

Challenging Physics and Discovering the Cause of Gravity

Stephen Mooney

The basis of science is the interpretation of observation which should occur through the application of a truly fundamental, consistent and connected perspective of the Universe. My truly fundamental, consistent and connected perspective is that of materialism. For me, everything in the Universe is composed of matter.

With my strictly materialist perspective, I conducted a simple electrostatic experiment. When I rubbed a glass rod and placed it near a suspended pith ball, it attracted the pith ball. Physics sees this attraction as being the result of dislike charges. This begs the question of how dislike charges cause attraction. I decided that the attraction was caused by the pith ball absorbing emission from the glass rod, and that this emission forms an unbroken material connection between the two objects.

I use the term emission (which includes the terms light and radiation and energy), and which is made of matter, to represent the fundamental thing from which everything is composed. The latest thinking by physics sees the cause of the attraction in terms of the exchange of matterless particles called photons, and light (emission) being composed of photons. For Physics, “the fundamental thing of which everything is composed” are particles composed of sub-atomic particles which are composed of sub-sub-atomic particles, etc. These are known collectively as elementary particles. I decided to use the term emission because I wanted to avoid having particles moving through an otherwise empty space on the basis that space is composed of emission as is not a vacuum. Emission includes the visible part of the spectrum and extends, through on-going dispersion, all the way down to the extreme microscale or groundstate fabric of space.

The simple electrostatic experiment also led me to see dislike charges as having different levels of emission. This came about because I could see that repulsion, which physics sees as the result of like charges, was the product of equivalent emissions. Two objects of equivalent emission push away from each other by way of their emission. Attraction sees the different levels of emission interacting with emission being absorbed via the emission of an object. This emission decreases in density with the distance from the object, forming an emission field around the object. This emission field can also be seen as a gravitational field, and pertains to the smallest possible elementary particle as well as planets and stars and solar systems and galaxies.

My simple electrostatic experiment led me to the conclusion that everything absorbs and emits as a product of its very existence, and is either in a state of absorption exceeding emission or emission exceeding absorption. This means that everything is either increasing or decreasing in matter at any given moment in time. The idea that things can have an unchanging mass, as the amount of matter, is not a fact but an assumption of physics.

Noticing that the physics formula for electrostatic attraction takes the same form as that of Newton's law of gravity, I immediately realized that all attraction in the Universe is the result of the absorption of emission. This includes the attraction between particles called the strong and weak nuclear force, and the attraction between large objects called the gravitational force.

Newton's gravitational law states the attraction is proportional to the sum of the matter of two objects divided by the square of the distance between the two objects. Which also means that gravity falls-off by the square of the distance between two objects. Of course, this is a statement of

effect and not cause. If you treat it as a statement of cause, then you're saying that gravity is a magical attribute of matter.

The physics definition of illumination (the emission called light) includes it falling off by the square of the distance from the source. This is in the same way as Newton's law sees gravity falling off by the square of the distance. It's obvious that this falling-off equates to the decrease in density of the gravitational field around all objects.

I decided to investigate an original gravitational experiment conducted by a chemist named Henry Cavendish. I requested a copy of Cavendish's original article in Philosophical Transactions of 1798 from the head of Cavendish Laboratory at Cambridge University. It arrived in the mail within a couple of weeks.

Henry Cavendish took over the work of one John Michell who "contrived a method of determining the density of the Earth, by rendering sensible the attraction of small quantities of matter". Michell built what is called a torsion balance. This entails suspended weights and a means for measuring the attraction between the weights. The Cavendish Experiment is claimed to be one of the great physics experiments. Later it was seen as the first experiment to determine the value of a factor that physics calls the gravitational constant.

On reading the Cavendish paper I was struck by two results. The first entails repulsion. Cavendish discovered that "the arm moved backwards, in the same manner that it before move forward". Gravity is not supposed to involve repulsion. The second result was that after heating one of the weights "the effect was so much increased, that the arm was drawn 14 division aside, instead of about three". Heating one of the weights increased the attraction. I had no problem with this. The heating increased the emission of the weight and when this was absorbed by the other weight it increased the attraction. So what about this gravitational constant measured by Cavendish? It's actually a measure of electrostatic attraction.

