Re: A Challenge to Orthodox Relativity

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006−12/msg01855.html

- *From*: Paradise_@xxxxxxxx
- *Date*: 19 Dec 2006 14:49:04 −0800

Phineas T Puddleduck wrote:

> In article <1166493808.385344.77910@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
> Paradise_@xxxxxxxx wrote:
>
> > For those whom do not understand what I mean when I say that objects
> > appear smaller as relative distance between an object and an observer
> > increases, I mean that if one holds up a ruler or meter stick and
> > measures the length of a distant object, with one eye (focused upon the
> > distant object, the object will measure smaller than when it is closer.
>
> One − its simple geometry

I'm not sure how geometry actually EXPLAINS perspective effects. Although one can utilise mathematics to reproduce the illusion of perspective, such an illusory reproduction does not necessarily explain why distant objects appear smaller. One can also exaggerate perspective. From the perspective of God...there is no "perspective". It seems to me that my explanation not only provides an actual explanation, it is backed by evidence. The evidence is to be found in the fact that objects (typically) become smaller when cooled. This is due to the fact that the rate of time flow for a cooled object is relatively decreased and the cooled object therefore expands at a slower rate than objects which are hotter. Thus, a cooled object appears to have become smaller.

Of course, whether the cooled object has truly become smaller or the hotter object has actually become larger is determined by which of the two have changed (relative to the boundary of the universe). If the hotter object's temperature (and size) has not changed relative to the boundary of the universe, then the cooled object's size has actually decreased (relative to the boundary of the universe). And if the hotter object's temperature and/or size increase as opposed to stay the same, then it is the hotter object which has expanded relative to the

boundary of the universe.

Since the boundary of the universe expands, it's size must be associated with a temperature. Of course, this temperature increase must be a negative increase. In other words, the temperature of the universe must be a negative absolute Kelvin temperature. To revise a previous explanation, I believe the universe is comprised of a neutronium condensate which has condensed to the planck scale where the condensate's temperature is Absolute zero degrees Kelvin and as it continues to implode it's temperature becomes increasingly negative (and it would therefore have effectively converted to an anti−neutronium condensate from the perspective of an observer positioned outside the event horizon).

> Two − quoting huge tracts of your own text to add a few lines is pretty pointless as it makes it difficult to find what you have posted. Snip and quote.

Hopefully, this helps?

> −−
> You know you've arrived when you've annoyed the cranks! Crank Hater proves his stupidity here!
>
> http://groups.google.gr/group/sci.physics/msg/f9488b70976a3a4b?&hl=en
>
> −−
> Posted via a free Usenet account from http://www.teranews.com

.