

The Naked Scientists Forum

**On the Lighter Side => New Theories => Topic started by: jerrygg38
on 29/11/2008 13:29:11**

Title: **Red Shift Theory**

Post by: **jerrygg38** on **29/11/2008 13:29:11**

THE RED SHIFT THEORY

There are two possible explanations for the red shift. The most common theory is that the far stars are moving away from us near the speed of light. However this conflicts with Einstein's laws of moving objects. The far stars would have to have near infinite kinetic energy to move near the speed of light.

The second possibility is that the light from the far stars loses energy per unit distance of travel. This makes more sense according to the dot-wave theory because the dot-wave energy decreases with time.

To make matters worse for the fast moving galaxy theory is the constraints placed upon our light speed C universe by the multi-light speed universe. Since space is a spectrum of multi-light speed energies, the only thing, which varies, are the dots and the dot-waves. Therefore expanding galaxies at the speed of light cannot fit into a multi-light speed universe.

The cosmology dot-wave theory is an extension of the dot-wave theory. It specifies that the distance between the center of galaxies does not change. Thus the black holes at the center of our major galaxies were formed during the big bang and have remained basically stationary ever since. This does not say that every black hole is stationary. Some smaller black holes may rotate around other black holes. However all black holes will tend to be within a relatively small distance from the inner sphere of our universe which is at 15.9145 Billion light years from the common center. In order to understand the red shift; let us perform a simple experiment, which will help to explain the red shift.

Take a small pebble and throw it in a quiet lake. This represents

the big bang impulse function. Notice that when the rock hits the water, there is a high frequency high amplitude wave at the point of origin or big bang. Notice that as the wave stretches out that the amplitude of the wave and the frequency of the wave decreases. Upon the lake the wave will dissipate. A point is reached where the wave will not be visible. There is friction within the water and thus the wave energy is used up.

This simple experiment shows us what is happening to the photonic waves from the far stars. As the light wave stretches out we find that energy is used up in the stretching of the energy field. Thus the photonic field acts very much like the water wave. By the time the light wave from the far stars reaches us, the energy of the wave is basically zero. All the energy has been used up and the wave will end in space at a distance R_g from each galaxy. As all the waves form a sphere as shown on the cover page, we get a perfect sphere at 31.8 billion light years from the common center of the universe.

At the 31.8 billion light year distance we meet up with the light speed 2 inner sphere with light speed 2 galaxies. Thus our wave ends at the junction of the next higher light speed universe. Likewise our inner sphere at 15.9 light years from the center contains our galaxies and is the surface where the light speed $C/2$ universe ends.

The dot-waves have expanded since the big bang. The photonic and gravitational fields have expanded as well. The galaxies have expanded however they have only expanded a small distance as compared to the photonic, gravitational, and electromagnetic fields.

The photonic waves tend to have collisions with the dots-waves of space. The waves continually hit the large amounts of free space dot-waves, which exist with random motion. The collisions are similar to the general gas laws except they occur at light speed. This damages the photonic waves. Thus the resistance of space decreases the energy of the photonic waves.

As the photonic wave flows outward over long distances, the collisions break up the wave. The wave loses energy per unit time or distance. Thus the universe tends to eat up the energy. The lost energy remains within space. Thus vast areas of space have huge amounts of dot-wave energy in them. However the dot-waves are uniformly distributed and cannot be seen or measured.

The red shift can be defined as:

$$f = f_0 [1 - (R_s/R_g)] \dots \dots \dots (5-2)$$

Equation 5-2 defines the redshift. It states that the frequency of the light wave from the emitting stars equals the original frequency f_0 (after big bang stability) times 1 minus the ratio of the distance from the far stars R_s divided by the radius of the galaxy R_g . At the far stars, the light is white like our stars. As the light wave moves toward us, it gets redder and redder.

It is true that the far galaxies are expanding. This means that their ruler has increased over time. However our ruler has increased as well. Thus the expansion of the dot-waves over time tracks the expansion of the protons and electrons over time. Therefore the expansion is common mode and cannot readily be measured.

The photonic waves coming from the far stars are independent photons photonic waves. Within our Galaxy we have dependent photonic waves. We are all traveling at the same galaxy speed. We are all part of our galaxy's inertial system. All galaxies tend to be independent systems. Therefore we must look at the entire light wave from a galaxy as coming from a different inertial system.

