Re: Big Bang Baloney....or scientific cult? [Apparent Red Shift]

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004−07/7226.html

---

From: Ralph Hertle (*ralph.hertle_at_verizon.net*)
Date: 07/23/04

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 2004 07:05:37 GMT

Info Plumber wrote:

[snip]

> Thanks for the tip, how is this?
>

Everything is OK.

>
>>.....
>>
>>"Ralph Hertle" <ralph.hertle@verizon.net> wrote in message
>>news:40FCC49D.2050105@verizon.net...
>>
>><snip>
>>
>> >> The universe is eternal. Every scientific discovery, demonstration,
>>and proof done in all of history validates the existence of the
>>existents being examined in the observations and experiments, and taken
>>together by the use of inductive logic, the fact of continuity can be
>>inferred and then validated.<<
>
>
> I believe that is an unsupportable claim.
>

Induction is not that popular in our society, however, that is the process that is used to arrive at the concept that, "The universe is eternal." With induction one reasons from many particulars to a single unifying concept. * You say that what I say is unsupportable. I say that what I said is a fact that is verifiable.

One fact is that you can verify with your own sense−perception information and powers of cognition is that from the time you first posted on this thread and the moment that you posted the message to

which I am herewith replying the universe continued to exist.

The many such time periods involving numerous identifications of physical entities that you have experienced in your life should give you a sufficient quantity of particulars from which you can inductively draw the conclusion that everything that you have seen or know does exist. Add to that the concepts similarly drawn by others and the base of data particulars is enormous. Enormous enough to formulate the concept that everything is. That process is implicit in the simplest generalizations formed by a child to the sophisticated conclusions involving high level abstract concepts of the universe, say that the functionings of many types of celestial objects (say planets, stars, moon, and comets) are different from one another.

The conclusion first drawn by any scientist or philosopher that the universe, that is all of existing things, is made of functioning existents, or beings, was made by Aristotle. He called that a Common Notion, or axiom, and today philosophers call that concept the Identity Axiom. Ayn Rand redefined the principle in the context of a comprehensive fact−based and logical philosophy called Objectivism, and her definition is, "Existence is existing," or for short, "Existence exists."

The fact that you existed during the minutes that you took to make your recent post has implicit within it the fact of your continuing existence. All the matter and materials or energy that is or was you has continued to exist. I hope you are still there, of course. To write a post, you looked at your computer, and you turned it on. The machine went into action. The actions that you took have the implicit basis that you, electricity, programs, and the computer actually exist, and that they continue to exist. Of course, if you were nuked by a terrorist, those things would not exist, however, changed, the atoms of same and other constituents would continue to exist.

Every human goes through a similar process of inductive generalization daily, and scientists go through a much more detailed process of induction wherein all the original particular facts are carefully identified, defined, and measured in advance. The methods of induction are carefully delineated for scientific advancements, discoveries, and identifications.

* Refer to Ayn Rand's book on concept formation, called, "The Theory of Objectivist Epistemology," that is available from, http://www.aynrand.org/site/PageServer .

Scientific experiments, demonstrations, and proofs are deductive processes and are not used to arrive at the universal concept of a continually existing universe. Deduction cannot be used for that purpose.

>
>>[you say:]

>>
>> > My intuition says that anything that is expanding at a more−or−less
>>constant rate (or accelerating rate) must have been a singularity at
>>some time in the past. Your statement above seems more like existential
>>philosophy than hard science. There are few things in cosmology that
>>have as much hard, scientific validation as the "big bang".<
>>
>>Intuition is not science, it is projection and wishing, just to mention
>>some of the possible notions.
>
>
> I was not the first person to mention "intuition" in this thread, but I made
> it crystal clear (I thought) that my position was based on science, not
> intuition.
>

Sorry, I misread or missed something.

