

Re: big bang paradox

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-12/msg01640.html>

- *From:* "N:dlzc D:aol T:com \(\dlzc\)" <dlzc@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 17 Dec 2006 22:04:56 -0700
-

Dear Pax:

"Pax" <SherriFWhite@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:jglhh.10440\\$hl.9006@xx](mailto:news:jglhh.10440$hl.9006@xx)

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

....

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?

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.

OK.

....

is the real Big Bang
paradox, since the universe
is calculated to be between
12 and 15 billion
years old.

Re: big bang paradox

~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.

I am interested in the subject, and I am not aware of any observations that don't simply adjust the age of the Universe a half Gy or so. So if you come up with a researchable citation...

....

"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

Re: big bang paradox

I assume you imagine something even above the plane of ecliptic? You are aware that there are a few dozen observations that establish a "cooling curve" for CMBR light even in distant galaxies, right? The CMBR would have to be pretty clever to be a "local artifact" everywhere, wouldn't it?

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.

"some sort", without a physical center.

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?

Everything (non-local), in every direction, is moving away from us. 14–15 Gy of history is displayed. Nothing new is intruding into our space, only our ability to resolve is getting sharper.

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.

The illusion involves all the matter *not* in our cluster. And is uniform enough that we can infer that all objects will see the same expansion uniformly from their POV. Your "different properties" simply aren't evident.

Re: big bang paradox

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.

Yes.

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.

We are in the middle... of how far we can go without getting into space.

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.

Look, this started with predictions / discussion of Big Bang Theory. What the theory predicts / says is "complete". Nature is under no compulsion to support it, as time goes on.

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/>

Re: big bang paradox

Thanks.

But the early Universe had the dispersive medium responsible for the CMBR, which extinguished 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...

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 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.

Exactly some more. lol

Thread title...

Science isn't about "truth" but about modelling, prediction, and falsification. BBT has a lot of patches associated with it, but mostly to allow the only tool we have that might be big enough (GR) to allow us to peak beyond the veil of the CMBR.

Re: big bang paradox

Re: big bang paradox

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. :)

Yep. That is why we are here.

Over and out.

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.

There is no sin. Creation is an act of self-discovery. The left and right hands of God can produce no sin.

Be well – Pax

You too.

David A. Smith

Re: big bang paradox

Re: big bang paradox