Our measurements of the light waves from far galaxies come from our inertial system. We read a light wave, which has been weakened as it stretched outward at the speed of light. Therefore the light wave that we measure is no different than the water wave we saw by throwing a pebble into a quiet lake.

The photons from our sun are part of the same inertial system as our galaxy. We produce gravitational and photonic waves all over the universe. These waves will reach a maximum radius and die out completely.

We produce describing functions to explain how our light works. This is all well and good for this galaxy. Light waves from a far galaxy flows across many other galaxies before reaching us. Thus independent photonic and gravitational fields interact with each other. Energy is transferred between these fields. The net result is the destruction of the fields into chaos over time.

Another factor for the redshift is the slowing of the light as it passes stars. The high density of space dots surrounding stars cause the photons to slow due to increased permitivity and permeability

constants. As the light nears a sun, the light speed drops. When this happens, the photon takes on the property of mass as per the following formula:

$$M_g = M_o [1 - (V/C)^2]^{1/2} \dots\dots\dots(5-3)$$

Equation 5-3 is a describing function equation of the overall photon. The photon is composed of the bipolar dots. These dots have the capability of being mass dots or photonic dots. When the photon travels at light speed, the multi-dimensional bipolar dot stays in the photonic dimensions. Thus it is basically almost 99.9 percent photon. The bipolar dots photonic dots change into bipolar mass dots some of the time as soon as the photon speed drops.

The net result is that the photon will oscillate between pure photon and partial mass. This will cause some bipolar dot-waves to split into electro-photonic waves and electro-dots. This prevents the photon from moving too far off course. In the process, the photon turns red.

Therefore there are two main parts of the redshift. The collision with space dots acts like friction and wears out the photonic wave. This causes the wave to turn into stationary bipolar dots, stationary electro-dots, and electro-photon dot-waves.

The final process involves the total destruction of the grav-photonic field into the electromagnetic field. As soon as the remains of the photonic wave reaches near the radius of the galaxy, the last mechanical energy turns into electrical energy. This self limits the galaxy field. This process protects and conserves the galaxy energy.

Title: **Red Shift Theory**
Post by: **BenV** on **29/11/2008 14:29:15**

[Quote from: jerrygg38 on 29/11/2008 13:29:11](#)

The most common theory is that the far stars are moving away from us near the speed of light.

That's not the theory I have been told - the stars are moving away, but it doesn't have to be anywhere near the speed of light.

Title: **Red Shift Theory**
Post by: **Bored chemist** on **29/11/2008 18:51:21**

"The far stars would have to have near infinite kinetic energy to move near the speed of light."

"Near infinite" doesn't mean anything. The energy is finite, or it isn't; there are no half measures.

The so called "tired light" hypothesis has been put forward before. There are problems with it.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tired_light

Title: **Red Shift Theory**

Post by: **ukmicky** on **29/11/2008 20:01:04**

[Quote from: Bored chemist on 29/11/2008 18:51:21](#)

There are problems with it.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tired_light

Yes **even i** can see problems with it. [;D]

Title: **Red Shift Theory**

Post by: **jerrygg38** on **30/11/2008 01:06:18**

[Quote from: Bored chemist on 29/11/2008 18:51:21](#)

"The far stars would have to have near infinite kinetic energy to move near the speed of light."

"Near infinite" doesn't mean anything. The energy is finite, or it isn't; there are no half measures.

The so called "tired light" hypothesis has been put forward before. There are problems with it.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tired_light

It is not that the light is tired. The photons slow as they approach stars. When they do they lose energy.

Title: **Red Shift Theory**

Post by: **Bored chemist** on **30/11/2008 14:50:21**

"tired" is a simplification.

Your opening post says "The second possibility is that the light from the far stars loses energy per unit distance of travel." which is exactly the hypothesis known as "tired light". It doesn't work.

Title: **Red Shift Theory**

Post by: **jerrygg38** on **30/11/2008 18:22:16**

[Quote from: Bored chemist on 30/11/2008 14:50:21](#)

"tired" is a simplification.

