

Re: Postulates of Relativity and The Cosmic Background – Question

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-05/msg00023.html>

- *From:* "Spoonfed" <jonathan.doolin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 1 May 2005 01:18:05 -0700
-

Ben Rudiak-Gould wrote:

- > Spoonfed wrote:
- >> The gas from which the CMBR emanates is moving around 0.999999976238c.
- >> (Calculation below)
- >
- > I should say first that I like your web site and your Flash tutorials a lot;
- > I think they're well above the norm for educational web sites. But nearly
- > everything you say in this post, starting with the above, is totally
- > incorrect. You are trying to use SR way outside its domain of applicability.
- > You really need to learn GR before you can talk sensibly about cosmology.
- >
- >> First realize that an equipartition of energy over the momentum of all
- >> the mass in the universe should result in a Lobachevskian pattern (if
- >> you neglect all acceleration due to collisions and gravity).
- >
- > There is a simple SR cosmological model in which this is in some sense true,
- > but it is not true of big bang cosmologies. The natural symmetry of big bang
- > cosmologies is much more Newtonian than Lorentzian in character. If you want
- > to get an intuition for it without actually learning GR, you're better off
- > thinking in Newtonian terms (no speed limit; no time dilation; the "outer
- > shell" expands at infinite speed).
- >
- >> The outer edges of this pattern are gasses from very early in the big
- >> bang.

Re: Postulates of Relativity and The Cosmic Background – Question

>
> True in that SR cosmology, but not in big bang models.
>
>> There are two reasons that they appear so young.
>> One, it has taken many billions of light years to reach us from the gas
>> (but this is not the main reason) The main reason is that in our
>> reference frame, they have been traveling away from us at so close to
>> the speed of light that they have not aged.
>
> Only the first reason is correct.
>
>> Although our local universe is approximately 13.7 billion years old,
>> every particle in it underwent many relativistic accelerations in the
>> first few years. With each (noninertial) bump, the dense, primordial
>> local supercluster would have found itself in an older universe, while
>> the edges (inertial) receded away. Just as the moving twin in the
>> infamous Twin Paradox finds himself still young, while the world has
>> aged, our galaxy, finds itself only 13.7 billion years old in a much
>> more ancient universe.
>
> None of this is correct. The 13.7 billion year figure is given in terms of
> the preferred coordinate time which exists in big bang geometries.
>
> -- Ben

I really appreciate your comments on my website. That makes two people outside my family who I know have looked at it.

I believe my theory is in conflict with the Friedman Metric, but I don't think it is in conflict with Schwarzschild Metric. However, I regard the Friedman Metric as a theory which came about because of a false assumption—that the matter in the universe is distributed homogeneously.

-
- Prev by Date: [***Re: Absolute Motion Of Earth Relative To CB***](#)
 - Next by Date: [***Re: How do you know that acceleration is absolute? <eom>***](#)
 - Previous by thread: [***Re: Postulates of Relativity and The Cosmic Background – Question***](#)
 - Next by thread: [***Re: Postulates of Relativity and The Cosmic Background – Question***](#)

Re: Postulates of Relativity and The Cosmic Background – Question

- Index(es):

- ◆ *Date*

- ◆ *Thread*