

Re: What before big bang?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-09/0378.html>

From: truegridtz (*marko_at_hal-pc.org*)

Date: 09/01/04

Date: Wed, 1 Sep 2004 12:26:46 -0500

You said pertaining to "c": "You might try being more precise. Constant with respect to what? Do you > *know the answer to that question?*"

"c" is constant no matter what the velocity of the observer.

The space-time alterations due to velocity are all automatically adjusted so that "c" is perceived to be the same.

You also said: " Please present that evidence. For starters, you could explain how electrons can be EMR."

I am not saying that they are. I am saying that they could be. I don't know what the actual waveform would be. I see considerable evidence that most everything in the atomic world is EMR.

What happens when light travels in a circle? It would continually accelerate toward the center wouldn't it? IOW there would be a factor involved that is not seen in rectilinear motion.

My position is that science is closed minded. Piling up evidence is not going to lead to a useful application of present knowledge. Sooner or later the nature of gravity will be discovered.

I have little doubt that whoever first generates the gravitational field will do it with a specific EM waveform. I cannot prove this. Whoever does this will not arrive at the understanding by piling up more quarks and other such evidence.

Relativity is a continuously adjustable multi-dimensional feedback system. Evidence concerning this universal system keeps piling up through the years, but there seems to be little effort to see what it all leads to.

It is obvious to me that it points to EMR as being the prevailing component, if not the only one.

sci.physics.relativity: Re: What before big bang?

Virtually everything has electromagnetic qualities. EM is the common factor. It seems logical to look at the nature of gravity through EM.

I don't see why you, and probably most, think that laboratory evidence is all that matters. Sure, science is based on fact (or what is perceived to be fact), but there is also the important element of interpreting the evidence and theorizing about what it could mean.

AE taught us that things aren't always as they appear. Newtonian mechanics was not the whole story. This lesson should not be forgotten.

IOW, don't be so quick to assume that what we perceive is what is really there. These manifestations that appear in laboratories could easily be something far different than what they appear to be.

When the Hubble went into operation it was stated that 70% of all that we believed about the universe was proved to be false.

I don't know what else to say. I can see where you are situated (to a certain extent), but I don't see why you are so committed to remaining there.

I don't mean to be rude, but judging from your reactions, I would say you know very little about relativity. Much of what I said was basic theory. You don't seem to recognize it.

Perhaps you are so involved with current laboratory evidence that you can't see it.

You said: " What properties of matter does light have? For starters, it has neither
> *rest mass nor charge.*"

$E=MC^2$: The energy of a photon is its mass times C. Rest mass of light?

You don't understand the redshift? You don't understand that the light changes direction when in the vicinity of a large mass? These effects are attributed to the properties of free space.

This is what amazes me. Relativity theory is used as a computation tool, but the actual understanding of it seems to be relegated and ignored. It is a partial explanation of how material reality operates.

You said :

" Fields in a transformer are not radiation."

Yes they are. The propagation velocity of any electromagnetic field is "c".

sci.physics.relativity: Re: What before big bang?

I don't mean to be rude, you haven't been rude to me. I suppose we are in two different worlds and yours is the most common one.

I welcome any replies you may have, but I don't know how to answer them. There is obviously a very wide communication gap. Many of your questions make sense. Many of my statements are basically out of order on a scientific basis.

For example: "> So it assembles in basic packages, call them quantum.

>

> *How does EMR "assemble" in packages?"*

With very poor context I was trying to say that the means whereby particles come into existence could be a purely EM event. My basic perspective is that little effort is put forth in physics to understand more about EM propagation. I'm sorry, I don't have the words.....physics is stuck in the mud in a certain way.

Since there is insufficient focus on the EM evidence there is consequently little or no effort to explore the possibility that what is perceived to one thing is really something else: The possibility that what is perceived as particles is really a form of EM.

There is overwhelming (as I see it) evidence that the relativistic effects (I am at a loss of words) of reality are causing, perpetuating, and accommodating EM waveforms that have yet to be identified. Nobody seems to entertain the possibility that much of what is detected is explainable with (as yet unknown) knowledge about EMR..

I strongly suspect that the answer lays hidden within the relationships of the Theory of Relativity. I wouldn't be surprised if the answer was hidden in plain view.

The one thing that most students in engineering and physics don't understand is the basic theoretical relationships upon which things are based. They work the equations and get the answers, but they never really understand what the equations really mean. Einstein built upon Maxwell and others. Building upon Einstein is a unique chore because of the continuously changing complexities.

Sincerely, Mark

"Bjoern Feuerbacher" <feuerbac@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de> wrote in message news:ch4i2a\$g5k\$1@news.urz.uni-heidelberg.de...

