

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-07/8784.html>

From: Ole D. Rughede (ole.rughede_at_privat.dk)

Date: 07/27/04

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 2004 17:32:54 +0200

"Bill Hobba" <bhobba@rubbish.net.au> skrev i en meddelelse
news:SVhNc.18267\$K53.9584@news-server.bigpond.net.au...

>

> "Ole D. Rughede" <ole.rughede@privat.dk> wrote in message

> news:4104eeaa\$0\$229\$edfadb0f@dread11.news.tele.dk...

>>

>> "Bill Hobba" <bhobba@rubbish.net.au> skrev i en meddelelse

>> news:JvZMc.16817\$K53.2438@news-server.bigpond.net.au...

>>>

>>> "Ole D. Rughede" <ole.rughede@privat.dk> wrote in message

>>> news:4103bd4d\$0\$305\$edfadb0f@dread11.news.tele.dk...

>>>>

>>>> "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?

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> 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."
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Run that but me again – how does induction show that the universe
is
>>>>>>>>>> eternal? Induction only gives us hypothesis – not facts.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> 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.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> That simply does not make sense. I claim the sun rises every day
>>> because
>>>>> I
>>>>>>>>>> have deduced that from past experience – ie I have used
induction –
>> but
>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>> does not guarantee it will rise tomorrow – it is simply a working
>>>> hypothesis
>>>>>>>>>> I have confidence in. Indeed someone could decide to unleash
> nuclear
>>>>>>>>>> Armageddon and whether you like it or not there is a good chance
> after
>>>>> such
>>>>>>>>>> the earth will be blown to smithereens and the sun defiantly will
> not*

> > > rise
> > > > tomorrow (at least over the earth)
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > 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.
> > > >
> > > > But that does not prove it will continue to do so – I certainly
> believe
> > it
> > > will – but proof is another matter.
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > 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.
> > > >
> > > > Sorry – it can never be enormous enough to prove a hypothesis
> deduced
> by
> > > > induction; because to verify it you must observe every occurrence
of
> it
> > > now
> > > > and forever; which is clearly impossible.
> > > >
> > > > > 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.*
> > > >
> > > > *What is implicit is that general statements like Maxwell's*
equations
> > > > *describe classical electrodynamics are purely provisional – a new*
> > > > *experiment*
> > > > *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.*
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > *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."*
> > > > >
> > > > > *I believe existence exists, but that is a belief on my part – it*
is
> > *not*
> > > > > *something I can prove any more than I can prove the sun will rise*
> > > > *tomorrow.*
> > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > *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.
> > > > >
> > > > > Would they? How do you know that? Conservation laws ie energy
can
> > not
> > > be
> > > > > created or destroyed but only converted from one form to another –
> is
> > > that
> > > > > what your invoking? But how do you know that is true? The
answer
> > > > physics
> > > > > provides is symmetry – but we have broken symmetries and
> conservation
> > > laws
> > > > > we thought were true are not. The fact is in science everything,
it
> > > does
> > > > > not matter how obvious it is to you, depends on correspondence
with
> > > > > experiment – that is all that counts – and that is the fundamental
> > > lesson
> > > > of
> > > > > science. All these philosophical considerations are gloss and
dross
> > > > > compared to the results of experiment.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > > 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.*
> > > >
> > > > *True – but that in no way deprives them of their provisional*
> > *character.*
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > * *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*
> > > > >
> > > > > *Experiments are not deductions – they are questions we ask of*
nature
> > *to*
> > > > *see*
> > > > > *how she works. They either disprove theories, confirm them or*
> *suggest*
> > > *new*
> > > > *ones.*
> > > > >
> > > > > > *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.*
> > > > >
> > > > > *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.*
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > > *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.*
> > > > >
> > > > > *Everything in the universe has substance? Do electric fields have*
> > > > > *substance?*
> > > > >
> > > > > *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.*
> > > > >
> > > > > *Yet you claim induction tells us truth.*
> > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > *Is the universe infinite of time? No,*
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > *That is the usual definition of eternal – I suggest all your doing*
> > > > > > *is*
> > > > > > *playing word games.*
> > > > > >
> > > > > > *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.*
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > *The universe conceivably may be infinite in all directions –*
> > *scientists*
> > > > > *suspect it is not – but that is a matter of observation – not*
> > *something*
> > > > > *that must a-priori be.*
> > > > >
> > > > > *Nor are there any particular infinite*
> > > > > *objects, for that would be a gross contradiction in terms.*
> > > > >
> > > > > *I suggest you acquaint yourself with the works of Cantor.*
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > *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.*
>>>>>
>>>>> *I have a book sitting here in front of me called 'Introduction to*
> *the*
>>>> *Theory*
>>>>> *of Infinitesimals' by Stroyan and Luxemburg. It is a book on a*
>> *subject*
>>>>> *called Non Standard Analysis. Its whole basis is that infinity and*
>>>>> *infinitesimals (the inverse of infinity) are not only logically*
>> *consistent*
>>>> *but*
>>>>> *have powerful applications to mathematical analysis eg it can be*
> *used*
>> *to*
>>>>> *give rigor to hand wavy arguments used in numerical analysis and*
has
>>> *many*
>>>>> *practical application see*
>>>>> *<http://members.tripod.com/PhilipApps/nonstandard.html>. In non*
>> *standard*
>>>>> *analysis infinitesimals exist and the reciprocal of an*
infinitesimal
>> *is*
>>>>> *infinity.*
>>>>>
>>>>>> *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.*
>>>>>
>>>>> *It can be known as well as any mathematical theory can be known –*
>>> *logical*
>>>>> *consistency is all that counts. BTW I think Kant is a crock of*
> *crap –*
>>> *he*
>>>>> *was destroyed not by philosophers but by mathematicians – Gauss,*
>> *Riemann*
>>>> *and*
>>>>> *Hilbert savaged him. To be fair however I have had discussions*
with
>>> *Kant*
>>>>> *scholars that disagree.*
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> *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.*
>>>>>
>>>>> *Scientists that advocate the BB do so for a very fundamental*
> *reason –*
>>> *you*
>>>>> *should acquaint yourself with the The Hawking–Penrose singularity*

