

## Re: The Origin of The Universe / S D Rodrian [vs. the eternal existence of the universe]

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-01/9840.html>

---

**From:** glbrad01 (glbrad01\_at\_insightbb.com)

**Date:** 01/26/05

Date: Wed, 26 Jan 2005 08:31:38 GMT

"robert j. kolker" <nowhere@nowhere.net> wrote in message  
news:35n5gaF4k6ue8U1@individual.net...

>

>

> glbrad01 wrote:

>>

>>

>> *And how would you deal in qualities rather than quantities? Or are  
>> there no qualities to the Universe?*

>

> *The only qualities that matter are those than can be quantified somehow.*

> *If one cannot measure and reproducibly demonstrate then one is wallowing*

> *in subjectivity. The entire thrust of modern science is to discover that*

> *which is invariant and reproducible under shift of subjective view point.*

> *In the last analysis, science is the View From Nowhere In Particular.*

>

> *To pure quality, incapable of quantification, I say boo hiss. Begone*

> *subjectivity!*

>

> *Bob Kolker*

Then it is apparent you don't like superstring theory and its infinities, or least multitudes of alternative universes, or the science of complexity, or the theory of chaos. Also, as I've continuously pointed out, Relativity is invariably relative, which does not make it wrong but universally subjective rather than universally objective. Universally virtual rather than universally real. Distortion is not local to looking out upon the universe from just the Earth via a definitive form of tunnel vision (I now call it 'virtual space-time continuum'). It is applicable to any reference frame whatsoever in the universe similar to ours.

The deadliest problem to modern physics though, the past of physics need not enter into this issue, is how blind we are regarding the real space, in real time, of the universe (u) at large, the simultaneousness of the universe (u) at large. We are observing histories to varying degrees out

there, but everything in the universe is in motion, highly dynamic rather than static, so nothing we see of histories can actually have occurred exactly where we see it to have occurred.

Other than that we are looking at a physic rather than the universe (u). Light to be exact. Analogous, we are studying very hard the paper upon which the information is written. We are studying all out the messenger that brought the message...as the physics and cosmology of a far flung universe. We are looking as hard as we can at a light-time frame (at light-time frames), the very framing itself, the thing itself in which the transmission of information is inlaid, the physic of light, the physic of x-ray, or the physic of microwave.

We are in no way considering the distortion of the transmitter itself, we take it so much for granted. Close up it isn't very much of a problem. It is only a little problem in studying the solar system, and only little bigger problem in trying to see, analyze and deduct the Milky Way. From then on the distortion of the physic of the messenger itself overlaying and into the message, merging with the message as if it belonged there in the message, grows ever more serious and deadly to our interpretation of the message (the universe).

Brad