Re: CMBR and neutron stars

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.astro/2005−08/msg00190.html

- *From*: "N:dlzc D:aol T:com \(dlzc\)" <N: dlzc1 D:cox T:net@xxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Mon, 22 Aug 2005 17:33:22 −0700

Dear Martin Brown:

"Martin Brown" <|||newspam|||@nezumi.demon.co.uk> wrote in
message news:de1h4p$h3c$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
> N:dlzc D:aol T:com (dlzc) wrote:
>>
>> "Steve Willner" <willner@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>> news:4303a492$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
....
>> But "we" have GR, and particular models in GR sound like they
>> might *also* provide a black body curve, if outer−time is
>> integrated over the surface, and the coordinate r_outer =
>> t_inner_Big_Bang is the instant that all infall must pass.
>
> Viewed from the outside of the BH you fade away at ever more
> extreme gravitational redshift as you cross the surface of the
> event horizon. But in the comoving frame nothing exceptional
> happens to you crossing the event horizon provided that you
> choose a nice large quiescent BH. You will have considerable
> difficulty reporting any observations though.

Thanks for the reasoned response, Martin.

What if your "report" is directed inside? They have no problems getting the message. The difficulty seems to be in "our" expectations of what happens inside. In our Universe, if the Big Bang is "just inside the event horizon" (by any finite distance/age), we should see no new structures dropping in wholesale. If outer−time is not "integrated across all time", then new objects or new basic building blocks (at least) should be periodically discovered crossing our light cone, and our Universe ingests more of the outer.