Re: big bang paradox

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006−12/msg01585.html

- *From*: "N:dlzc D:aol T:com \(dlzc\)" <dlzc@xxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Sun, 17 Dec 2006 11:00:57 −0700

Dear Pax:

"Pax" <SherriFWhite@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:szahh.29645$qO4.7571@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> "dlzc" <dlzc1@xxxxxxx> wrote in message
> news:1165875231.495444.106360@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

....

> > The fact normally−formed cosmic objects have
> > been viewed at around 15 billion LY distance from
> > us,
>
> More like 14 billion LY. And they are not like the
> objects we see around us, mainly because the
> objects around us are far too dim to be seen at that distance.
> These are very energetic.

> True, after recalculations that allowed for that
> stretching you mentioned, with a juggling of the
> Hubble Constant yet again... (The Hubble Constant isn't very,
> is it?)...

Agreed by all.

> that brought them down from the first number that
> was close to 18 billion LY.

14.7 was the most recent determination that I am aware of, made
about 6 months ago. What have you got?

> But they're also well−formed, isn't that correct?

Well formed, perhaps, but still hot enough to see over all that distance... seems like a stretch doesn't it?

> They aren't blobs of still−coalescing plasma, are they?

No, definite stellar activity.

> > is the real Big Bang paradox, since the universe is calculated to be between 12 and 15 billion years old.
>
> ~15 now. Moved to "14.7" from "12.7", with the oldest / youngest "normal" object this side of the CMBR "curtain" being about 750 million years later.
>
> > Something's very wrong with that.
>
> Your "facts".

> ???? Stated. Sometimes facts are simple.

Sometimes misremembered...

> > If the BB really happened, looking 15 billion LY out in space should show us no cosmic objects, even if we were looking straight across the center of the universe to view them, cutting their (and our) actual distance from the point of the BB in half.
>
> There was no space before the BB, so looking before the BB Could show only a "zero size" singularity (according to BBT)... even though light had not coalesced then either.

> You know what I meant, and that wasn't it. :) 15 billion was an approximation, as you used above.

Oh. You had only used 15 billion up to that point...

> Logically, there is no way to see the original churning stuff produced by the BB, because we are part of that stuff.

> Well, skid marks from my last time around the track are still visible. In a closed space, the "light echo" goes around and around infinitum.

> "In an enclosed space"... but why do you assume such? There's really no evidence for that, only (to date) unprovable theory.

But it is potentially disprovable, which is all science requires. Are there any directions we can look in that don't show the CMBR, or show it in some discontinuous intensity (as close to the center / beginning that we can see)? Are there any directions we look at (beyond our local cluster) that has objects not moving fairly uniformly away from us?

There is no empty space in any direction. All the distant laws of physics appear to agree with what we have here. Everything (non−local) is moving uniformly away from us. These observations are inconsistent with a non−closed Universe.

> But the early Universe had the dispersive medium responsible for the CMBR, which extingushed specular light in a parsec or so... before it itself "quenched", and became transparent.

> Theories are fun, huh? :) The stuff we can do with computers these days.

In lieu of a star drive...

> However, by the same token, no stuff should exist independently 15 billion years back in time for its light to finally reached us because, at that time, it should have been part of the churning plasma too.

> Something like that.

> Exactly something like that.

Only in BBT.

In my pet theory (which only I will pet), the CMBR is "just inside" an event horizon, and our universe is some other universe's black hole. Our universe is contained by one higher, and ours contains one (or more) lower (which may also be our "container" universe). Fully formed "gravitationally bound" structures and heavy elements could be allowed to be detectable right up to the CMBR. My "only" problem is having heavy elements << hydrogen...

Over and out.

David A. Smith

.