use of straight lines. It cannot be done. Unless the lines to the origin point are not straight, and in that case the projection of the universe would appear to be similar to a plate of linguine - all curvy.

Or the Universe would be curved; of course there would be local deformations in the curve due to masses such as planets, stars and galaxies, but by and large they would be gentle curves in space time.

From what I have gathered, that if there were no masses, the "space" would be flat.

The "curves" represent not Platonic ideal abstractions, rather, for

## Re: The big bang theory [ The Red Shift ]

example, they are vector surfaces or contour lines of equal iso-intensities of varying radiated fluxes of physical gravitational existents that are emitted by mass entities.

since every indication shows  
that space is non-Euclidean, and yet the BB theory survives.

The term "non-Euclidean" is an anti-Euclidean terms that carries with it a specific anti-reason implication. "Non-Euclidean" is a term that denies the use of identifications, facts, and logic. Note the the same authors have been equally vehement against the metaphysics (existents, facts, properties, functionings, consequences, and cause and effect relationships of existents), and the epistemology (inductive and deductive logic, proof, validation of concepts, genus and differentia definitions, and the hierarchy of knowledge) of Aristotle.

The term non-Euclidean generally applies to geometry and has no anti-reason implication;

You got that doubly wrong. Try the idea that, The term, Euclidean, only applies to Euclid's geometry, and it decidedly has a non-contradictory

## Re: The big bang theory [ The Red Shift ]

pro-reason basis for all its conclusions.

rather it applies to any geometry that exists outside the perfect  
2 and 3 dimensional spaces that Euclidean geometry depends on.

I'll deal with your phrases in reverse order.

You say, the "2 and 3 dimensional spaces that Euclidean geometry depends on." Actually, there is no two-dimensional "space" in Euclid's geometry. He deals at length with the concepts of length, location, and straight in terms of lines. The concept of space is not used, rather the concept of a solid is used. He does use the defined terms, plane, and surface, however, that may apply in either a two or three dimensional context.

Nor are the spaces, to which you refer, "perfect". By "perfect" you bring in the concept of the Platonic (anti-)concept of perfection, and that is a concept from the ideal and non-material realm of mysticism. That is the hinge point of Platonic Mathematics. You could have differentiated the concept of "perfection" that Aristotle provides, and that meaning is the completed accomplishment of the functioning of a metaphysical or epistemological concept or principle. e.g., that the universal concept of a triangle is applicable or useful for measurement purposes at any selected place in the universe. Your ambiguity needs clarification.

You say that non-Euclidean geometry applies outside the Euclidean Geometrical spaces. But the Euclidean concepts of solids are universal, and they apply everywhere that may be selected.

The non-Euclidean give not one iota of credibility to Euclid and yet they use his concepts at every turn.

The anti-Euclidean should have opted out of their anti-Euclid rhetoric and simply said, modern mathematics, or mathematics after Newton, for example.

Re: The big bang theory [ The Red Shift ]

Your Platonism is showing.

The BB theory is untenable now that physics has proved that the cosmological Red Shift is caused by the energy reduction of photons in inelastic collisions with hydrogen molecules in cosmological space. Do the math: the universe need not be expanding to explain and demonstrate the cosmological Red Shift. Hence, the BB theory is history.

1. Physics has not proved that nearly enough energy can be reduced through inter-galactic space to produce the red-shifts that are seen.

That has not been shown. I call your bluff. Where is your evidence for that claim?

Sources that I have read, and cited on Usenet, show that hydrogen molecules can indeed lower the energy levels of photons in outer space and in the QM laboratory. I understand from a scientist friend that QM scientists have worked out the relationships, and that they are well known. In fact, it appears that the BB expansion is an untenable idea, and that the missing mass of the universe, that the anti-Euclidean could not find, can be accounted for.

2. Both Newtonian Mechanics and Relativity show that the Universe must be either expanding or contracting; it cannot exist in a state of equilibrium.

Neither of them took into account the relationship of hydrogen molecules and photon energy levels. Newton knew nothing of it, and from what I can gather, Einstein sidestepped the matter of the available empirical evidence, e.g., of Lord Rayleigh's discoveries.

Therefore since the evidence suggests that the Universe is expanding it makes sense to conclude that it does.

Both of them did not include the relevant factual information in their studies.

You could have mentioned Hubble and the discoverers of the Red Shift. Hubble eventually concluded that the BB conclusion was not a logical necessity, and that the BB expansion could not be concluded from the available information.

## Re: The big bang theory [ The Red Shift ]

The Christian Platonists wanted a non-physically existing "ideal" cause for the universe, and Plato's ideas were perfect for them. They also discarded Aristotle's, objective reality, proof, validation of concepts, and accurate scientific measurement.

Aristotle first explained that the causes for the continued existence of the plurality of existents in the universe are the existence, properties, functionings, and potentials of the existents in the universe. Aristotle said that the cause and effect relationships of the properties of things function and are conserved, and the plurality of the universe continues to exist.

What does Christian Platonists have to do with the Big Bang?

The modern Christian Platonists find the Big Bang to be a matter of convenience that is used to shore up a failed Creation theory.

Western Christianity has been firmly in the Aristotilian camp since the 12th century.

## Re: The big bang theory [ The Red Shift ]

Wow. Where did you get that news?

Christianity has never been in the Aristotelian camp. The only possible exception was Thomas Aquinas who continued to develop the translations of Aristotle's works that were being done by his mentor. Even though he popularized Aristotle's logic and started the Enlightenment and helped cause the Renaissance and Industrial Revolution, that were secular and strongly Aristotelean, he was never able to endorse Aristotle's metaphysics and dispense with faith. And didn't the Catholic church vigorously oppose the Aristotelean and secularist, Galileo? There were some so called Aristoteleans, however, to many of modern committed Aristoteleans they were so steeped in Platonic and mystical interpretations as to make them seem totally Platonic - its better that the be called neo-Platonists.

Except for Aquinas in large measure, Christianity has never been Aristotelean. There may have been some adaptations, but mostly, Aristotle has been misquoted, misinterpreted, and seriously maligned in history.

Today, there is no Aristotle in Christianity, and it is safe to say that it is all Platonic.

In either case science has rejected both in favor of scientific method.

--  
Bill

That is a total lie.

Plato has never been a basis for any science, and all known ideas of mathematics of Plato's were borrowed from prior geometers, especially, Pythagoras.

Aristotle, on the other hand, has produced the science of definitions,

## Re: The big bang theory [ The Red Shift ]

hierarchical classification of knowledge, science of inductive and deductive logic, realistic metaphysics, and refinements to the science of concept validation, correct logic, and proof that, with one or two additions by later scientists, became the scientific method. Aristotle was a primary cause of the scientific method. He was a solid base for Euclid's works. If there is any basic cause for the Industrial Revolution and scientific revolution that continues to this time, it is Aristotle's ideas. I would further add that Aristotle has been the most influential man in all of history, and more people are living on earth today due to his ideas on logic than any other person in history.

Science has by no means rejected Aristotle, and all science is based upon the universal principles that he identified.

Ralph Hertle