[snip]

>>Forget the Euclidean geometric origin point that the
>>religionist−creationists have foisted upon us.
>>
>>Instead, ask the real questions: what happens to photons in their
>>travels through space to cause the lowering of their energy levels. If
>>collisions or the intercession of other causes are at work, it may be
>>found that the universe is not at all expanding, that there was no BB,
>>that the Apparent Red Shift will have been explained in terms of
>>physical cause and effect, that the cause of gravity may also be
>>explained as an integral cause, that the red shift varies due to the
>>differences of densities of hydrogen atoms or the different flux
>>densities of radiant gravitons in space, and that the universe is
>>considerably smaller than previously estimated.
>
>
> wait just a minute, how can a "continually existant" universe be anything
> other than infinite in size while at the same time being "smaller than
> previously estimated"?
>

That's an excellent question. In the space of these writings it sometimes isn't possible to develop all the points needed for a complete exposition.

A "continually existant" universe made of a plurality of discrete existents is finite. Finite in that (Aristotelean and not Platonic) context would mean that existents are existing in physical actuality and that they have properties. The plurality continues to exist, will exist, and is known to have existed for some time prior to now. By induction we can create the concept of a continuity of everything, and we can similarly form a concept that isolates the distinguishing

characteristics and omits all the non−essential properties of the existents except for the existence of the plurality and its continuity; and we call that concept, eternal.

The universe is eternal.

Being eternal is always an actuality, and it is continually actualized in every moment of existence. The universe is always existing instantaneously, and there is always only the now. In the now, there is no past, and, in the now, there is no future. The characteristics of future existents are only determined by their currently existing properties.

Everything in the universe has substance, the stuff that is, and that stuff has properties. Some of those properties are location, amount of mass, distance relationships, and dimensional motion, for example. We can only know the natures of the existents that we can, and we can know no more. We have no knowledge of whether future discoveries of more distant objects, i.e., by means of iron light red shifted down into the long radio wave lengths, will enable us to see older and more distant objects. We can know know more by such empirical and verifiable observations.

Is the universe infinite of time? No, it is only continuous of existence. That fact we can verify, and by means of induction we can surmise that existence is eternal. To be eternal is that the universe will continue to continue in the here and now,

Is the universe infinite of size, or mass? No, it is only continuous of the existence of its parts and its possible functionings. Actually, We only know what we know. If we build more powerful instruments we can see farther, and if all that we have seen has similar characteristics, we could make a conditional guess that if we saw further we would see more of the same. If we saw older objects, we could conditionally guess that older things were formed or were existing based upon the same causes.

The universe is always finite. No part of it is infinite.

Infinity is a potentiality only, and it can never be demonstrated to have any particular existence. Nor are there any particular infinite objects, for that would be a gross contradiction in terms.

Refer to several posts that I have written on HPO, humanities.philosophy.objectivism , and AA, alt.astronomy, concerning discussions of the concepts of existence, continuity, and infinity. Fuller explanations may be found there, and also, on the archives for the above mentioned groups on Google.com. Search by "author:<author's email address>" and by subject keywords, existence, continuity, and infinity, for example.

The concepts of the existence and the continuation of entities are demonstrably finite.

The concept of infinity is a religious concept that is used widely by Platonists of all types, and is rarely and only used in comparative discussions by those in the Aristotelean tradition. Infinity cannot be actualized in terms of finite existents, extents, sizes, or physical substance of any kind. All that it can possibly mean is: immeasurably huge, and that is just about all that can be said about the concept. At best infinity is not, and can never be, a scientific concept. Why? Because that which is supposed to be the infinite has no properties, no identity. Infinity can never be known − and therein is its great appeal to the Platonists as well as the modern Kantians in science.

> with respect to "the flux densities of radiant gravitons in space", are you
> referring to the hypothesized effect of a "Mitchell star" or other
> significant gravity well, namely the indirect result of uni−directional
> gravitons causing localized Elysium density increases which result in the
> refraction and ultimate red−shifting of photons? this idea seems to me to
> have some fatal logical weaknesses, so perhaps he has something else in
> mind?