The gravity measured by the torsion balance is that which stops the whole apparatus from floating away. That downward attraction that everything on Earth experiences. To the extent that this downward attraction acts to reduce the horizontal attraction between the weights on the Cavendish torsion balance, it can be said to measure gravity. Physics claims that the torsion balance can be isolated from the possibility that there will be any electrostatic (horizontal) attraction between the weights. However, as everything absorbs and emits as a product of its very existence, it's not possible to completely isolate anything.

A short time after my consideration of the Cavendish paper one Malcolm Longair (who later ironically became the head of Cavendish Laboratory) toured Australia demonstrating the measurement of some of the constants of physics. He held a public lecture at Melbourne University, and I attended. He conducted the Cavendish Experiment and proclaimed that the value for the gravitational constant was within acceptable limits. At the conclusion of the demonstration he stated that physics encourages questions and critical appraisal. I went up to him and quietly pointed out that the Cavendish Experiment was nothing more than a demonstration of electrostatic attraction. Malcolm Longair, who appeared to me to a sincere person, went red in the face, threw his arms in the air, and stated that you cannot interpret it that way. This member of the physics establishment was not about to allow me to question one of their assumptions.

As objects are attracted through the absorption of emission, then the space between objects must be composed of emission. Space is not a vacuum, as claimed by some physicists. Some physicists will

also claim that my explanation is not possible because the idea of space being composed of emission has been experimentally proven false. This entails an experiment conducted by Michelson and Morley. It involved using an instrument called an interferometer. Michelson and Morley were looking for a static medium (called an ether) which caused drag on the movement of the Earth. They could not detect any drag, and that's because it doesn't exist. The Earth via its gravitational field absorbs the emission that impacts upon the Earth. The emission of the Earth is also via this gravitational field. The gravitational field is not static in relation to the movement of the Earth.

The Earth remains in its orbit around the Sun through the absorption of the emission of the Sun via the gravitational field of the Earth. At least part of the Sun's emission would be absorbed via the Earth's gravitational field and into the core.

I see the inner most core of the Earth as having a dissymmetrical duality from which the gravitational/magnetic field of the Earth is generated. This duality would involve one being a state of absorption exceeding emission and the other emission exceeding absorption. From time to time, these would attain their maximum state of absorption and emission respectively and each would flip-over into the alternative state. This be the basis of the Earth's magnetic poles reversing from time to time.

The dissymmetrical duality at the core of the Earth would also increase in matter over time, causing the surface of the Earth to expand. This expansion would cause the movement of the continents, which is a well established scientific fact.

Albert Einstein proposed the idea of curved space to account for the cause of gravity. The Sun, for example, is said to curve the space around it due to its mass. It's said that this idea has been proven by the fact that the emission (light) from distant galaxies is bent around the Sun. This is called "gravitational lensing". Is curved space the best explanation of this phenomena? No. The best explanation is that the emission of the Sun decreases in density with the increase in distance from the surface of the Sun. How about this density falling-off by the square of the distance in accordance with Newton's law of gravity. The emission called light passing near the Sun absorbs emission from the Sun's gravitational field, and its path is bent in the same way as the path of an electron is bent in an electromagnetic field.

Some physicists claim that gravity is caused by elementary particles whose matter is purely electromagnetic in origin. Elementary particles have gravitational fields and attraction between particles is derived from the absorption of emission and not purely the presence of their gravitational fields.

An experiment was conducted which measured the rate of decay of two atomic clocks. This involved placing one on the surface of the Earth and the other in a airplane above the Earth. The clock on the surface ran slower than the clock in the plane. The clock in the airplane was subject to less density of impacting emission than the clock on the surface of the Earth. As the density of impacting emission increased the rate of atomic decay decreased. This indicates that the stability of matter is dependent upon the density of the impacting emission. As the density of impacting emission is variable, as a space-craft traveled into a region of decreased density of emission the rate of atomic decay of it as matter would increase and the space-craft would decay and then completely disintegrate into its constituent parts.

The increase in the density of emission impacting upon the Earth over time is derived from the Sun increasing in emission over time. As the Sun converts its matter into emission, it decreases in matter

over time, therefore, the rate of the emission of the Sun must increase over time. Some time ago the Melbourne Age carried a news item headed "Brighter sun sheds light on new extremes in weather". This item quoted one Sami Solanki of the Max Planck Institute for Solar System Research: "...the sun is burning more brightly than at any time during the past 1000 years."

