

Re: Perhaps still possible to determine where the big bang occurred

Re: Perhaps still possible to determine where the big bang occurred

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-07/msg00202.html>

- *From:* "guskz@xxxxxxxxxxxx" <guskz@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 03 Jul 2007 04:45:53 -0700
-

On Jul 2, 4:20 pm, wolfgang <e6k8s...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jul 2, 9:54 pm, PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jul 2, 10:07 am, "g...@xxxxxxxxxxxx" <g...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

First they say farther objects are more redshifted then they
say they
are less redshifted than much closer objects

The statement following "then" is NOT what "they" say at all. What is true is that farther objects are still more redshifted than closer objects, but just not quite as much as would be expected from a straight-line relationship between distance and redshift. That's a much different statement than what you just said.

EQUALS a very LARGE
MARGIN OF OBSERVATION ERROR.

For the above reason, it would be difficult to believe these same scientist that say the Universe is expanding uniformly in all directions. And if possibly it isn't expanding uniformly then it

Re: Perhaps still possible to determine where the big bang occurred

would be possible to determine "WHERE" the big bang occurred.

and why not linear?

and not progressive if it is accelerating?– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

Hubble would have noticed the farthest star less redshifted than the closest star, instead he noticed vice-versa.

They're saying only data from the farthest stars are inconsistent with Hubble's observations, the closer stars are still consistent.

.