

Re: "Another Rebuff to General Relativity By Cosmological Observations"

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.particle/2008-10/msg00026.html>

- *From:* "rustyjames777@xxxxxxxxx" <extremesoundandlight@xxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 9 Oct 2008 17:07:25 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Oct 2, 6:45 am, "Kna" <k...@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:

"Another Rebuff to General Relativity By Cosmological Observations"

(See also our sister website Reticssays.com)

Cosmological observations have recently indicated that the "expansion" of the universe to be faster at extreme distances than it is over most of its observable volume. There have been attempts to reconcile these observations with the predictions of General Relativity. These attempts, for example, resurrected Dr. Einstein's idea of the cosmological constant as a possible source of a repulsive force to explain this effect. This is rather startling since one does not have to be a rocket scientist to recognize that the so-called cosmological constant is the conventional gravitational constant expressed in terms of the energy represented by the gravitational masses involved. Obviously if a repulsive force existed which was equal and opposite to the conventional gravitational force, there would be no net force to cause the Universe to contract and the static Universe which was the cosmological belief at the time would result. When the expansion of the Universe was recognized, Dr. Einstein recanted his belief in the cosmological constant.

What is overlooked is the fact that when we observe extreme distances such as exist when we look at the source of the "big bang" or in a direction opposite to that source we are looking backwards in time. The description of the "Big bang" tells us that the Universe suddenly appeared at a point in space which then underwent an almost instantaneous "inflationary expansion" which then settled down to the more sedate expansion we presently observe. In other words, at the beginning the rate of expansion was apparently much larger than it is now. The same effect is to be expected when we look outward to extreme distances. We are making observations of events which occurred very early in the history of the Universe. If, at that time, the Universe was apparently expanding in an "inflationary" manner, it must also apparently expand in an inflationary manner at extreme distances. What we should see is that the rate of the universe's expansion increases at extreme distances, and this is what is being observed! The only mystery is what is causing the inflation.

Re: "Another Rebuff to General Relativity By Cosmological Observations"

When one correctly derives General Relativity the source of the apparent "inflationary" expansion becomes readily apparent. The strangeness occurs as a result of Dr. Einstein's incredibly naive error in the derivation. Correctly derived, General Relativity provides meets all of the observational tests which are alleged to have verified (valid only in weak fields such as exist in the Solar system. The corrected gravitational theory account for:

A:– The observed gravitational force in terms of three dimensional Euclidean Space (observationally verified).

B:– It is consistent with the ABSOLUTE validity of the Law of Conservation of Energy.

C:– It eliminates the idea of "Black Holes" since gravitational pressure and radiation pressure at extreme densities (twice the ABSOLUTE "Event Horizon" radius or less) gravitational pressure and radiation pressure balance each other and gravitational collapse ceases. (See<http://einsteinhoax.com/gravity.htm>.)

D:– The apparent "inflationary expansion" at extreme distances results from the fact that the ABSOLUTE velocity of light was much higher in the past.

The source material for this posting may be found in<http://einsteinhoax.com/hoax.htm>(1997);<http://einsteinhoax.com/gravity.htm> (1987); and<http://einsteinhoax.com/relicor.htm>(1997). EVERYTHING WHICH WE ACCEPT AS TRUE MUST BE CONSISTENT WITH EVERYTHING ELSE WE HAVE ACCEPTED AS TRUE, IT MUST BE CONSISTENT WITH ALL OBSERVATIONS, AND IT MUST BE MATHEMATICALLY VIABLE. PRESENT TEACHINGS DO NOT ALWAYS MEET THIS REQUIREMENT. THE WORLD IS ENTITLED TO A HIGHER STANDARD OF WORKMANSHIP FROM THOSE IT HAS GRANTED WORLD CLASS STATUS.

All of the Newsposts made by this site may be viewed at the<http://einsteinhoax.com/postinglog.htm>.

Please make any response via E–mail as Newsgroups are not monitored on a regular basis. Objective responses will be treated with the same courtesy as they are presented. To prevent the wastage of time on both of our parts, please do not raise objections that are not related to material that you have read at the Website. This posting is merely a summary.

E–mail:– einsteinh...@xxxxxxxxx If you wish a reply, be sure that your mail reception is not blocked.

The material at the Website has been posted continuously for over 8 years. In that time THERE HAVE BEEN NO OBJECTIVE REBUTTALS OF ANY OF THE MATERIAL PRESENTED. There have only been hand waving arguments by individuals who have mindlessly accepted the prevailing wisdom without questioning it. If anyone provides a significant rebuttal that cannot be

Re: "Another Rebuff to General Relativity By Cosmological Observations"

objectively answered, the material at the Website will be withdrawn.
Challenges to date have revealed only the responder's inadequacy with one exception for which a correction was provided.

The apparent "inflationary expansion" at extreme distances results from the fact that the ABSOLUTE velocity of light was much higher in the past.

this is possible because there was less resistance in space time fabric moments after the big bang so there was less impedance on light propagation.

.