Basic Dark Matter question.

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.astro/2005−07/msg00184.html

- *From*: Charles Cagle <skybolt99@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Fri, 22 Jul 2005 16:42:35 −0700

On 6/2/05 2:53, in article mt2.0−31536−1117706019@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx,
"Rantrod" <rantrod@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

> I am curious about one aspect of the Dark Matter issue. Basically the
> argument is that there is more matter evident by the movement of the
> galaxies and such than there is from observable luminous matter. For
> example, if you were far enough from our own solar system, you would
> only be able to see the sun, yet by analyzing the movements of the
> solar system, it would be evident that there is a lot more mass than
> just the sun. I don't understand why this is such a big deal, off
> course there is more mass than just the sun, lots more! We got lots of
> planets, asteroid belts, meteors, etc. It doesn't seem worthy of such
> deep analysis as I'm seeing on the scientific community. When we're
> talking about a galaxy such as ours, I'm sure there is plenty of
> non−luminous stuff out there, 5−10 times more non−luminous than
> luminous matter sounds reasonable. Furthermore, I don't think we'll
> have the technology to account for every stellar object in our galaxy
> for hundreds of years. When we're talking about the universe as a
> whole, I think it would be pretty darn silly for us to suspect we can
> see it all from our puny telescopes. I don't think we'll be able to
> map the whole universe for thousands of years.
>
> Is there anyone who can explain in plain terms why is it more
> complicated than what I just explained?

Well, let me spell it out. Dark matter is dark because it cannot allow electrons to fall down to the ground state with the baryons. No one knew this until I discovered it but a gravitational field will produce a strong charge separation effect and it excludes electrons from the terminus region of the gravitational field of a star. Oh, and I discovered that the essence of a gravitational field is a charge and its conjugate in superposition structured in a vector field like a Del X H or Del X E. The terminus of the gravitational field that originates from such a large scale standing wave boson is along the toroidal axis of that flux toroid. A side issue is that photons are gravitational charge units. Who knew? LOL. I did. Photons can be forced to disassociate into a charge and its conjugate...electron and positron. The gravitational field of a photon is precisely what gives the photon the ability to ionize matter...because of the charge separation mechanism. This really isn¹t all that difficult folks... A gravitational

field is a time rate gradient field... Think about it. Particles that approach the terminus of a gravitational field (the terminus is a loop not a point and it is the closed line at which the time is most strongly dilated) will immediately begin to overlap in momentum space because they develop a common de Broglie wavelength that is equal to or greater than their interparticle distance −−− why? Because with respect to any outside observer their relative speed with respect to each other begins to approach 0. And lambda = h/mv so as v−>0 then lambda −> large values and the begin to overlap in momentum space. It is really trivial to show that elementary charges which are overlapping in the same momentum space will behave opposite to the expectations of Coulomb¹s law... That¹s right folks...there is no strong force...what we¹ve been calling the strong force is really entirely electromagnetic in nature and it is so damn easy to show that this is true that I¹m just amazed that so many bright people never figured this out. No strong force... No gluons, no quarks... Amazing that so many people are so easily taken in by the results of inductive logic which cannot yield certainties.

So, that matter...which I have called Isaacium is just pure neutrons and protons...entirely baryonic. I named it Isaacium because Isaac in Hebrew means the laughter of disbelief and I figured that most astro guys and cosmologists will laugh in disbelief at the suggestion that I've actually managed to unify electromagnetism and gravity and could deduce the existence of this baryonic matter because I discovered that a gravitation field will produce a strong charge separation effect...something no one else has suggested. It is heavy precisely because electrons are excluded and so it doesn't possess atomic volume (which are related to the presence of electrons). It is dark for the same reason... No electron associations. And you can see that it occurs in rings...loops that are coincident to the toroidal axis of the standing wave boson that is the primary physical feature of a star. So, if the boson is displaced or expands more rapidly than the Isaacium ring can accommodate to it then a supernova results as a cascade of electrons flows down to the Isaacium and is acquired by it. The result is that the Isaacium begins to differentiate into a wide variety of atomic species... There is an immense radiation flux that will emerge because of all those electrons falling down to ground states and an immense explosion as the Isaacium makes the transition from having only nuclear volume to acquiring atomic volume as it differentiates into ordinary elements. I was hoping people would get a clue as to why the primary signature of a recent supernova is an expanding ring of matter. How do you get an expanding ring except that you start with a ring? People should pay more attention to the clues that the universe gives us.

.

- Prev by Date: ***Re: "Deep Impact" predictions***
- Next by Date: ***Re: New Study Claims Mars Dry for 4 Billion Years***
- Previous by thread: ***Astronomers Find New Evidence for the Violent Demise of Sun−like Stars (Forwarded)***

- Next by thread: ***Please send articles***
- Index(es):
  - ***Date***
  - ***Thread***