

# Re: Guinness World Records: scientific illiteracy?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro/2005-12/msg00155.html>

---

- *From:* "Greg Neill" <[gneillREM@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:gneillREM@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 14 Dec 2005 19:15:35 -0500
- 

<[msadkins04@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:msadkins04@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:1134595025.270972.255060@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:1134595025.270972.255060@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
> The 2005 edition ("Special 50th Anniversary Edition) of Guinness World  
> Records, contrasting "fifty years of change", gives information on the  
> category "Remotest known body" (in space) for 2005 and 1955 on page 8.  
> The entry for 1955 states in part: "There is reason to believe that  
> even remoter nebulae exist but, since it is possible that they are  
> receding faster than the speed of light (670,455,000 mph /  
> 1,078,992,730 km/h), they would be beyond man's 'observable horizon'.  
>  
> What theory is this based upon, if any, and how is the apparent  
> inconsistency (with relativity's requirement that massive objects  
> travel below the speed of light as measured by all observers)  
> explained?  
>  
> Mark Adkins  
> [msadkins04@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:msadkins04@xxxxxxxxxx)  
>

General Relativity does not place a constraint on how fast regions of space may be separating. The velocity of objects \*through\* space is limited by c.

.

---

- *Follow-Ups:*
  - ◆ **[Re: Guinness World Records: scientific illiteracy?](#)**  
◇ *From:* [msadkins04@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:msadkins04@xxxxxxxxxx)
- *References:*
  - ◆ **[Guinness World Records: scientific illiteracy?](#)**  
◇ *From:* [msadkins04@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:msadkins04@xxxxxxxxxx)
- Prev by Date: **[Re: Most radioactive planet in our solar system???](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: Guinness World Records: scientific illiteracy?](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Guinness World Records: scientific illiteracy?](#)**

Re: Guinness World Records: scientific illiteracy?

- Next by thread: ***Re: Guinness World Records: scientific illiteracy?***
- Index(es):
  - ◆ ***Date***
  - ◆ ***Thread***