Your opening post says "The second possibility is that the light from the far stars loses energy per unit distance of travel." which is exactly the hypothesis known as "tired light". It doesn't work.

There are three sources of the red shift. Photons are composed of particle/waves of dot-waves. Space is filled with dot-waves. Photons do not move continuously but move at light speed and then stop and move at light speed again. All along the way photons encounter the dot-waves of space. They collide and energy is transferred to space dots by the photons thus for every unit distance they travel, they lose energy.

Photons also encounter stars. As they pass a star they slow. This makes them spend more time as a particle than a wave. When this happens they are attracted to the star. In order to prevent being pulled into the star the photons convert some of their dots into electro-photonic dot-waves. Thus energy is lost as they pass each star.

Finally the last loss of energy of the photonic waves occurs at a radius of 31.8 billion light years from the common center. At this point the entire photonic wave converts into an electromagnetic wave. This means that when stationary the dots are plus and minus charges. When moving they are moving magnetic point fields. Therefore in the end, no photons are left and the entire material universe has been converted into electromagnetic energy which converges upon a billion points at 15.9 billion years from the common center. Then the big bangs happen again/

Title: **Red Shift Theory**

Post by: **ghostofdavinci** on **06/12/2008 18:48:12**

Doesn't that violate law of conservation of energy?

Title: **Red Shift Theory**

Post by: **jerrygg38** on **06/12/2008 23:37:23**

[Quote from: ghostofdavinci on 06/12/2008 18:48:12](#)

Doesn't that violate law of conservation of energy?

The conservation of energy is not violated. The law is true when we look at the total energy of the universe. This includes the material energy and the photonic energy and most importantly the dark energy.

The total energy at our light speed is a constant. When the photonic energy radiates away and changes into dot-waves, it becomes dark energy as it is invisible energy. Later even the invisible photonic energy become electromagnetic energy. Still the total energy remains constant.

Title: **Red Shift Theory**

Post by: **Bikerman** on **07/12/2008 00:44:29**

Expansion theory does not violate Einstein's relativity in any way. Expansion of spacetime is responsible for distant galaxies 'moving away'. Movement through spacetime is limited to c , not spacetime itself. Since the distant galaxies are not moving through spacetime (or at least not above c) then there is no problem.

Distant galaxies with a red-shift greater than about 1.7 were indeed receding with an apparent velocity $>c$ when the light was emitted...but that in no way violates relativity.

Title: **Red Shift Theory**

Post by: **jerrygg38** on **07/12/2008 14:40:41**

[Quote from: Bikerman on 07/12/2008 00:44:29](#)

Expansion theory does not violate Einstein's relativity in any way. Expansion of spacetime is responsible for distant galaxies 'moving away'. Movement through spacetime is limited to c , not spacetime itself. Since the distant galaxies are not moving through spacetime (or at least not above c) then there is no problem. Distant galaxies with a red-shift greater than about 1.7 were indeed receding with an apparent velocity $>c$ when the light was emitted...but that in no way violates relativity.

The words expansion of space itself has no meaning. They are just words. What is the mechanism for space to expand? There is no understanding brought with those words. To me they are meaningless words.

I can understand the Bohr radius expanding. I can understand my dot-waves expanding. I can understand the photons expanding. But mysterious space itself expanding to me carries no meaning whatsoever.

Since we cannot produce a meaning for space expanding, it is meaningless. thus is is just empty words which explain nothing.

Of course they need these empty words to explain the big bang at a single point. Since I have billions of big bangs at the circumference of a sphere 15.9 billion light years from a common center, I do not need the expansion of space.

Title: **Red Shift Theory**

Post by: **Bikerman** on **07/12/2008 15:00:31**

But the idea of the BB at a single point is profoundly wrong. The BB did not occur at a single point in space (how could it since there was no space?). Using a simple 'explosion' metaphor for the BB is a mistake (one often repeated in the popular press/media) since it implies a starting point in space. In a real sense every point in the universe is the centre of the BB - in another sense there is no centre. The skin of a balloon is the normal analogy...

Your insistence that you have to find a 'meaning' for observation is also profoundly misguided. There ARE no analogies for much of physics so trying to imagine processes in terms of existing experience will always lead you into trouble. The fact seems to be that flat spacetime has energy - a sort of anti-gravity - which causes it to stretch and by doing so increase the distance between distant objects in spacetime.