As the density of the emission impacting upon the Earth increases over time, the rate of atomic decay on Earth would decrease over time. It's the density of the emission within which we exist, along with the attraction between the constituent parts, that binds matter into its constructed forms, such as particles and atoms. Physics sees the binding of matter into its constructed forms purely in terms of attraction between the constituent parts, the so called strong and weak nuclear forces. Physics is wrong. Their mistake derives from the assumption that the absorption of emission that it calls gravity only acts on large-scale objects over great distance and is completely unconnected to the absorption of emission that attracts an electron to a nucleus and that binds the nucleus. Gravity and the two nuclear forces are, in fact, merely scale representations of the one force.

Physics sees gravity not changing over time. The gravity experienced on the surface of the Earth is connected through absorption and emission to the gravitational field of the Earth, which in turn is connected to the gravitational field of the Sun. For the gravity of the Earth to be uniform over time would require that the gravitational field of the Earth to be uniform in its density over time, and for the emission of the Sun to be uniform over time, and for the matter of the Earth and the Sun to be uniform over time. It is simply impossible for the gravity of the Earth to be uniform over time. In the time of the dinosaurs, the Jurassic period, the gravity of Earth would have been less than it is now.

The speed of emission (light) is another fundamental measurement of physics, and it claims that it too is universally constant. The actual speed of light is relative to the density of the emission within which it travels. If you reflected light from the Earth to the Moon the light would speed up as it passed through the decreasing density of the Earth's gravitational field. As it encountered the Moon's gravitational field it would then slow down again. The measured speed of light between the Earth and Moon is the average of this slowing down and speeding up. It's not possible for the speed of light to be universally constant.

As the speed of light is relative to the density of emission through which it travels, and the measured speed of light was determined near the surface of the Earth which has a high density of emission, if that measured value is applied to the distance of galaxies and stars then it would be an over-estimate of the distance. The galaxies and stars are closer than is claimed by physics.

Given that the other stars in the Milky Way galaxy are closer than determined by physics, the movement of our solar system into and out of an additional source of emission within the Milky Way Galaxy would have an impact upon the Earth. How about the recurring cycle of ice ages on the Earth. How about these cycles actually being in reverse. Ice ages could be the norm, and are interspersed with long periods of increased temperature within the overall increase in temperature due to the increasing emission of the Sun. Could the dinosaurs have died out due to a relatively sudden increase in gravity, which in turn was due to our solar system moving into an additional source of emission within the Milky Way galaxy?

As emission (light) travels across the Universe through interaction with gravitational fields it must, if not absorbed by large scale objects, eventually obtain its maximum state of dispersion. This is the groundstate fabric of space. It entails rotation, forms the core of everything, and accounts for the rotation of particles and planets and stars and galaxies. Rotation is an inherent aspect of the

Universe.

The groundstate fabric of space can also be seen as cycles of fluctuation or pulsation. A unit of emission would absorb emission and then fall back as that absorbed emission was itself emitted. This groundstate has been detected, and is called the cosmic background microwave radiation by physics. The groundstate would not have a uniform distribution, because it's the result of emission from galaxies and stars in different stages of development in different regions of space. For it to have a uniform distribution would require that the emission was from a single source in one location. Which is obviously not possible.

The idea that the space between things is composed of emission that is made of matter, appears to fly in the face of common sense. How could we see through space if it was made of matter. We don't see through space, we see with space in the sense of the emission image of an object impacting upon our retina and being processed by our brains.

I see the construction process called nuclear fusion entailing the absorption of emission within a context of increasing density of impacting emission. A visible star is a state of emission exceeding absorption, whereas a planet is a state of absorption exceeding emission.

The construction of a star involves a stage of absorption exceeding emission and the construction of the elements. This occurs within the context of the increasing density of impacting emission and increasing pressure on the core derived from the progressive construction of the elements. Eventually, the pressure on the core attains critical mass and ignites and the star takes on its visible form, as a state of emission exceeding absorption. However, in its first stage the star is solid like a planet. A Brown Dwarf star and a Red Giant star are the first stage of a star's formation prior to it igniting, or fully igniting, into its second stage.

As a second stage star is a state of emission exceeding absorption and is a process of converting its matter into emission, eventually its matter becomes exhausted and the star progressively dissipates. As external pressure can not be applied to a state of emission exceeding absorption, a second stage star can not explode.

