

Sick and Tired of Inconsistencies

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.research/2008–06/msg00032.html>

- *From:* charleskmhui@xxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Tue, 10 Jun 2008 16:52:11 +0000 (UTC)
-

Is MOND (Modified Newtonian Dynamics) beaten to death yet? This theory is tried to explained dark matter without resolving to any new theory or new physics. It basically tries to apply two different standard at different scale of physics. If people cannot propose any consistent deep thought and elegant mathematical equations, please drop their papers. Don't create papers for sake of creating papers!!! String theorists has done a much better mathematical job than this kind of physics, at least they have created a branch of new math.

Lately, I read an article "Dark Energy without Dark Energy". I am not convinced by the author approach. Again, applying different definition of word at different stages and different assumptions at different phenomena. I really doubt what kind of scientific standard at the first place?

Does anyone know any model that can be consistently derived from early stage of Universe to the current phenomenal Universe, without switching principle, without switching assumptions at different stages of the evolution of the Universe, and without switching interpretation of conventional operational terms. It can derive consistently from quantum gravity to classical gravity descriptions. If no one can do that then I am not convinced that anyone can claim oneself understand gravity. Classical gravity is insufficient to explain dark matter and dark energy. Don't give a cheap explanation; otherwise so-called physicists just try to humiliate Mother Nature. Mother Nature needs not our permission to operate consistently.

I can only accept switching assumption at different scale or even changing physical laws for one set of phenomena if someone can formulate their "assumptions" in a dynamical way in their model such that this assumption is no longer implicit in one's model but explicitly expressed as dynamical constraints, and no switching of definitions/terms. For example, we can accept Uncertainty Principle but then accept that Newtonian Mechanics is an approximation to Quantum Mechanics...etc. Again, an author that is unable to recognize his/her own theory short-fall is just trying to fool us and Mother Nature.