

Re: big bang paradox

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-12/msg01617.html>

- *From:* "Pax" <SherriFWhite@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 18 Dec 2006 00:27:59 GMT
-

"N:dlzc D:aol T:com (dlzc)" <dlzc@xxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:pBfhh.197351\\$4Z1.6151@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:pBfhh.197351$4Z1.6151@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Dear Pax:

"Pax" <SherriFWhite@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:szahh.29645\\$qO4.7571@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:szahh.29645$qO4.7571@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

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

...

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.

Re: big bang paradox

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

Actually, the age that was brought down from almost 18 billion LYs to something over 13 was of that distant object we're talking about. That was from an interview with a cosmologist who was a member of the team who discovered it. She said they knew immediately something was very wrong somewhere, because the object was registering as being older than their estimates for the age of the universe.

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...

True, but not in this instance. The facts I was stating are repeated constantly, and anyone who's interested in the subject is aware of them.

Re: big bang paradox

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?

Is there any place we look that isn't through the interior area of our solar system?

Re: big bang paradox

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.

No they aren't. If you take away the creative speculations, all such observations prove is cosmic motion of some sort. What if it all winds up being no more than a "local" roiling of the objects inhabiting the area of the universe we can see, a universe that is, in actuality, truly infinite?

Perhaps our galaxy is part of a galactic mega-cluster with properties different from the structure we're familiar with for most galaxies. Maybe more on the order of a spherical galaxy, but with properties that cause movement within the cluster outward from the center then back inward. In that instance, of course, all cosmic objects making up the cluster would appear to be moving away from each other as they moved outward.

For years it was taken for granted all the stars we can see from here on Earth were all of the universe. That was the state of cosmology at the time Einstein was growing up. Believing the universe was in "Steady State" is why Einstein came up with the Cosmological Constant to counteract the force of gravity.

The idea of a galaxy was not part of the nomenclature. The Milky Way was named that because of what was considered to be an unusual huge grouping of stars in the appearance of a stream of milk streaking across the night sky, it wasn't the name of our entire galaxy back then, as it is today. The fact those stars make up only one of the spiral arms of our galaxy, the arm our sun's system was situated within, wasn't considered, because no one knew of the existence of galaxies.

Do you see what I'm getting at? :) We're at the beginning, not the end. To talk as if we know it all, when what we know is only something based on current, incomplete knowledge that could be proved wrong in the light of new discoveries, is... well... childish.

Perhaps you might find this article interesting:

Nailing Down Gravity

New ideas about the most mysterious power in the universe

By Tim Folger

Drawings by Dan Winters

DISCOVER Vol. 24 No. 10 | October 2003

<http://www.discover.com:80/issues/oct-03/cover/>

But the early Universe had the dispersive medium responsible for the CMBR, which extinguished specular light in a parsec or so... before it

Re: big bang paradox

itself "quenched", and became transparent.

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

In lieu of a star drive...

I'm a sci-fi fanatic myself. :)

However, by the same token, no stuff should exist independently 15 billion years back in time for its light to finally reach 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.

Exactly some more. lol

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...

Not just you concerning the black hole part. <grin> I've entertained an idea similar to yours, but where our "singularity" is one of a group (within an entirely different sort of reality from ours). Their forces pulling on and against each other build our spacetime, by causing "whorls", within our singularity, of these warring forces that manifest (to us) as particles. Okay... far out, I know... but it's fun to imagine. :)

Over and out.

Re: big bang paradox

Re: big bang paradox

Science should be fun, and its vistas should be wide open to imagination, exploration, and discovery. The most fun is in tackling the "givens"... the reasons behind not just the theories, but the laws. The sin isn't in being wrong, everyone is wrong at times, the sin is in not wondering in the first place. Being ignorant is forgivable, it's wonderful to not know and then discover. True stupidity lies in thinking you've already learned everything you need to know.

David A. Smith

Be well – Pax

Re: big bang paradox