In accordance with Occam's razor, nuclear explosion can be seen as derived from external pressure forcing all the constructed matter and emission to the groundstate and this resulting in a massive repulsion and destruction and dispersion event.

The dissipation of a second stage star would occur in stages, and be derived from the dissymmetrical duality at the core. As the duality expanded and then suddenly flipped over, as in the reversing of the magnetic poles of a planet, this would see the outer most layer of the star rapidly move away. This process of dissipating layers of the star would conclude with the complete dissipation of the core.

Solar systems form within the gravitational field of galaxies, and from solar discs. The planets begin in a proto form, and due to the increasing density of impacting emission and the absorption of emission construct the elements.

Galaxies with cores are constructed from the groundstate fabric of space and are literally fusions of light. As galaxies with cores are subject to attraction to other galaxies through the absorption of emission, they form macro-structures or groups of galaxies. This allows room for new galaxies to be constructed from the groundstate, between these macro-structures. Over time, all galaxies must

merge with other galaxies or be consumed by other galaxies, or their cores dissipate and form Nebulae galaxies.

Why don't the stars within Nebula galaxies attract each other and the Nebulae evolve into a compact form? As second stage stars are a state of emission exceeding absorption they're much less subject to attraction than planets or first stage stars. Then there is the fact that stars of equivalent emission would repel each other.

As gravity is the product of the absorption of emission and not curved space, a magical attribute of matter, or the exchange of particles called gravitations, second stage stars can not collapse and form black holes. If physics really believed that gravity was the result of the exchange of gravitons through an otherwise empty space, it would have given up on the idea of black holes long ago.

Binary stars systems are also known to exist, and are obviously second stage stars. If these stars had a total inequivalence of emission they would attract each other and not form a binary structure. If they had simple equivalence of emission they would repel each other. They are kept in contact with each other and locked in their orbital motion because the levels of equivalence and inequivalence within their emissions limit the repulsion/attraction. One level of inequivalence or equivalence would be enough to lock the stars in their binary orbital motion, because they would alternatively attract and repel each other and vibrate as a consequence. Seen at an angle where one star obscured the other, it would appear that one star was vibration or pulsating.

The rotation of the Earth is decreasing. As the gravity of the Earth is increasing and the emission of the Sun is increasing, this give rises to an increase in the attraction between the Earth and the Sun. The cause of the decrease in the rotation of the Earth is inertia.

Physics defines inertia as “the property of a body, proportional to its mass, which opposes a change in the motion of the body.” (Larousse, Dictionary of Science and Technology) You will notice that inertia is presented as a “magical” property of matter. Physics offers no explanation of the mechanism which causes this “magic” to exist. Actually, every example of inertia is an example of attraction acting on a body. A body on the surface of the Earth opposes a change in its motion due to gravity attracting the body downwards. The mechanism of inertia is, therefore, the same as the mechanism of gravity, i.e. the absorption of emission. John Gribbin, in Companion to the Cosmos (1996) states that, “It is a curious and still not fully explained phenomena that ... inertial mass and gravitational mass ... are always exactly the same...”. It's now fully explained.

As the attraction between the Earth and the Sun is increasing, the average distance between the Earth and the Sun must be decreasing.

The average distance between the Earth and the Moon is increasing. This is because of the increase in the emission of the Sun pulling the Moon away from the Earth through the Moon absorbing the emission of the Sun. In other words, the balance of the gravitational attraction to the Sun and the Earth has increased towards the Sun. Which is what you would expect with an increase in the emission of the Sun.

Physics claims that the decrease in the rotation of the Earth and the moving away of the Moon derives from a tidal bulge in the Earth, and as the Earth tries to drag this bulge along its rotation is decreased and that this loss of angular momentum is transferred to the Moon lifting it into a higher orbit.

The only way that the decrease in the rotation of the Earth (the loss of angular momentum) could cause the Moon to move away would be if the rotation of the Earth was responsible for the Moon's distance from the Earth in the first place. Which isn't the case. Also the physics claim takes no account of the impact of the gravitational field of the Sun on the Moon, nor the increase in the density of the gravitational field of the Sun over time.

The Moon exists within the gravitational field of the Earth, which involves both perpendicular and transverse aspects. The orbital motion of the Moon is derived from it being dragged around by way of its material (field) connection to the Earth. The contra-orbiting of natural satellites (moons) can only be accounted for by the transverse aspect of emission fields.