Title: **Red Shift Theory**

Post by: **sophiecentaur** on **07/12/2008 18:13:18**

jerrygg38

Quote

Since we cannot produce a meaning for space expanding, it is meaningless. thus is is just empty words which explain nothing.

It has no meaning if you insist on thinking in terms of the existing (or, rather, recent) paradigm. If you want to become familiar with the newest ideas then you have to accept some of the new concepts and go along with them until they gel in your mind.

After all, where you are 'at' at the moment is because you have already accepted all the stuff you learned as a lad because it is familiar. If you had lived a hundred years ago and had your present attitude to new things, you would be struggling with the very ideas which, now, you take for granted. "Particles as waves? Time dilation?

Quantum Mechanics? " You have accepted huge amounts of that stuff before you started getting critical and they sound just as daft.

Title: **Red Shift Theory**

Post by: **jerrygg38** on **08/12/2008 16:04:20**

[Quote from: Bikerman on 07/12/2008 15:00:31](#)

But the idea of the BB at a single point is profoundly wrong. The BB did not occur at a single point in space (how could it since there was no space?). Using a simple 'explosion' metaphor for the BB is a mistake (one often repeated in the popular press/media) since it implies a starting point in space. In a real sense every point in the universe is the centre of the BB - in another sense there is no centre. The skin of a balloon is the normal analogy...

Your insistence that you have to find a 'meaning' for observation is also profoundly misguided. There ARE no analogies for much of physics so trying to imagine processes in terms of existing experience will always lead you into trouble. The fact seems to be that flat spacetime has energy - a sort of anti-gravity - which causes it to stretch and by doing so increase the distance between distant objects in spacetime.

I believe that it appears to us that we live on the skin of a surface. The red shift can then be the surface expanding which requires a mechanism for its expansion. You say anti-gravity. That certainly is a possibility. However the alternate which I believe in is that space is filled with huge amounts of mass and energy at the sub-microscopic size. Thus we live in an ocean which behaves similar to the general gas laws except the size of our fishbowl does not change. Only the stuff inside changes.

Title: **Red Shift Theory**

Post by: **jerrygg38** on **08/12/2008 16:08:55**

[Quote from: sophiecentaur on 07/12/2008 18:13:18](#)

jerrygg38

Quote

Since we cannot produce a meaning for space expanding, it is meaningless. thus is is just empty words which explain nothing.

It has no meaning if you insist on thinking in terms of the existing (or, rather, recent) paradigm. If you want to become familiar with the newest ideas then you have to accept some of the new concepts and go along with them until they gel in your mind.

After all, where you are 'at' at the moment is because you have already accepted all the stuff you learned as a lad because it is familiar. If you had lived a hundred years ago and had your present attitude to new things, you would be struggling with the very ideas which, now, you take for granted. "Particles as waves? Time

dilation? Quantum Mechanics? " You have accepted huge amounts of that stuff before you started getting critical and they sound just as daft.

In my studies I deny everything until I can no longer deny it. Thus I was happy with expanding space for many years until I realized that space is not empty but full of stuff. We live in a multi-lightspeed universe in which each universe is bounded by the prior universe. Thus we live between the light speed $C/2$ universe and the light speed $2C$ universe. They are all composed of dot-wave but when you go down in light speed, the dot mass increases and when you move up in light speed the dot mass decreases.

Title: **Red Shift Theory**

Post by: **Bikerman** on **08/12/2008 16:16:16**

Therefore you are saying that both SR and GR are wrong. There is simply no way, in either, to construct a spacetime frame of reference for anything massive travelling at c or above.

The fact is that you start from a false dichotomy and then construct a theory based on that - it is a fallacious way to proceed and can only result is a fallacious outcome (as it does in this case).

Title: **Red Shift Theory**

Post by: **jerrygg38** on **08/12/2008 20:08:58**

[Quote from: Bikerman on 08/12/2008 16:16:16](#)

Therefore you are saying that both SR and GR are wrong. There is simply no way, in either, to construct a spacetime frame of reference for anything massive travelling at c or above.

