

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-07/8492.html>

From: Dale Trynor (dalet_at_nbnet.nb.ca)

Date: 07/26/04

Date: Mon, 26 Jul 2004 20:47:21 GMT

Ole D. Rughede wrote:

> "Bill Hobba" <bhobba@rubbish.net.au> skrev i en meddelelse
> news:qwKMc.15672\$K53.8089@news-server.bigpond.net.au...

>

>>"Ralph Hertle" <ralph.hertle@verizon.net> wrote in message
>>news:4100B8C0.7060504@verizon.net...

>>

>>>Info Plumber wrote:

>>>

>>>

>>>[snip]

>>>

>>>

>>>>Thanks for the tip, how is this?

[snip]

>>could be performed tomorrow that invalidates it. That is very unlikely
>>given how interconnected it is with all sorts of other things we know –

>

> but

>

>>the point is it is not impossible. And we even have examples of it
>>happening in physics eg parity violation. That parity should be conserved
>>is pretty intuitive, so much so that scientists fooled themselves into
>>believing the data said it was – in fact it was not.

[snip]

Dale Trynor wrote:

Careful here, I posted some time ago on the hypothesis that if one were to have an antimatter universe one could mirror the parity violations in that universe in such a way that they would no longer be violations and would simply be conserved in a way we are not privileged to observe. Unless of course one could observe both universes simultaneously. The

hypothesis dose require that one has a chiral quantum vacuum and a type of antigravity to allow this hypothesis to work. This is because one needs then to allow for the creation of the alternative universe. This is an alternative to what is now believed, that matter was simply favored over antimatter and to paraphrase Einstein in this somewhat altered way, god dose not simply play dice with the universe, he cheats as well. I have never been comfortable with a violation that simply must be, because we are here. Why should anyone rational be comfortable with it.

>>>>>

>>>>>>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

This is where I really disagree.

Singularities must be impossible if one has gravity and if the time dilating effects that are unavoidable with gravity can be shown to contract matter in such a way that one ends up with more space.

Before you say I am crazy here is my latest attempt at a simplified gedanken that one can use as a mathematical framework to test this theory. And yes it lead to an initiative understanding of the big bang. Some of you must have seen my posts before so either you ignored it or haven't tried to seriously solve for this gedanken. I would be very interested how me why it dose not lead you to similar conclusions.

You probably know about the Shapiro delay and how it involves how light is delayed as it passes

by a gravitational body and if you don't look it up first. its

well documented so we can ignore details and just skip by and use our analogy of the pole-vault

and barn gedanken that

becomes rather similar to the Shapiro delay when we have a black hole within the barn.

Trying to keep this ridiculously simple, lets put in a time dilation of an average of 300,000,000

times and make the barn 1 meter long where it equals 1 light second long and our rod is some reasonable percentage of light speed where even after

Lorentz contraction it will

still measured as some reasonable amount longer than the barn. We allow

both the rod as well as

a series of light pulses to enter the

barn at about the same time and because we know the rod cannot travel faster than the light its only logical to expect the rod will also take at least 1 second to exit the outlet door as this must also be the case for the light. Note that we will still be able to show that the longer rod will still fit nicely within the barn from the prospective of our outside observers and given that much time delay they will all have agreed that both doors were at some time, more or less simultaneously closed. You cant do this without the time dilation effect within the barn as you will get different observers disagreeing on when both doors were closed but I wont repeat this old stuff as I know you must know it already and its importance to simultaneity arguments.

Ok so do you now agree that we actually have a circumstance where we can indeed argue that a longer rod has indeed fitted nicely within the barn for almost a whole second.

Alternatively now it gets more tricky, even with these simplified extremes of now trying to show that from our rods prospective it will also measure more distance within the barn, as now we also have Lorentz contraction effects to also account for and they become more significant because it is in free fall. This is because of the way one gains speed when traveling through a gravitational lens and because objects traveling faster measure shorter as well as measuring a shorter path from their prospective it makes this whole thing more complicated. So try doing this where the rod is prevented from gaining speed relative to its prospective of the black hole and it will become more obvious that it will indeed measure more distance inside the barn than it would have estimated before it entered. Doing this you will need to remember that we have two ends of the rod where we can also place observers and we need to show where both have sufficient time to agree that they are able to observe both doors closed and or observe more space within the barn than they would have originally predicted from viewing the outside of the barn before entering.

Note that this alternative theory leads to the idea that an infinite time dilation equals an infinite space expansion, assuming anything infinite is ever actually approachable. This leads to the idea that black holes will have a minimal orbit that on after passing it, all

later orbits become longer. It gives essentially the same predictions as those given for inflation theory, if you could be inside of a black hole when it forms.

>>*Philosophical doublespeak and balderdash. I say the question of if the universe is eternal is a scientific question whose answer depends on how well it fits with observation – the best current thinking is it had a beginning and will have an end.*

[snip]

Note how the above theory suggests a multiverse much older than our short 15 billion years and looks at how new universes are created giving a new prospective to what is eternal.

It also predicts white holes and that could in principle put new questions on the idea of the size of the universe.

Dale