Re: Expansion is wrong and its soooo freakin' obvious

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008−05/msg01293.html

- *From*: jjsajd@xxxxxxxxx
- *Date*: Sat, 17 May 2008 09:02:36 −0700 (PDT)

On May 17, 3:37 am, Michael Helland <mobyd...@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:
<snip>

> > What the universe isn't some lazy person, these are irrelevant
> > comments which even push the envelope for youMike...
>
> Not lazy.
>
> Beautifully efficient.

Yet your ignorant as all hell so obviously your efficiency isn't worth
shit...

<Snip>

> > Because this is not an observed behavior... go learn about EM
> > theory...
>
> If the EM force had a range and began to die out at about 60 Mpc;
>
> we would observe:
>
> first. a loss in frequency starting about there (which we do)
>
> second. very very large galaxies and very distant galaxy whose light
> is being received as point like objects (which we do, quasars)
>
> third: very very faint light from even farther galaxies just limping
> in before everything goes black (which we does as the CMB black body)

Of course that is all crap because deceleration runs into problems with the conservation of energy. Reason for why the photons would slow down. Tolman Surface brightness test (which you still don't get), the fact that redshift has nothing to do with light slowing down since photons propagate at c, and the energy is not lost it is merely a relative observer phenomena.

> We observe all the things that would show up if the EM force had a finite range.

NO we observe things that are consistent with expansions SR, GR.... not deceleration. If you ever took the time to read anything about the topic you'd see that actually all this theory you never bothered to learn actually disproves. But to go through it is a waste since you can't grok even basic math such as spherical harmonics...

> If I'm wrong, make some predictions that an EM force with a finite range (say, 100 billion light years) would lead to and cite observations that falsify them.

I have, Tolman surface brightness test, redshift, SR, GR, conservation of energy.... all these things point to you being wrong.... as I have explained already.

<snip, mike peeing in his panties>

<snip, questions mike dodges because he is to dumb to have an answer>

> > Really so what about the conservation of energy which a good principle to apply...
>
> It is good.
>
> But maybe it doesn't apply to every thing in the Universe.

Maybe you don't know shit about what it applies to, so maybe you should take your idiot mind and apply it to some physics reading. Ever heard of Noethers Theorem?

Oh yeah and you never answered can you solve Maxwell's equations?

> Maybe it has limits that begin to appear in interactions that reach 60
> Mpc in distance.

Except it doesn't and this would violate observation.... such as
redshift, and the conservation of energy....

<snip, mike peeing himself again>

Cheers
.