

Re: Evolution is really sun worship

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro/2004-08/1393.html>

From: C Lund (*clund_at_notam02SPAMBLOCK.no*)

Date: 08/16/04

Date: Mon, 16 Aug 2004 09:02:48 +0200

In article <timberwoof-8A966C.13485415082004@typhoon.sonic.net>, Timberwoof <timberwoof@stimpberawoofm.com> wrote:
> In article <clund-33705C.10242715082004@amstwist00.chello.com>,
> C Lund <clund@notam02SPAMBLOCK.no> wrote:

(BIG snip)

> > *Mind you, I'm not even saying the big bang theory is wrong; I'm saying*
> > *it's just one more plausible theory among other more or less plausible*
> > *theories. Maybe the universe was created in a Big Bang. Maybe the*
> > *universe has always existed and will always exist. Maybe it's a matter*
> > *of local Big Bangs in an eternal universe. I don't know.*

> *Oh. For a moment there it seemed as though you were trying to come up*
> *with all sorts of alternative explanations for observed phenomena as*
> *though the Big Bang and expanding universe were not how things were.*

Nope. Just stating that the Big Bang isn't the fundamental truth many think it is. B)

> *Tell me something ... if there's a universal electron cloud dense enough*
> *to causes all that Compton-effect redshift, can it still be sparse*
> *enough to allow the spontaneous generation of matter supposedly allowed*
> *by quantum physics?*

I don't know. Perhaps this universal electron cloud is the result of the very spontaneous matter generation you've mentioned? (iirc this spontaneous generation involves a matter/antimatter pair, so it probably isn't)

> *And if in some volume that had been vacuum some matter appeared, would*
> *it then still be sparse enough to allow the creation of more matter? At*
> *what point would the existence of spontaneously-created matter prevent*
> *the creation of more matter? Is that density great enough to allow the*
> *resulting matter gas to coalesce into galaxies at the rate needed for a*
> *steady-state galaxy?*

sci.astro: Re: Evolution is really sun worship

Well, the galaxies are not distributed evenly in the universe (another problem with the Big Bang, I think). Instead you have huge structures like the Great Wall and vast empty areas where there are no galaxies at all. Perhaps the matter is generated in the empty areas and then drawn into the large structures by gravity?

> *And why do you need spontaneous creation of matter anyway, in a static galaxy?*

To replace matter that has decayed. Neutrons decay to an electron + proton pair, and protons decay into a positron + pion pair.

http://www.fact-index.com/p/pr/proton_decay.html

For a static universe to work, matter would have to be replenished somehow.

> *To me, the current mainstream explanation seems to fit all the facts, and works well enough that a sane person could provisionally (until a better explanation comes along) accept it as fact. The various steady-state theories have too many holes.*

All the current theories have holes. That's why I don't place any of them higher than another. Although I have to admit I prefer the thought of an eternal universe to that of one created in a Big Bang. All the outcomes of a Big Bang universe are depressing. Yes, I know that's not very scientific.. ;)

--

C Lund, www.notam02.no/~clund