A ""Mitchell star" or other significant gravity well"? I don't know. The idea, from what you say could be worth looking into. I don't know enough about that aspect of science.

> Has he subjected this option to experimentation?
>

Yes. Lord Rayleigh was a true experimenter−theoretician type of scientist. His experiments are well documented. I for one wish I had a book that documented all his works.

>
>>Due to religion the theory that no physicist seems to be advancing is
>>that the universe continually exists as plurality, and that it is made
>>of a myriad of parts.
>>
>>Ralph Hertle
>>
>
> this is a very interesting theory and one that I have not seen before.

The theory "that the universe continually exists as a plurality" is not mine. That is straight from Aristotle, that is, after I did a lot of mulling to get the ancient concepts working in my gray cells. I've been developing upon and explaining the concepts for our modern purposes.

Or are you referring to Lord Rayleigh's work with light?

The guy we are talking about is:

John William Strutt Lord Rayleigh
Born: 12 Nov 1842 in Langford Grove (near Maldon), Essex, England

Won: Nobel Prize, 1904
Died: 30 June 1919 in Terling Place, Witham, Essex, England

> I will enjoy very much giving this idea some serious consideration, but for
> now just a few questions and comments:
>
> 1. Where can I obtain more information on Lord Raleigh and his work?
>

Again, I wish that I had a full documentation of abstracts of his work. Use the Internet search engines. Possibly also write to the Librarians at the universities and organizations in GB where he did his work. I wouldn't doubt that they can give you a little free help, however, a researcher could possibly be hired.

> 2. Does he extrapolate his findings with estimates of ?
> a) stellar and intergalactic distances.
> b) the size of the currently visible portion of the universe.
>

He made a few comments about the light coming from distance places in the universe, and I don't have the details

> 3. Where does he stand on General Relativity?
>

I don't know.

Note the years in which he did his work. He published his work, and I would suspect that his experiments may have been mentioned in the works of Einstein and others in the prior art or reference sections of the papers they wrote. I would be interesting to see how they dispensed with his ideas,

> 4. What are his positions on dark matter and dark energy?

I don't know.

>
> 5. What is his position on multiple universes and string theory?

I don't know.

>
> The majority of today's physicists who are atheists are also "Big Bang"ists,
> so your final comment does not hold water.

You caught one of my problems in logic. Thank you.

I should have said that some advocates of the BB are religionists and that some are not.

I may have tried to promote the idea that creationists are religionists, and as you point out, they all are not. I should have added, as a parenthetical remark, that many of the religionist creationists latched on to the Doppler−Hubble BB theory because it shored up the Biblical creationist viewpoint. Nor are all religionists creationists Biblical creationists.

A poll of the different types of scientists regarding their religious, scientific, and philosophical views would be of interest.

Steven Speicher, a scientist who posts on HPO, remarked that most scientists leave their religious views at the door when they go to work.

> From the general tone of your
> post, I get the distinct impression that you harbor an irrational hostility
> towards any theory that would lend credence to the Creationist point of
> view.
>
> IP
>
>

I am vehemently opposed to any theory that is widely promoted and that has so many logical contradictions in it. For example, one contradiction that is really disreputable is that at the instant of the BB the universe is supposed to have come into existence out of nothing. They imply, and some state outright, that there were no physical causes existing prior to all of existence. The implication is that the principles of cause and effect, of the plurality of existents in the universe, of the existence of the universe, of the eternal nature of the universe, and of the concepts of specific properties of existents, of the knowability of the facts of the universe and of the pre−BB universe, don't exist and cannot be known.

Only existence is existing.

I am not a Creationist, although the original hypotheses of Hubble using the Doppler Effect and the balloon had considerable merit worth checking. It is still true for many local observations.

I am an advocate of the continuity of existence of a plural and eternal universe of only physical existents.

Ralph Hertle