The elliptical nature of the orbits of the planets can be accounted for by the balance of equivalence/inequivalence of the emission of the Sun and the planets in combination with the orbital motion of the planets. From aphelion the factors of equivalence/inequivalence (repulsion and attraction) within the gravitational field of a planet sees the balance toward that of inequivalence and attraction. At perihelion, the balance reverses until it reaches aphelion where the balance reverses once again.

Before our Sun has dissipated, it will have destroyed all the planets. As planets are states of absorption exceeding emission their fate is to eventually explode from the increasing density of impacting emission. This will occur through the increase in gravity within the solar system drawing the planets toward the Sun. Planets within solar systems die with a bang, and stars with a whoosh of dissipation.

There is a component of repulsion within gravitational fields that entails attraction through the equivalence of some levels of emission within the field. This repulsion component is manifest by the field falling off in density by the square instead of exponentially. The waves of emission of fields are constructed by convergence, because of the equivalence of some of the levels of emission. If there wasn't an equivalence of some of the levels of emission within an emission field, then there wouldn't any emission waves to detect.

It's a fact of observation that gravity entails acceleration and not simply uniform motion. An object attracted to the surface of the Earth accelerates towards the Earth. The only logical way to explain this acceleration is by the absorption of emission from an gravitational field that increases in density with the decrease in the distance to the surface of the Earth. This would also entail the object increasing in matter. Relativity theory states that matter (mass) increases with acceleration, but doesn't offer an explanation of the material cause.

Millions of dollars of public money has been spent building "gravity wave detectors", in the hope of detecting gravity waves from distance galaxies and stars. If you go outside and measure the emission (light) from galaxies and stars, you will have detected their gravity waves. The whole community has to pay for the mistakes that result from the confined thinking of the physics establishment.

Why do spiral galaxies have spiral shaped arms? The arms are attracted towards the core through the absorption of the emission of the core, and given the rotation of the core this accounts for the spiral shape of the arms. This also means the stars and planets within the arms of a spiral galaxy are subject to the increasing density of emission.

Another physics wild goose chase involves the idea that the Universe contains missing "dark

matter” that is undetectable by its emission. It's said that the existence of this matter is inferred from its gravitational effects on visible matter. This “dark matter” is, of course, the emission that is space and it has an effect on visible matter through being absorbed. If physics wasn't locked into the idea that the emission called light was matterless, it would never have proposed the existence of dark matter.

The atmosphere of the Earth is retained in position through its interaction with the gravitational field of the Earth. Physics states that the atmosphere of the Earth decreases in density with the distance from the surface of the Earth, and offers no explanation of the mechanism by which the Earth retains its atmosphere. It's no mere coincidence that both the atmosphere of the Earth and the gravitational field of the Earth decrease in density with the distance from the surface of the Earth. As the gravitational field of the Earth increases in density over time this would increase the density of the atmosphere leading to increased global warming by way of a greenhouse effect. Increased carbon emission in combination with the increasing density of the gravitational field and the increasing emission of the Sun would result in global warming at an ever increasing rate. Given that the increasing density of the Earth's gravitational field and the increasing emission of the Sun is not taken into account when calculating the reduction of carbon emissions that needs to occur, such reduction amounts will inevitably be under-estimates.

Here's another shock for the physics establishment. You can't measure cosmic distance from the light emitted by galaxies or stars. More specifically, you can't distinguish between the distance of a galaxy or star and its brightness from the redshift of its light. Is a star of a given brightness far way relative to one less bright? Or are they both the same distance away and it's simply that one has less brightness because its younger? The measure called “a light year” is nonsense. All the desire in the world to have a means for measuring cosmic distance will not change the situation.

Physics uses many measured values as universal physical constants. As change is an inherent aspect of the Universe, physics should explain how these values can remain constant over extended space and time. It doesn't offer any such explanation. When Malcolm Longair concluded his demonstration of some of the constants of physics at Melbourne University, he stated that “One day physics might even understand why the constants have the values that they do”. This was presented as if it was some great mystery of the Universe. The constants have the values that they do, in a particular space and time, for no other reason than that is the way in which they are measured.