> truegridtz wrote:

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

>> news:ch3tr5\$d2s\$1@news.urz.uni-heidelberg.de...

>>

>>> truegridtz wrote:

>>>

Re: What before big bang?

sci.physics.relativity: Re: What before big bang?

> >>> "Albert Einstein" <dadaismo@tin.it> wrote in message
> >>> news:iG7Zc.178539\$OR2.8434846@news3.tin.it...
> >>>
> >>
> >BF: This is about a short as I could make it and hopefully it makes
> > sense. I have trouble reading it myself.
>
> We'll see.
>
>
> >>>As I see it the ultimate in science (relativity) proves that the
> >> universe was created.
> >>
> >>General Relativity is the best theory we have up to know – but
> >>essentially everyone agrees that for very small times, it breaks down
> >>due to quantum effects,
> >
> >
> > There is always the problem of the "observer." Since we have but one
basic
> > observation point (possibly the term is "world event") we cannot be sure
> > exactly what we see. Matter is in motion, internally.
>
> Sorry, I don't see what that has to do with my argument above.
>
>
>
> >>and in order to describe these first times, we
> >>need a theory of Quantum Gravity. It may well turn out that then that
> >>the universe *had* no beginning.
> >
> >
> > I do not subscribe to what might be termed quantum theory.
>
> *big sigh* Why not? And why does every piece of evidence we have
> so far agree with it, in some cases even to an accuracy of 12
> significant digits?
>
>
>
> > I see overwhelming evidence that everything is EMR.
>
> Please present that evidence. For starters, you could explain how
> electrons can be EMR.
>
>
> > So it assembles in basic packages, call them quantum.
>
> How does EMR "assemble" in packages?
>
>

Re: What before big bang?

sci.physics.relativity: Re: What before big bang?

> > *I strongly suspect that what is perceived*
> > *through science is highly flawed because many observations are flawed,*
> > *thus results and extrapolations are flawed.*
>
> *Which observations are flawed, and what is your evidence for that?*
>
>
> > *Science is trying to fit all the evidence together into a unified*
theory.
> > *A lot of the evidence is not what it appears to be.*
>
> *For example?*
>
>
> > *Much of it is*
> > *mathematical representation that has little resemblance to reality.*
>
> *Evidence is not mathematical representation.*
>
>
>
> >> *For some, still speculative, ideas, look here:*
> >>
>
>><<http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?chanID=sa006&colID=1&articleID=00042F0D-1A0E-1085-94F483414B7F0000>>
>
>
> *Have you looked there?*
>
>
> >>> *No matter what type of theory is set forth pertaining to a beginning of*
> >>> *our*
> >>> *existence, there must have been the propagation medium present*
> >>> *beforehand for anything to work.*
> >>
> >> *Huh? Could you please explain that logic further?*
>
> *I don't see anything below where you explain why a "propagation medium"*
> *had to be there "beforehand for anything to work".*
>
>
>
> > *As I see it, the "writing on the wall"*
>
> *What do you mean?*
>
>
> > *says that EMR traveling through*
> > *free space is traveling through a propagation network that is "bent" by*
> > *gravity.*

Re: What before big bang?

sci.physics.relativity: Re: What before big bang?

- >
- > *Huh? What do you mean by "propagation network"?*
- >
- >
- > > *The bending is only a mathematical and geometric observation.*
- >
- > *Well, since bending *is* something geometrical, that's not surprising,*
- > *isn't it?*
- >
- >
- > > *What is actually happening is probably quite different than a bending.*
- >
- > *If you can reproduce the predictions of General relativity without*
- > *the assumption of curved spacetime, feel free to do so.*
- >
- >
- >
- > > *Relativity, in a geometric sense, is mostly rotation through 90 degrees*
- > > *or somewhere in between.*
- >
- > *I have no clue what you mean here.*
- >
- >
- > > *What is actually happening is most uncertain.*
- >
- > *Not at all.*
- >
- >
- > > *The propagation medium is what is called free space. It has properties*
- that
- > > *are necessary for matter to operate as it does.*
- >
- > *For example?*
- >
- >
- > > *The "writing on the wall"*
- > > *strong suggests (from my perspective) that matter does not inherently*
- have
- > > *all of the qualities of space–time.*
- >
- > *I have no clue what you mean by "matter has (or has not) qualities of*
- > *space–time".*
- >
- >
- > > *What matter reacts to is a quality (qualities) of free space.*
- >
- > *Huh*
- >
- >
- > > *It must have been present in the beginning.*
- >

Re: What before big bang?

sci.physics.relativity: Re: What before big bang?

