

Re: WMAP: New Satellite Data On Universe's First Trillionth Second

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2006-03/msg01792.html>

- *From:* "G. L. Bradford" <glbrad01@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 17 Mar 2006 15:08:11 GMT
-

A SINGLE SIDED UNIVERSE ONLY! (HAVING ABSOLUTELY NO OTHER SIDE WHATSOEVER!)

Someone in a movie once ask of Big Brother Cylon, "How can there be only one side to a bargain?!" Big Brother's answer, "When there is no other side!" (Thwack!)

Dark Age scientists are always flatly single-sided only! Their cosmologies and universes and worlds (their minds, indoctrination, and premises) are always flatly single-sided only.

Did you notice that if you tried to put that illustration of the universe in a 3-d CAD program it wouldn't work? There's no 'space' in that illustration. No space whatsoever (absolutely zero space). To mean, there's no vacuum in that illustration. No vacuum whatsoever (absolutely zero vacuum). Since there is no "vacuum," ipso-facto there is no "light" nor "speed of light." The light is stop action. The light is stopped. The illustration, like all its counterparts, illustrates a dead-frozen universe having no motion, no movement, no travel, dead end to dead end one-hundred percent entropically inert (one-hundred percent relativistic). No motion at all much less any constant, consistent, variably varying motions throughout.

It's like looking to the far blue mountains from a distance then walking to that spot where they are supposed to be and finding they are still exactly the same distance from you as before you started walking, and where you were then looking to them in the distance is exactly where you are now still looking to them in the same distance. You walked and walked but never once left the exact spot you're standing on. You didn't even make a circle in walking. You walked and walked, and walked, but you didn't move at all. One dimensional scientists [designing] a two-dimensional single-sided only cartoon universe. Big Brother Earth-Utopia couldn't possibly design brainwashing any better than that. The pure fact, though, of modeling a two-dimensional single-sided only cartoon universe and world, and with it Man and Life, and forcing that nothing but inflated (distortionist) cartoon upon all, is a growing real-world reality of World Dystopia (Dark Age's total war).

Distance–time does not mean a cosmological version of Creationism. It does not mean the Cosmopolis is a Toon Town Universe (an inflationary cartoon). The Earth does not begin in time and end in time where you observe its horizon to be; just because it has a distance–time horizon everything that comes toward you comes out of. You can't make each and every car coming out of the constant of the distant horizon of Earth toward you the very first car there ever was in time. But that is exactly what cosmologists try to force with the constant of the distance–time horizon of the universe.

On Earth, though you can't see simultaneous space in the distance, you perceive it all the time as if you see it because the limitations of the speed of light make so little difference at distances on Earth. It makes enormous difference at distances in the universe. It means a multiverse of totally unobservable simultaneous [spaces] or universes, simultaneous with us in time. "Background" is a universal constant, nothing more and nothing less. [Cosmic background this] and [cosmic background that] are universal constants, nothing more and nothing less. They've been made by ideologues (by MEN) to be something more. Of course the universe expands away from us. Of course it accelerates in that expansion away from us. So does the Earth expand away from our local spot of it in all directions toward its horizon in distance–time. So does the Earth accelerate in that expanding away from our local spot of it in all directions. But the distance to the distant horizon, compared to cosmological distances to the distant horizon, is indistinguishable from zero.

You have objects in [ever constant motion traveling] a trillion trillion trillion kilometers from you. The speed of light is 300,000 kilometers per second. Exactly when will light depict the latest change in position and/or velocity, and/or state, of those objects in [ever constant motion traveling] a trillion trillion trillion kilometers from you? The only answer is NEVER. And it is the "ever constant" answer. The horizon of observability collapses. And it [accelerates] in collapse.

Not so long ago an object was spotted to be in a galaxy some hundreds of millions of light years from us with a redshift to it that told us that particular object was not hundreds of millions of light years from us but many billions of light years from us. The galaxy was hundreds of light years away, the object [within it] was several billion light years away. What is the outside limit of the speed of an implosion of a titanic object imploding in on itself? And what would be the shift of the light from its collapse [away] in horizon seen from any great distance away from it? It created an optical illusion of vastly different distance from the distance of its surrounding neighborhood. Its horizon of observability accelerated in collapse to a degree matched only by the corresponding acceleration in collapse of the universal horizon of observability, creating the same correspondingly same degree of redshift. Was it a so–called nearer Big Bang object? No. But in relative differential nearer in time, it matched up with a whole lot of relative differential in time farther. The breakdown of

Re: WMAP: New Satellite Data On Universe's First Trillionth Second

relativity matched up with THE BREAKDOWN OF RELATIVITY, as marked by the degree of redshift.

Today's scientists cannot afford to believe in any "breakdown of relativity," or that graduating redshifting of light would visibly mark such graduating occurrence. Or that other things as well might also mark such occurrence. And in place of "nothing" there being in place "optical illusion." A distant picture that is not the reality and never was the reality.

But who in cosmology today deals in any reality, or even any perception of reality, in the first place? First of all they would have to be skeptical of distant pictures. They are not skeptical concerning them. They talk the talk of dead certainty.

GLB

.