

Re: Expanding Space

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro/2005-02/2973.html>

From: kenseto (kenseto_at_erinet.com)

Date: 02/24/05

Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2005 18:04:18 GMT

"Bjoern Feuerbacher" <feuerbac@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de> wrote in message news:cvk5uv\$cme\$1@news.urz.uni-heidelberg.de...

> kenseto wrote:

> > "Bjoern Feuerbacher" <feuerbac@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de> wrote in message

> > news:cvi9ak\$ieu\$1@news.urz.uni-heidelberg.de...

> >

> >>kenseto wrote:

> >>

> >>>Cosmologists explain the Big Bang (BB) and the expansion of the universe

> >

> > as

> >

> >>>that the space is expanding and not the galaxies are expanding into

> >>>pre-existing space.

> >>

> >>Congratulations, you got that right.

> >

> >

> > No need to congratulate me. I merely repeating what the cosmologists are

> > saying.

>

> And I congratulate you for representing correctly what they said.

>

> In general, you are **badly** misrepresenting what scientists **actually**

> say.

So you think that what most scientists wrote are not what they mean to say?

Or are you saying that they are a bunch of idiots and only you have the correct interpretations.

>

>

> > So why the expansion of the universe is not that motion of the galaxies

> > moving radially away from the point of BB in pre-existing space?

>

> Because then you would have big problems explaining things like the

> CMBR.

That's not a problem if space is stuff (or the E-Matrix). The CMBR is the waves (energy) exist in the E-Strings of the E-Matrix.

>

>

> > *Why are the*

> > *galaxies only have parculiar motions such as orbiting motion but not*

> > *expanding motions?*

>

> 1) *The word is "peculiar", not "parculiar".*

> 2) *Galaxies don't orbit in general. The stars *in* the galaxies*

> *are orbitting.*

So what is your answer to my question?

>

>

>

>

>

> >>> *They use a lump of raisin bread dough as analogy. The*

> >>> *raisins are the galaxies and the dough is space. As the dough (space)*

> >>> *expands it carries the raisins (galaxies) along with it. The trouble*

> >>> *with this analogy is as follows:*

> >>> 1. *The dough is physical and yet SR denies that space is physical.*

> >>

> >> *Define "physical".*

> >

> >

> > *A material medium that has measureable physical properties.*

>

> *Hint: if you want to define "physical", you shouldn't include "physical"*

> *in the definition. Read up "circularity".*

OK...How is this definition:

Space is a material medium (stuff) that has measureable properties and that it transmits light and that it can have stress within it.

>

> *However, if we concentrate on the first part, "a material medium",*

> *then I agree: space is no material medium.*

Hand waving is not an arguement.

>> *space is empty space".*

> >> *So what?*

> >

> >

> > *So Einstein was wrong. Right?*

>

> *Today, we know that something like "empty space" can't really*

> *exist. Ever heard of quantum fluctuations?*

So you admitted that Einstein was wrong.

Quantum fluctuation....is it just another term for the distortions in the aether (the E-Matrix)?

>

>

>

>>>*Hint: our knowledge has advanced quite a bit since Einstein.*

>>

>>

>> *Hint: his SR remains the same.*

>

> *Indeed. However, that space is empty is no part of SR.*

So the new interpretation of SR is that space is not empty as Einstein asserted. Then space must be the some form of aether like the E-Matrix. What this mean is that you re-named the aether as space.:-)

>

>

>>>>2. *Some phyicists said that space is "stuff" but refuse to define what*

>>>>*is "stuff"*

>>>

>>>*Liar.*

>>

>>

>> *So are you saying that you never said that space is stuff? If I can proof*

>> *that you did would you agree that you were the liar??*

>

> *I explained this ad nauseum. Either you are incredibly stupid, or*

> *willfully obtuse. Either way, it makes little sense to explain this*

> *yet again.*

Hey idiot did you ever say that space is stuff???? I don't want you explanation why you said it.....just answer yes or no.

>

>

>>>>*and at the same time they asserted that space is not nothingness as*

>>>>*asserted by SR.*

>>>

>>>*SR does not assert that space is nothingness.*

>>

>>

>> *SR assert that space is "empty".*

>

> *No. Where on earth did you get that idea from?*

>*From Einstein's writings.*

>

>

sci.astro: Re: Expanding Space

- > > *So are you saying that empty is not the*
- > > *same as nothingness?*
- >
- > *I am saying that empty *space* is not the same as nothingness.*

So you are saying that empty space is some kind of aether because empty space is not nothingness.

- >
- >
- >
- > > *If so please define both terms for me.*
- >
- > *Nothingness: nothing there at all. Empty space: space is there.*

You denied the term "empty space" earlier and now you are embracing it??

- >
- > *For a definition of "space", see some old posts by me.*

As I see it you re-named the aether as space. You really think that will eliminate the existence of an aether by simply re-naming it?

- >
- >
- > >>> *When these physicists are cornered they just simply said*
- > >>> *that space is space*
- > >>
- > >> *Liar. I provided clear definitions.*
- > >
- > >
- > > *No you provided the dictionary definition.*
- >
- > *Which *were* clear.*

Which were not clear because you insisted that space can have measureable properties.

Ken Seto