

Re: Explanation of why expansion redshift optical illusion of a different kind of redshift

## Re: Explanation of why expansion redshift optical illusion of a different kind of redshift

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-04/msg02244.html>

---

- From: [jjsajd@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jjsajd@xxxxxxxxxx)
  - Date: Wed, 23 Apr 2008 15:01:03 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Apr 23, 5:37 pm, Michael Helland <mobyd...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:  
<snip>

The evidence is the cosmological red shift.

$$f = 1 / t$$

In the expansion model, the space and time involved a long journey for light expand together.

So it satisfies the red shift.

But it could also be just the time that is expanding.

All that means is in  $v = d / t$ , if the distance is static, then  $v$  decreases. It's a deceleration.

and still you have no proof.... it could be, but it just as easily might not, and your not a scientist so... what would you know? what you think its convincing that you toss in a little science jargon here and their? Try this on for size...

$\text{DiracDelta}[\text{Subscript}[x, 1], \text{Subscript}[x, 2], \text{Ellipsis}] == (1/\text{Pi})$   
 $\text{Limit}[\frac{\text{CurlyEpsilon}}{\sqrt{\text{CurlyEpsilon}^2 + \text{Subscript}[x, 1]^2 + \text{Subscript}[x, 2]^2 + \text{Ellipsis}}}, \text{CurlyEpsilon} \rightarrow 0] /;$   
 $\text{Element}[\text{Subscript}[x, k], \text{Reals}]$

You know what it is? Can you solve it? If you were a scientist you'd know....

Oh... right no an no....

Wow this jargon thing is fun... I like string random things together and say they prove something...

Re: Explanation of why expansion redshift optical illusion of a different kind of redshift

My little graphs prove beyond a doubt that data of a decelerating body can be charted over a grid that "zooms" in over to give the illusion that the body is traveling at a constant speed.

no they prove that you can fool yourself into believing you have a point... since chart zooming has nothing to do with nature...

<snip> crap

<snip>

Your graphs prove that your imaginative they have nothing to do with what happens in science.

The world would be so unfair to you if my graphs had any meaning in them.

no not really.... your graphs have no meaning so thats not even a valid concern... and I happen to be perfectly successful as a scientist thanks.... so unlike you I actually know what I am talking about....

You can't bring yourself to even look and see.

I looked I saw, they are meaning less.. they are spew....

<snip>

I know enough to know that if the big bang never happened and space wasn't expanding, that would solve every problem that the big bang faces.

I know that if you stopped posting the quality of this group would increase 100% what's your point? Just like I know that if you're really as dumb as your posts make you look, evolution would have seen to it that you never came about.

Re: Explanation of why expansion redshift optical illusion of a different kind of redshift

<snip>

<snip>

See in the subject where it says expansion is an illusion?

According to that speculative paper, sure, according to your argument your knowledge of science is an illusion. And mike the argument you make never proves expansion is an illusion, in fact the only argument I can detect is for tired light and the rest is spew, which I didn't bother to read...

If you would have taken a minute to read my posts and understand my charts, you'd probably have a clue about what it is I'm saying.

If you learned anything about science you'd understand why everyone is so mean to you, and why you such a complete imbecile.

Cheers

.