The fact is that you start from a false dichotomy and then construct a theory based on that - it is a fallacious way to proceed and can only result is a fallacious outcome (as it does in this case).

Special relativity was based upon the Michelson/Morley experiment which was an invalid experiment since the light speed upon planet Earth is a constant everywhere due to the gravitational field. Any light coming from the sun is changed far out in space. as the Earth heads toward the sun, it is blue shifted. As the Earth recedes away from the sun, it is red shifted. The differential velocity between the incoming photons and the Earth keeps changing as the photons adjust.

If you tried the experiment far out in space, the instrument would not null. Once you are free of the Earths gravitational field, the

instrument would give a true reading which is a non-null.

Einstein's equations work well because they are root mean square doppler

$$\text{Thus } M(\text{forward}) = M_0 C / (C - V)$$

$$M(\text{rear}) = M_0 C / (C + V)$$

$$M(\text{rms}) = M_0 / [(1 - (V/C)^2)^{0.5}]$$

There Einstein's equations are root mean square Doppler and work well. As far as general relativity is concerned, Einstein's electrical type equations work well because the density of dot-waves around the stars is higher than surrounding space. Therefore when Einstein says that space bends, his equations are basically the same as saying that the density of space dots are higher.

Therefore Einstein gets good results although both GR and SR are flawed.

As far as anything traveling above C. My dot-waves form a spectrum $C/4, C/2, C, 2C, 4C$ etc.

These dot waves are the basic structure of matter. As we move outward we find a 2C universe. The planets are as stationary as we are. The people are as stationary as us. The dots move at 2C but the structure are quite stationary.

Our bodies are composed of dot waves which either are perfectly stationary at time and which travel at light speed C at other times. When we travel at 100 miles per hour our dots do not travel at 100 miles per hour. They can only stop and then travel at C. Thus the average speed of our dots is 100 miles per hour since they are stationary most of the time.

A electron has $1.24E38$ bipolar dots. Most of the time the dots are mass dots and are basically stationary. At other times they are photonic dots and travel at C. Linear momentum becomes spherical and angular momentum. Therefore there is an uncertainty of the dots direction when it changes from stationary to linear motion. The probability of the totality of all the dots causes the Heisenberg uncertainty principle.

Title: **Red Shift Theory**

Post by: **jerrygg38** on **18/12/2008 16:58:22**

[Quote from: Bikerman on 07/12/2008 15:00:31](#)

But the idea of the BB at a single point is profoundly wrong. The BB did not occur at a single point in space (how could it since there was no space?). Using a simple 'explosion' metaphor for the BB is a mistake (one often repeated in the popular

press/media) since it implies a starting point in space. In a real sense every point in the universe is the centre of the BB - in another sense there is no centre. The skin of a balloon is the normal analogy...

Your insistence that you have to find a 'meaning' for observation is also profoundly misguided. There ARE no analogies for much of physics so trying to imagine processes in terms of existing experience will always lead you into trouble. The fact seems to be that flat spacetime has energy - a sort of anti-gravity - which causes it to stretch and by doing so increase the distance between distant objects in spacetime.

JG: I thought about what you said and I maintain my red shift causes. However I agree with you that space is expanding. If everything expands common mode then the ruler expands and space expands as well. Therefore there is no red shift due to the expansion of space-time.

However as I studied alternate solutions to the red shift problem, I returned to my theory in Doppler Space Time in which space did expand. The only problem I had with the expansion of space was the conflict with the $C/2$ universe and the $2C$ universe. We are locked between these universes. Therefore our space cannot expand into their universes.

However two days ago I explored a multi-light speed expansion of space time. If the $C/2$ and $2C$ universes simultaneously explode with our big bangs, this would cause the entire spectrum of coexisting universes to track each other in the expansion. Scientists feel that a super inflation period occurred at the big bang.

This would agree with my multi-light speed universe going to light speed zero. All the universes would explode at infinite light speed which is the highest light speed in the package.

At the same time I restudied by definition of multi-dimensional space time and came up with a better answer. Therefore each cubic of quantized space-time expands at the same rate as my dot-waves. I now have 12 dimensional space time.

In general my equations do not change. However the explanations for the equations constantly change. Anyway thanks for your input.