

Re: The oldest explosion in the universe

# Re: The oldest explosion in the universe

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2006-03/msg01010.html>

---

- *From:* Sam Wormley <[swormley1@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:swormley1@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sat, 11 Mar 2006 20:59:24 GMT
- 

uri wrote:

Sam Wormley wrote:

o really bright stars are just a few million years old.

How do we know that?

Study stellar evolution obeying the laws of physics.  
If you would like references, I will provide.

o the further out one looks, the further back in time one peers.

But what is time?

You used the phrase "14 billion years ago". Think about time  
in the context that you used it.

o the big bang simply says the universe was smaller, hotter and  
denser in the past.

## Re: The oldest explosion in the universe

All the big bang says is that all the light and heat in the universe was once packed into a single point.

No, no, no, no, no... that's not what the big bang says.

Hubble made an presumption that by

the light that reaches us we can measure distances in the cosmos. So it all boils down to the way we measure distances (using metrics).

Hubble proposed in 1929 that almost all galaxies were moving away from the Milky Way. He postulated that recessional velocity was directly proportional to distance  $r$

We have overlapping measures that work well for measuring large distances.

<http://www.mhhe.com/physsci/astronomy/fix/student/chapter23/23f23.html>

But redshift can also be intrinsic and the speed of light need not be constant at all. Therefore i like the QSS theory better.

On cosmic scales, Doppler shifts are negligible.

<http://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0602500>