

# Re: Question about Light from the Big Bang

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-11/msg00489.html>

---

- *From:* "Sue..." <[suzysewnshow@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:suzysewnshow@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 8 Nov 2005 02:22:56 -0800
- 

Androcles wrote:

> "Brian Weatherley" <[brian.weatherley@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:brian.weatherley@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
> [news:Xns9707EB6264591bweatherley@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:Xns9707EB6264591bweatherley@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
>> Let me start off by saying that I am just barely aware of the basics of  
>> relativity and in as much I have a question that I cannot seem to find an  
>> answer to. I would appreciate someone with not only understanding but  
>> maybe a certain level of skill for stating things in easy to understand  
>> terms for non psycisist.  
>>  
>> I have heard mention that with our advanced telescopes we can see light  
>> that is so far away that it has been travelling towards us since very near  
>> the "big bang", in effect giving us a view into the universe's distant  
>> past  
>> and early beginnings.  
>  
> With our advanced telescopes we can see light that ORIGINATED  
> so far away that it has been travelling towards us for a long time.  
> That you can take to the bank. I'm not so sure they'll accept the  
> forgery you added to it.  
>  
>  
>> But it is also my understanding that at the big  
>> bang, all matter in the universe was essentially in a single point, this  
>> point including all space as well.  
>  
> I wouldn't call that an "understanding". Why not just say its a rumour  
> you heard on the grapevine?  
>  
>  
>  
>> At the point of the "bang" matter and  
>> the space containing it exploded outward.  
> Rumour.  
>  
>> Light being a constant speed,  
>  
> Another rumour.  
>

## Re: Question about Light from the Big Bang

- >> and nothing can move faster than light,
- >
- > Yet another rumour.
- >
- >> how is it that the matter that is
- >> our planet, having started at the same point as everything else, can be so
- >> far away from the light that is coming towards us that supposedly was
- >> emitted near the forming of the universe?
- >
- > Maybe you shouldn't trust rumours. Like lies they become whoppers
- > if allowed to grow.
- >
- >> Wouldn't light from the big bang
- >> 14 billion years or so ago be at the very edges of the expanding space,
- >> farthest from the point of origin?
- >
- > What big bang?
- > Light is like the ripples on a pond and you can only detect them at
- > the pond edge.

No... Light is like the mother croc that crawled out the pond and swallowed a child molester. When the Pope heard about it he fought a paper bull and Stephen Hawking said child molesters are caused by priests that remain singularities. IMHO... BB and the mother croc are both crocks. :o)

Sue...

- If the splash that makes the ripples is at the centre
- > of the Pacific Ocean they get somewhat lost in all the other waves
  - > by the time they reach shore.
  - >
  - >
  - >> I would think that in order to see light coming towards us from so long
  - >> ago
  - >> that it was from the big bang would require us to be some 14 billion light
  - >> years in front of it to begin with?
  - >
  - > What big bang?
  - >
  - >> I know that my reasoning reflects my lack of study in this field which is
  - >> why I have turned to those who could explain it to me.
  - > I can't explain what isn't known to be true.
  - > All I can explain is that some people think they know it all and spread
  - > rumours to make themselves seem important.
  - > This is what we know.
  - > Light from distant galaxies is red-shifted.
  - >
  - > This is what some people ASSUME.
  - > Assumption 1)
  - > The red shift is Doppler shift, there can be no

Re: Question about Light from the Big Bang

## Re: Question about Light from the Big Bang

- > other explanation. (I disagree, there is another explanation)
- > Assumption 2)
- > From the Doppler shift, it follows that the further galaxies are
- > racing away.
- > Assumption 3)
- > From the racing away, there was a central point to race away from.
- > Assumption 4)
- > At some time in the past, there was a big bang.
- >
- > What else do we KNOW?
- > Ripples on a pond carry ALL the energy of the splash to the
- > shore, but the bigger the pond the bigger the shore and the greater
- > the spread of the energy.
- > We at the edge of the pond see tiny ripples, not much energy LOCALLY.
- > In energy terms, Max Planck discovered  $E = hf$ , which Hubble
- > ignored. Frequency  $f$  multiplied  $h$ , Planck's constant, gives a measure
- > of the energy. So we EXPECT to see red shift from distant objects.
- > Now throw out all the assumptions, no big bang. The universe always
- > was, always will be, just as it is now.
- > Problem solved.
- > Androcles.

---

- **Follow-Ups:**

- ◆ **[Re: Question about Light from the Big Bang](#)**  
◇ From: Androcles

- **References:**

- ◆ **[Question about Light from the Big Bang](#)**  
◇ From: Brian Weatherley
- ◆ **[Re: Question about Light from the Big Bang](#)**  
◇ From: Androcles

- Prev by Date: **[Re: Attraction VS geometry](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: force](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: Question about Light from the Big Bang](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: Question about Light from the Big Bang](#)**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **[Date](#)**
  - ◆ **[Thread](#)**