

Re: The Big Bang's Little Problem

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-03/13395.html>

From: jonathan (*Write_at_Instead.com*)

Date: 03/26/05

Date: Sat, 26 Mar 2005 11:52:49 -0500

<guskz@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:1111836313.517152.52020@f14g2000cwb.googlegroups.com...

> *Nick wrote:*

> > *If the universe started without gravity it violated the No*

> > *Boundary proposal. No curvature/gravity in the begining?*

> >

> *I'm no science expert but:*

>

> - *The big bang was called Chaos by the Greeks.*

>

> *The universe may have to be viewed differently and perhaps:*

Yes it does need a new perspective. Have you considered that the properties of living systems provide an understanding of the physical universe? Why is it assumed that the customary opposite frame of reference is the correct perspective?

Through complexity science, see intro link below, an ...abstract... mathematical form of Darwinian evolution is gained. Which allows the true source of order to be seen in a universal way.

<http://users.ox.ac.uk/~quee0818/complexity/complexity.html>

>

> - *consider matter/substance only as a localised density of energy and*

> *as an amplitude of energy from a manifestation of Newton's inertia*

> *momentum law.*

Consider matter and energy in the same way as a cloud. Which stands poised at the critical point or phase transition between condensation and evaporation. A persistent storm or edge of chaos state where systems move spontaneously to a more ordered state and then self-tune to the optimum.

Consider the universe in the same way. As a system at the critical point between gravity and cosmic

expansion.

When any system resides midway or at the transition between its static and chaotic forms then self organization spontaneously occurs, and the system evolves to produce new emergent properties not predictable from the components.

It is these higher level emergent properties that produce the self-tuning or evolving nature of any system whether material or living. A market force for instance. The properties that guide the universe and all order flow from the whole, not the parts, are ethereal in character and are most strongly seen in the highest forms of order..
.....through life and Darwin.

Not particle physics!

The physical universe is NOT understood by looking at quarks or quasars, but by a passing cloud or a simple bloom of flowers.

Jonathan

s

- >
- > – *consider gravity/magnetic forces as perhaps individual*
- > *transmission/reception frequencies where the signals move toward their*
- > *"least" restrictive path.*
- >
- > – *consider massless light as a perturbation or resonance of vacuum*
- > *space/ether or the smallest permissible form of energy/quantum.*
- >
- > – *consider that possibly there is no void & possibly all existence must*
- > *remain "with-in" the big bang's energy field/bubble.*
- >
- > – *consider why 3or4 viewable dimensions why not 200.*
- >
- > – *consider there is no energy and that it's sum total = zero which they*
- > *explain as possibly the positive & negative universe or the outcome of*
- > *Newton's action/reaction law.*
- >
- > – *consider curvature (why 3or4 if the straight arrow of time also*
- > *curves), gravity, boundary as possibly a transmission/reception*
- > *manifestation of Newton's action/reaction law where the only void(s) (ant*
- > *thus "room/space" for travel) that is formed is through Newton's laws*
- > *on action(inertia/momentum) to which must be re-filled (curvature &*
- > *boundary) by the reaction.*
- >
- > – *consider time(4d) = "total energy transmitted by the big bang who's*

sci.physics: Re: The Big Bang's Little Problem

> *propagation velocity(time/frequency) is limited by the "sectional 2d"*
> *distance(span) created by the volume(why 3d) of the big bang's total*
> *energy" (All d's are inter-related).*

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

> > *What about unification? If there was mass there was gravity.*

> > *Can't get around it.*

> > *But if that mass started as a singularity the gravity of*

> > *this universal mass would make it a black hole.*

> > *And black holes don't expand.*

> >

> > *So if there was no gravity it was only because there was*

> > *no mass yet – as a singularity. Mass was created spread*

> > *apart and flung outward. That way the gravity of mass*

> > *can be overcome by inflation/expansion.*

> >

> > *It can clearly be seen that space-time expanded outward*

> > *from a single point. So there was a space-time singularity*

> > *but there was no "mass" singularity.*

> > *Mitch -- Gravity is a Continuum --*

>

-----== Posted via Newsfeeds.Com – Unlimited–Uncensored–Secure Usenet News==-----

<http://www.newsfeeds.com> The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World! 120,000+ Newsgroups

-----= East and West–Coast Server Farms – Total Privacy via Encryption =-----