

Re: Sick and Tired of Inconsistencies

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.research/2008-06/msg00145.html>

- *From:* Surfer <no@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 21 Jun 2008 09:59:06 +0000 (UTC)
-

On Tue, 10 Jun 2008 16:52:11 +0000 (UTC), charleskmhui@xxxxxxxx wrote:

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.

A Quantum Cosmology: No Dark Matter, Dark Energy nor Accelerating Universe
http://www.scieng.flinders.edu.au/cpes/people/cahill_r/OC.pdf

.