- > **What* must have been present there, and why?*
- >
- >
- > > *Whatever massive material event happened (that appears to be steadily*
- > > *expanding), call it the Big Bang,*
- >
- > *The Big Bang is not "steadily expanding", and it even makes no sense*
- > *to say that a "massive material event happened that is steadily*
- > *expanding". Events don't expand.*
- >
- >
- > > *must have had an already existant free space.*
- >
- > *Why?*
- >
- >
- > > *Once again, (assuming that there is some scientific explanation for*
- > > *the presence of the initial quantity of matter in the beginning)*
- >
- > *See the link above for some ideas, as I said.*
- >
- >
- > > *the matter*
- > > *itself did not and does not generate the qualities of free space.*
- >
- > *Well, I know of no one who says that "matter generates the qualities*
- > *of free space". Probably because it is totally unclear what you *mean**
- > *with "the qualities of free space".*
- >
- >
- > > *It is conceivable to me that the generation of matter in the beginning*
- could
- > > *have been an electromagnetic event that literally generated matter.*
- >
- > *What is an "electromagnetic event", and how can it generate matter?*
- >
- >
- > > *It is*
- > > *conceivable that light and velocity were spontaneously generated*
- >
- > *Contradicts conservation of energy, don't you think?*
- >
- > *And, BTW, velocity of what?*
- >
- >
- > > *and then matter formed due to some type of interaction.*
- >
- > *That's marvelously vague, congratulations!*
- >
- >
- > > *Even so, the properties of*

Re: What before big bang?

sci.physics.relativity: Re: What before big bang?

- > > *free space would have to be present the mass–energy conversions to take*
- > > *effect.*
- >
- > *What "properties of free space" do you mean?*
- >
- >
- > > *Who knows, maybe someone stuck a match in a room of of mirrors*
- > > *inside a black hole.*
- >
- > *A black hole has nothing to do with the BB.*
- >
- >
- > > *Maybe that's what the damned ape did. Playing with a*
- > > *cigarette lighter. Kaboom. Mabey it was an anti–cigarette*
- > > *lighter.....anyhow....*
- >
- > *What ape? Sorry, I don't get the joke.*
- >
- >
- >
- > > *The qualities of free space (as far as I know) are homogeneous through*
- the
- > > *universe no matter what the quantity of matter in the vacinity (surely*
- there
- > > *is some exception to this at the edge of reality, wherever that might*
- be, if
- > > *there is such a place). Yes, the matter in the vacinity changes the*
- free
- > > *space, but the free space itself is the same every where.*
- >
- > *Err, if it is changed, how can it be the same?*
- >
- >
- > > *From this it*
- > > *seems logical to conclude that the qualities of free space were not*
- > > *generated at the moment of the beginning.*
- >
- > *How does that follow?*
- >
- >
- > > *These qualites were already*
- > > *present. Someone put free space in operation. In fact, a universe this*
- > > *complex could not have generated itself.*
- >
- > *Why not?*
- >
- >
- > > *The whole theory of evolution is patently absurd.*
- >
- > **even bigger sigh**
- >

Re: What before big bang?

sci.physics.relativity: Re: What before big bang?

- > Please go to www.talkorigins.org and read **all** of the articles there.
- > That will keep you busy for some days...
- >
- >
- >
- >> My point is that science is used to generate arguments in behalf of a
- >> godless beginning of existence.
- >
- > Science deals only with natural explanations, since supernatural events
- > can't be studied with the methodology of science. And science found such
- > natural explanations for a lot of things which were previously
- > considered to be the work of god(s). If you have a problem with that,
- > then apparently your faith is rather weak.
- >
- >
- >> I say that the highest science (which
- >> describes accurately the nature of free space) makes it obvious that
- what
- >> ever evolutionary model is set forth requires an already existent free
- >> space.
- >
- > What "highest science" is that which achieves such marvelous things?
- >
- >
- >> Gravity, mass, energy, space–time are all predicated on events occurring
- in
- >> relation to the ether.
- >
- > Unsupported, baseless assertion.
- >
- >
- >> Mass increases with velocity.
- >
- > Yes, indeed. Nice that we agree on that.
- >
- >
- >> Electrons are moving
- >> at high velocities in (from our perspective) circular orbitals.
- >
- > Wrong. If they would do that, they would radiate off electromagnetic
- > radiation, and spiral into the nucleus.
- >
- >
- >> The
- >> gravitational effect of matter seems to be due to the mass of the atom
- >> interacting with free space.
- >
- > Again, marvelously vague.
- >
- >
- >> The mass of the electrons and vibrating protons and neutrons

Re: What before big bang?