Physics sees the Universe having inherent uncertainty. This is presented with the Uncertainty Principle, which states that “there is a fundamental limit to the precision with which a position coordinate of a particle and its momentum in that direction can be simultaneously known.” (Larousse, Dictionary of Science and Technology, 1995) If something is in a static position then it doesn't have a velocity, and if it has a velocity then it's not in a static position. Surely, position and momentum, are mutually exclusive. The only way that both factors could be known to any level of precision simultaneously would be if the particle does not have a static position but is, in fact, moving at some velocity in a particular direction.

Physics claims that the inherent uncertainty also relates to the “quantum”, or ultra microscale, and that “it has nothing to do with the ability (or inability) of our instruments to make accurate measurements.” (John Gribbin, Companion to the Cosmos, 1996) At the ultra microscale the absorption/emission of the matter of the instrument with which you measure interacts with the absorption/emission of that which is being measured. If what you were measuring was a wavelength, then this could entail the matter of the measurement instrument absorbing some of the emission of the wave causing it to collapse to a lower state of construction. This is usually referred

to as, “the collapse of the wave function”.

Within physics there is Quantum theory. This is based on the observation that emission (energy) comes in discrete packets or “quanta”, and not as an undifferentiated stream. Quantum theory does not ask how these “quanta” are constructed. I see emission (energy) being constructed from the convergence of levels of emission. If these “quanta” were not constructed in this way then they would not exist.

Another “mystery” of physics is called the wave/particle duality. Sometimes the emission called light is detected as a wave function and sometimes as a photon particle. As a particle is a fusion of emission, then the wave function must be un-fused emission. We can say the wave function is composed of particles smaller than the photon and is spread out, or dispersed, so that it's detected as a wave function. The greater the dispersion of the emission the greater the wavelength. I've notice that some physicists talk as if the wave function is more than the detection of emission as a wavelength. Even going so far as to claim that everything is composed of nothing more than (emission) waves. This is to commit the fallacy of misplace concreteness, or reification.

Those things that physics calls particles are fusions of matter (emission), and are constructed from the emission fabric that is space within the context of impacting emission. If there were particles that were massless, as claimed by physics, then they would be matterless and made of nothing. As this is impossible, it's easy to see that the massless (matterless) status of these particles is not real but merely an assumption of physics

Physics also claims that when two particular types of particle meet they destroy each other. This is put down to one particle being matter and the other being anti-matter, and offers no explanation of mechanism. I see the particles destroying each other through the density of their emission fields causing compression leading to explosion. In my science, an explanation of mechanism beats no explanation of mechanism every time. Also, for the mutual explosion to occur the particles would have to have equivalent levels of emission at the time of their explosion. How about two particles, of different levels of emission, being attracted through their absorption of emission and each attaining their maximum state of absorption and then exploding due to the compression from the density of the impacting emissions.

When ever particles are made to collide in particle accelerators the resultant particles always take a curved, and sometimes spiraling curved, path. The reason for this curved path is because they have a dissymmetrical core which is derived from the groundstate. Everything constructed from and groundstate, which is everything, has a dissymmetrical core. The particles which emerge from the collisions in a particle accelerator are “created” by the collision, and so do not represent the building blocks of matter as assumed by physics.

The particle called an electron orbits a nucleus by absorbing emission from the nucleus thus causing the electrons attraction to the nucleus. However, to stop the electron simply crashing into the nucleus its emission alternates between equivalence and inequivalence with that of the nucleus and in this way the electron remains in orbit around the nucleus while it pulsates and rotates.

Around 1923 an American astronomer by the name of Edwin Hubble decided that all the other Galaxies in the Universe were accelerating away from our point of observation, and that the further they are away the faster they were accelerating. This was derived from the observation that the light from distant galaxies was shifted to the red (wide) end of the wavelength spectrum. He seen this redshift being the result of what is called the Doppler Effect. He thought that as the galaxies were

accelerating away, the Universe must be expanding and had begun with a big bang. This big bang theory was adopted by most of the physics establishment.

In 1928 a Swiss astronomer by the name of Fritz Zwicky rejected Hubble's assumption by proposing that the light lost energy as it traveled. He called this his "tired light" theory. Given that light disperses as it travels across the Universe, and that this dispersion involves increasing wavelength, the redshift phenomena is indicative of light traveling towards us and not the galaxies accelerating away.