> > > *theorem*
> > > > *which shows that provided some very reasonable assumptions that*
most
> > > > *physicists would not choose to doubt are made (see Wald – Generals*
> > > > *Relativity for the details) then the universe must have been a*
> > > *singularity*
> > > > *some time in the past. If you wish to doubt it then it would be*
> > > > *reasonable*
> > > > *for you to detail which assumption of the theorem you wish to*
> *dispute.*
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > *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.*
> > > > >
> > > > > *Irrelevant – science is concerned with correspondence with*
> > *experiment –*
> > > > *that*
> > > > > *is all. Other issues are simply gloss and dross ie a beat up by*
> *those*
> > > *who*
> > > > > *wish to make the issue into something it is not.*
> > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > *Steven Speicher, a scientist who posts on HPO, remarked that*
most
> > > > > > *scientists leave their religious views at the door when they go*
to
> > > *work.*
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > *Steven Speicher is a person who at one time posted a lot on*
> > > > > > *sci.physics.reality and is a person I have great respect for.*
On
> > *the*
> > > > > *above he is 100% correct.*
> > > > >
> > > > > >

>>>>>
>>>>>> *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.*
>>>>>>
>>>>>> *That is not what the BB theory says – it says that is started as a*
>>> *quantum*
>>>>>> *fluctuation is a primordial 'quantum soup' that inflated into the*
>>>> *universe*
>>>>>> *we see around us – it did not start from nothing. If you believe*
>>>> *otherwise*
>>>>>> *please point me to the scientist that claims otherwise.*
>>>>>>
>>>>>> *And from where or what should that 'quantum soup' have been*
>>>>>> *invented, created, cooked and served by whom for inflation?*
>>>>
>>>> *Its technical name is the false vacuum.*
>>>>
>>>> *You avoid answering the question!*
>>>>
> *Not really. Adjectives like 'cooked and served' are emotive terms used to*
> *denigrate a theory and do not require a response other than to show they*
are
> *irrelevant in this context. The fact is any hypothesis in accord with*
> *observation is a valid scientific hypothesis – how it was 'invented,*
> *created, cooked and served by whom' is an irrelevant issue designed to*
shift
> *the discussion to one of how the person feels about the hypothesis rather*
> *than the only issue – how well it fits observation.*
>>>>>>>

You still did not answer my question: where the 'quantum soup' of the 'false vacuum' should have come from and in which way it should have been 'created'? (With the purpose of giving man a subject of unscientific

beliefs and wild speculations!).

>>>

>>>> *What came first, the hen or the egg,*

>>>

>>>> *Blowed if I know – speak to an evolutionary biologist.*

>>>

>>>> *and which went into the soup?*

>>>

>>>> *It is assumed to contain something whose technical name is the 'false*

>>>> *vacuum' See <http://nedwww.ipac.caltech.edu/level5/Guth/Guth3.html>. I*

>>>> *called it a 'quantum soup' to indicate it properties were strongly*

>>>> *governed*

>>>> *by the laws of QM.*

>>>

>>>> *Which 'fluctuations' caused by what should make the soup inflate?*

>>>

>>>> *From the link written by the originator of the theory:*

>>

>> *There is no theory, just wild speculations.*

>

> *Any hypothesis consistent with observation is a valid theory – you wish to*

> *describe it as 'wild speculation' for purposes of your own. Such tactics*

is

> *not part of legitimate intellectual debate.*

>

You have logical rules for what may be hypothesized!

>>>

>>>> *'There are many versions of inflationary theories but generically they*

>>>> *assume that some small patch of the early Universe somehow came to be*

in

> *a*

>>>> *false vacuum state Various possibilities have been discussed,*

including

>>>> *supercooling during a phase transition in the early Universe, or a*

> *purely*

>>>> *random fluctuation of the fields. A chance fluctuation seems*

reasonable

>>> *even*

>>>> *if the probability is low, since the inflating region will enlarge by*

> *many*

>>>> *orders of magnitude, while the non-inflating regions will remain*

>>>> *microscopic. Inflation is a wildfire that will inevitably take over*

the

>>>> *forest, as long as there is some chance that it will start. '*

>>>

>> *You mean there are many inventors of inflationary theories?*

>

> *There was only one inventor – Alan Guth – there are many variants all of*

> *which fits the facts. Thus it is a group of theories – not a single*

theory.

>

- > > *And many speculations about unknown chain-reactions called 'wildfire'?*
- >
- > *What you wish to denigrate by use of the word 'speculation' serious*
- > *scientists call theories. Of course a theory is a speculation but your*
- > *choice of words and not the usual scientific nomenclature, and the desire to*
- > *draw a distinction, would seem designed for a particular purpose –*
- > *denigration of t*