>
> *What is vibrating there?*
>
>
> > *is due to the interaction of their velocities with free*
> > *space.*
>
> *Still marvelously vague.*
>
>
> > *This gives them their mass. It is a system that we percieve as*
> > *material existence. It could all be EMR.*
>
> *How?*
>
>
> > *Light has mass.*
>
<http://www.physics.adelaide.edu.au/~dkoks/Faq/Relativity/SR/light_mass.html>
>
>
>
> > *Light has velocity.*
>
> *Finally something we can again agree upon.*
>
>
> > *Light's path is changed as*
> > *gravitational fields change the nature of free space, the medium through*
> > *which light propagates. Light is EMR and has the properties of matter.*
>
> *What properties of matter does light have? For starters, it has neither*
> *rest mass nor charge.*
>
>
> > *All EMR travels at c, even the fields in a 120V 60Hz line transformer.*
>
> *Fields in a transformer are not radiation.*
>
>
>
> > *Light is EMR and has mass.*
>
> *Wrong. See above.*
>
>
> > *This relationship strongly suggests that all*
> > *material existence is EMR*
>
> *Why?*
>

sci.physics.relativity: Re: What before big bang?

- >
- > > *in forms that we cannot understand because we are*
- > > *wasting so much time on all this quark and quantum theory.*
- >
- > *Hint: these theories are the best theories we have, were tested hundreds*
- > *of thousands of times, and have never given a wrong prediction. Just*
- > *dumb luck, eh?*
- >
- >
- > > *It is good for*
- > > *what it is good for, but it will never get us where we need to go.*
- >
- > *Unsupported, baseless assertion.*
- >
- >
- > > *We need to prove or disprove whether electrons and all other forms of*
- matter
- > > *are small*
- >
- > *We know quite well that electrons are small (smaller than about $10^{(-18)}$*
- > *m). That is shown by scattering experiments, which are based on*
- > *electrodynamics.*
- >
- >
- > > *(or mabey huge and dimensionally distorted) circular and*
- > > *self-sufficent webs of light.*
- >
- > *Where would their charge, rest mass and magnetic moment then come from?*
- >
- >
- >
- > > *Light travels at "c" because this is the standard propagaton velocity*
- > > *(from our perspective, from our reference point).*
- >
- > *Would that be different from other reference points? From which, why,*
- > *and how do you know?*
- >
- >
- > > *The redshift is due to*
- > > *the gravitational effect upon the propagation medium, the ether.*
- >
- > *Yet another unsupported assertion.*
- >
- >
- > > *Gravity*
- > > *itself appears to be as result of mass interacting with free space.*
- >
- > *Still marvelously vague.*
- >
- >
- >

sci.physics.relativity: Re: What before big bang?

> >>>EMR propagates through some type of universal format.
> >>
> >>Ever heard of the Michelson–Morley experiment?
> >
> >
> > Yes, amazing, but ineffective. It may have worked, but due to factors
that
> > had a cancelling effect there was no drift (for lack of the proper term)
> > detected for planet earth.
>
> What cancelling factors are these?
>
>
>
> >>>The "ether" surely exists or there would not be a reference point
called
> >>>"c". MH
> >>
> >>"c" is not a reference *point*. What do you mean?
> >
> >
> > "Point" here means a place in the theory that is a reliable constant
Not a
> > geometric point, a reference point. A point of reference. A place in
the
> > theory that has a definable quantity. Relativity is based on "c" being
> > constant.
>
> You might try being more precise. Constant with respect to what? Do you
> know the answer to that question?
>
>
> > AE said that there was no proof of this, the value of "c". It
> > was chosen to be the constant, but it does work out in the equations.
>
> Huh?
>
>
> > It is
> > the maximum theoretical obtainable velocity in mass–energy conversion.
> > It can also be measured, so it seems to be a reliable constant.
>
> So, why does the existence of this "reference point" imply the existence
> of an ether?
>
>
> > If anyone made it through this, thanks for reading it. If I read
everything
> > three times I could see what I was trying to say. I hope that it is
> > basically sound according to theory.
>

Re: What before big bang?

sci.physics.relativity: Re: What before big bang?

- > *Sorry, but it consisted mainly of unsupported assertions, plain denial*
- > *of well-established theories, some totally vague statements, and some*
- > *misrepresentations of what science actually says.*
- >
- >
- > *Comments are welcome, if they aren't based on tons of geometry.*
- > *Regards, Mark*
- >
- > *What's your problem with geometry?*
- >
- >
- > *Bye,*
- > *Bjoern*