If the redshift of the light from distant galaxies was due to them accelerating away, then physics is claiming that if they were not accelerating away their light would travel towards us without increasing in wavelength, it would not disperse, and would be just as strong as it was at its source. The cosmic sky would be ablaze with so much light that we wouldn't be able to distinguish anything. The light (emission) from our Sun would have the same wavelength when it reached to Earth as it has at the surface of the Sun.

Unless physics can prove that the Doppler Effect wavelength increase is in addition to that which occurs through the light traveling, then they have no irrefutable evidence. However, physics does propose that there is another source of redshift. It states that light increases in wavelength in a gravitational emission field. This is called the "gravitational redshift". As everything has a gravitational emission field which decreases in density with the distance from the source of the field, then the light emitted from everything increases in wavelength with the distance from the object. The light emitted from galaxies and stars increases in wavelength as a product of it traveling through space, because space is composed of the emission of objects and forms an emission field around those objects. Or, to put it more simply, cosmic redshift and gravitational redshift are one and the same thing.

Physics claims further evidence for its big bang theory. This involves the detection of the cosmic background microwave radiation, which it sees as being left over from the big bang. The cosmic background microwave radiation is, of course, the groundstate fabric of space.

Hubble's assumption is wrong. The distant galaxies are not all accelerating away from us and the Universe did not begin with a big bang.

As there are galaxies moving away from and towards our position in the Milky Way galaxy you would expect a certain amount of Doppler redshift in the light of it those moving away and a certain amount of Doppler blue shift in the light of those moving towards our position. This is what is observed. However, the light is predominately red shifted due to the increase in the wavelength of light as it travels.

Hydrogen and helium are claimed by physics to be the most abundant elements in the Universe, due to their wavelengths being detected in all regions of space. As the emission (light) from the elements increases in wavelength as it travels, then eventually everything would appear to be hydrogen and helium if wasn't for the variability in the distance and the intensity of the sources of emission that make up the cosmic sky.

The Universe is infinite in space and time, distance and duration. There are obviously an infinite number of things constructed by the process that is the Universe. There is an infinite number of galaxies and stars and planets and biology, etc. However, can there be an infinite number of types of things? If there were an infinite number of types of things, then there would be an infinite variety of

things and not the types of things that we observe. We observe that galaxies and stars form types with the same characteristics. We observe that plants and animals also form types with the same characteristics. If you were to say that these types are merely a consequence of the way in which we humans are able to observe, the so called anthropic principle, then I would say that we're only able to understand the Universe as humans. And then there is the fact that we humans are a product of the process of the Universe, so it's entirely reasonable to assume that our observations are in accordance with the Universe: that they're objectively real.

Although the finite number of types of things would be an extremely large number, it leads to an extraordinary conclusion. Everything which can be constructed by the process that is the Universe, must exist and re-exist an infinite number of times in an infinite number of places in the Universe.

Out there in the Universe there are an infinite number of people just like me typing this very sentence, in every sense of the past and the present and future. In this space that I presently occupy, an infinite number of beings have and will occupy the same space in different times. The Earth has formed and evolved and been destroyed an infinite number of times. You're not alone in the Universe. There are an infinite number of yourself out there. However, you're not able to travel through space and meet your other selves because as the density of space decreases your space craft would literally disintegrate. Just when we came to the realization that the Universe is full of biological life, and that the other galaxies and stars are closer than we thought, we discover the impossibility of distant space travel.

Not only do you live an infinite number of times, but you do so in every possible social context that can be inflicted upon a human being. You should give consideration to those who live in oppressive contexts, because that's you in other spaces and times.

The meaning and purpose of existence is the realization of potential, within the context within which each thing exists. The potential of the Earth is realized within the context of its internal process and its external environment, which happens to include biological beings that presently call it home. The potential of an individual human is realized within the context of their individual biological inheritance and their particular social context. The meaning and purpose of the Universe, if we can call it that, is the realization of its construction possibilities. We're a realization of the construction possibilities of the Universe.

Conclusion

It's clear that establishment physics is not a truly fundamental, consistent, connected and strictly materialistic perspective of the Universe. The cause of gravity is clearly the absorption of emission via the gravitational field of objects from the microscale to the macroscale, and that the gravity of the Earth has progressively increased since the time of its formation.

* *

Stephen Mooney
 57 Shamrock Street
 Bendigo
 Victoria
 Australia. 3555
 Ph. 03 54428573
 Email: Stephen.Mooney@Westnet.com.au