

# Re: Euclids postulates and non-Euclidean geometry

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2006-03/msg01025.html>

---

- *From:* "Hexenmeister" <[vanquish@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:vanquish@xxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sat, 11 Mar 2006 22:52:27 GMT
- 

"Spaceman" <[Realspace@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Realspace@xxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:g8ydnSW5W5P0so7ZRVn-gw@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:g8ydnSW5W5P0so7ZRVn-gw@xxxxxxxxxxxx)  
|  
| "T Wake" <[taswakeAt@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:taswakeAt@xxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
| [news:0M6dnUV8PoLxt47ZRVny1Q@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:0M6dnUV8PoLxt47ZRVny1Q@xxxxxxxxxxxx)  
| > "Spaceman" <[Realspace@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Realspace@xxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
| > [news:psadnaZX28W6g47ZnZ2dnUVZ\\_sidnZ2d@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:psadnaZX28W6g47ZnZ2dnUVZ_sidnZ2d@xxxxxxxxxxxx)  
| >>  
| >> "T Wake" <[taswakeAt@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:taswakeAt@xxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
| >> [news:u6qdnWR1GtbwhI7ZRVnysg@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:u6qdnWR1GtbwhI7ZRVnysg@xxxxxxxxxxxx)  
| >>>  
| >>>> If everything is truly recessing from everything than somewhere  
| >>>> there is a middle of such.  
| >>>  
| >>> It is common to think this, yet it seems to not be true.  
| >>  
| >> Seems to?  
| >  
| > Yes. As in all the observational evidence points to that.  
| >  
| >> The way you are describing the universe expansion is a way  
| >> which no age could be determined at all.  
| >  
| > Only if age was solely determined by the expansion.  
| >  
| > Despite what you say here the age of the universe has been determined  
and  
| > there has been no centre identified.  
|  
| How do you think the age was determined then?  
|  
| >>> Everything we can measure is recessing from everything else, yet there  
| >>> is no determinable centre.  
| >>  
| >> How do you know they are recessing if you can not provide  
| >> a recession point?

Re: Euclids postulates and non-Euclidean geometry

|>  
|> They recess from everything else. Everything becomes the recession point  
|> for all other objects in the universe. We see them recess from Earth. We  
|> see them recess from each other.

|  
| Aha,  
| "You are the center of your universe" type thought processing..  
| LOL

|>>> I can only explain this by resorting to a two dimensional analogy,  
| which  
|>>> you refuse to accept as relevant, so it really is up to you to work  
| out  
|>>> how you visualise this.

|>>  
|>> You can't explain it using 2 dimensions only because that would ignore  
|>> the reality of 3 dimensions.  
|>> so even if you do such, it would be an ignorant explanation only.  
|>  
|> Exactly. Therefore I didnt try to explain this to you.

|  
| You can't explain such a fantasy because it involves too much  
| fantasy to be discussed here.

|>>> Well, no. Everything in the explosion is recessing from the centre.

|>>  
|>> Yup,  
|>> Just like the universe.

|>  
|> With the difference being the Universe has no centre.

|  
| So where does the age of the universe come from?  
| And how could a big bang be a cause if no bang point  
| has been found?

|>> That is how astronomers gathered an age from such also.

|>  
|> Really? How do you know this? Where is the centre these astronomers  
| used?

|  
| Ask them,  
| They may show you with the hubble.  
| How do you get an age of the universe if you don't have  
| a point where the big bang supposedly occured to find out  
| how "long" stuff has been expanding from that point?

## Re: Euclids postulates and non-Euclidean geometry

|>>> Study the blast patterns and shockwave intensity from a blast and you  
|>>> can see that everything in an explosion is recessing from the point of  
|>>> the explosion. Often this creates a blast which fills a three  
|>>> dimensional volume but is not made up of particles recessing from each  
|>>> other at increasing speeds.

|>>>

|>>> In the universal model it is different.

|>>

|>> No,

|>> It is the same, only much larger with more mass.

|>

|> Nope. It is different. If you dont believe me look at explosive blast

|> studies. Compare that to astronomical data. The two do not match.

|

| The only differences are gravity differences.

| simple as that.

|

|

|> Where was it guessed to be? The age of the universe provides no clue as

to

|> the centre.

|

| When are you going to show how an age could be determined at all

| without a point that the supposed big bang ocured?

| .

|

|>> Where everything is receding from.

|>> Duh!

|>

|> Everything recedes from everything else.

|

| You have a problem there.

| if everything recedes from everything else,

| there needs to be a point they would all recede from.

| Why don't you get that?

|

|> There is still no centre.

|

| Yes there must be or you have no proof that everything

| is receding from everything else.

|

|

|> Can you show me on a star map where the centre is please?

|

| Can you show me how you can get an age of the universe

| without such?

| Can you show me how a big bang could be plausible without a

| center of occurance at all?

|

|

|> Yet you have visualised the universe in a manner that is not consistent

## Re: Euclids postulates and non-Euclidean geometry

| > with the actual data. And you think this puts me at fault. Interesting.

| I have done no such thing,

| You are the one trying to do such,

| You are creating an expansion that has no expansion point.

| > Each large scale structure provides its own centre. Everything expands

| > from everything else. Where is the centre for that?

| In the center that everything is expanding from.

| Sheesh you are about as dense as a black hole..

| LOL

| >> You truly are lost..

| >

| > Why? How do you think the age of the universe was determined?

| By guessing at the center when the stuff is expanding at a slower rate  
| still.

| You truly are only proving to be a troll that is ignoring and  
| repeating the same questions over even though I gave answers  
| that fit the situations perfectly fine.

| You still have not shown how expansion of all can not have a center  
| of expansion.

| You also have not shown how an age of the universe could be  
| determined at all using your "joke" non center approach.

| You need to get your head examined I think.

| You have lost all logical thought processes somehow.

The word is "recede".

Recede:

Function: intransitive verb

Inflected Form(s): receded; receding

Etymology: Middle English, from Latin recedere to go back, from re- + cedere

to go: to move back or away : WITHDRAW

to slant backward

to grow less or smaller

**DIMINISH, DECREASE**

synonyms RECEDE, RETREAT, RETRACT, BACK mean to move backward. RECEDE implies a gradual withdrawing from a forward or high fixed point in time or space <the flood waters gradually receded>. RETREAT implies withdrawal from a point or position reached <retreating soldiers>. RETRACT implies drawing back from an extended position <a cat retracting its claws>. BACK is used with up, down, out, or off to refer to any retrograde motion <backed off on the throttle>.

## Re: Euclids postulates and non-Euclidean geometry

Recess:

a hidden, secret, or secluded place or part

INDENTATION, CLEFT <a deep recess in the hill>

ALCOVE <a recess lined with books>

a suspension of business or procedure often for rest or relaxation <children playing at recess>

The age of the universe has not been determined and nobody has seen recession. The data is "light from distant galaxies is red shifted."

The cause is unknown, scientists (real scientists, that is) do not make assumptions, assumptions are invariably incorrect.

One may advance hypotheses, but hypotheses are not proof or evidence.

Father Androcles, Astronomer.

.