Re: Does Time Obey The inverse Square Law???

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004−10/2054.html

---

From: glbrad01 (*glbrad01_at_insightbb.com*)
Date: 10/07/04

Date: Thu, 07 Oct 2004 10:02:40 GMT

Your wrong in the time of "13 billion years." If light travels 78 billion years, 78 billion light years, that sets the time and the time cannot be less. Thanks for correcting my own post concerning this figure−−I put it at 76 billion light years by mistake−−though you weren't addressing my post.

The claim is that we are looking out farther and ever farther back in time to the beginning of the Universe. This presupposes time does not turnover, that it is an "arrow" one end of which is the so−called Big Bang, there and then, and the other end is the Earth, here and now (at least here). No change, no event, occurs at this end, "now," that does not blow up the balloon some more and lengthen the arrow that much more. Not a single second passes on Earth, or rather at this end, that the arrow does not correspondingly lengthen by one more light second and the Universe expand by exactly that much in space−time (300,000 kilometers more of spatial increase to the Universe, radially−−blowing up the entire bubble or balloon that much more, to that one second's passage in time (300,000 kilometers per second)).

Of course there is no space whatsoever along the arrow between Earth here and now and the Big Bang there and then, regardless of the fact that Stephen Hawking himself, in his immensely popular book "A Brief History of Time," said that if we were to travel out from the Earth, in space, in the direction of the Big Bang, we would be traveling back in time (through space). Such was even illustrated in the book as a bubble with a flat lens, representing the Universe, at its equator half way between the beginning in the so−called Big Bang and the end (at the time thought to be the "Big Crush"). Now they simply have it as a big cone shape telescoping out with the lens of the flat Universe at the large aperture end−−of course. As to Hawking, he has done a lot of mind changing since that time, I do believe. It doesn't matter though, change is turnover, as in a wheel turning, it is not an arrow. A wheel turning usually has reasonably straight spokes running from the turning hub to the equally turning rim, and if the hub is zero, and the rim is the distant horizon, the wheel will have rolled in turnover of time forever and will roll in turnover of time forever. The Universe could be infinite in space, eternal in time, but the spokes running out in straight lines from any zero time point or hub (time at 300,000 kilometers per second, 300,000 kilometers of space to each and every second of time, is exactly zero) to the distant horizon or rim−−be it 13.7 billion light years

or 78 billion light years, or whatever length−−will have measurably finite total length.

How old are the galaxies observed at a distance of 13.4 billion light years distant from Earth. Cosmologists assume only 300 million years old. They assumed this at the time of discovery since they assumed the Universe to be 13.7 billion years old. By that distance, or at some distance not far beyond that and maybe even short, to well short, of it, I presume quantum accumulation and effects, and a lot of gravitation and gravitational effects accumulating between, in the picture of time between here and now and there and then will begin to change the picture, warp it in as yet unknown ways, and play awesome tricks upon astronomers and cosmologists in the same way Planck predicted quantum effects would accumulate to the point of quantum chaos and vast warping in the picture the farther the distance looked down into in nuclear−−inner−−space. Whether toward the infinite or towqrd the infinitesimal, the attempted reach in looking across ever increasing distance will end in collapse, a collapsed horizon that will not be penetrated or resolved any further from this awesome distance in time from it. We may still see something there, or detect something there, but it will have nothing to do reality on the spot. Relativity, vis−a−vis time between here and now and there and then, will have broken down totally, starting its breakdown from the end of our noses moving outward in space and time toward those far reaches. We just lose relativity far faster, far nearer, for space than for time but the losses regarding relativity, both the nearer and the farther, just accelerate in loss. Relativity accelerates in its breakdown with all accumulating distance between entities in either space or time, or even in velocity. Unreality begins invading, corrupting and gradually taking over the picture with continually accumulating distance and accumulating complexity and chaos. To the Universe though, probably even "unreality" has its place, its own clearly identifiable entity, and its uses to the Universe and maybe to us into the bargain.

Brad

"Patrick Powers" <frisbieinstein@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:9511688f.0410062216.ff5184a@posting.google.com...
> herbertglazier@webtv.net (G=EMC^2 Glazier) wrote in message
> news:<18333−416138D0−143@storefull−3171.bay.webtv.net>...
>> It must if speed,and gravity can change its rate of flow.We know time is
>> not a constant. Clocks tick at different speeds in different areas of
>> the cosmos. Does the accelerating expansion of space slow time? One
>> could create a theory that goes like this."Time runs slower the closer
>> you get to the universe's expanding horizon." If the universe's
>> horizon speed is now faster than the speed of light(no reason why not)
>> things could get very tricky. Bert
>
> Some original thinking here. But the universe's expanding horizon is
> just like the rainbow: you can't get any closer to it or further from
> it no matter what you do.
>
>

>> If the universe's
>> horizon speed is now faster than the speed of light(no reason why not)
>
> You have confused two things: the horizon and change of the curvature
> radius of the universe. Distance to horizon <= curvature radius of
> the universe.
> Distance to horizon = 30 billion light years.
> Curvature radius >= 78 billion light years. Could be infinite.
>
> After that I don't really understand the relationship very well. but
> you are right: the universe is only 13 billion years old but the
> horizon is much further than that, and the reason is the increase in
> the curvature radius.