

T\_Wake, can't you count that high ?

# T\_Wake, can't you count that high ?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2006-06/msg01229.html>

---

- *From:* Jeff&Relf <[Jeff\\_Relf@xxxxxxxxx](mailto:Jeff_Relf@xxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 10 Jun 2006 04:09:33 GMT
- 

Hi T\_Wake, There are lots of missions to test the Cosmic\_Inflation theory, WMAP being the most recent one, the Planck bird for L2 orbit is the next one, to launch in 2007 or 2008.

None of them will find gravity waves because the Planck boundary is purely artificial, ad hoc... bad sci-fi.  
It's only purpose is to avoid wading too deep into the sub-Planck realm.

Nothing is more natural than to assume entropy is intrinsic to mass-energy over cosmic-time, i.e. lambda is ever-constant.

You told me:

Nothing in the big-bang-inflation model suggests there is a "place" where the  $t=0$  event took place. What have you read which says otherwise ?

As I just finished telling Shane and Matt\_Silberstein...

General\_Relativity's lambda,  
( part of the standard model of cosmology, Lambda\_CDM )  
models time as a spatial dimension,  $-ct^{.5}$ ,  
so 13.7 billion years is the same thing as 13.7 billion Light\_Years,  
i.e. it's also a length.

Assuming lambda is ever-constant, it's demarcatable in either degrees Kelvin, entropy ( Joules per Kelvin ), light-years or seconds,  
....whichever best suits you.

You told me:

For now we will avoid the issue of why \_you\_ have decided five is the magic number for the dimensionality of the universe.  
I will pretend ( for a while ) that it isn't arbitrary  
and you actually have reasoned from first principles.

Why do you use a 3D Newtonian model ?  
instead of General\_Relativity's 4D model ?  
is three a magic number for you ? or can't you count that high ?

T\_Wake, can't you count that high ?

T\_Wake, can't you count that high ?