



Why NASA tells us we have 72% Dark Energy, 23% Dark Matter and 4.6% Atoms.

These figures stem from what has been discovered so far.

See this NASA link: http://map.gsfc.nasa.gov/universe/uni_matter.html

We have known for some time that we see the arms of spiral galaxies as going faster than their escape velocity and this is impossible.

The reason we know this is that Cepheid Variable stars <http://zebu.uoregon.edu/~soper/MilkyWay/cepheid.html> have been our yardstick for measuring this universe and even though Type 1A Supernovas are the only yardsticks we can use to measure far distant elements in this universe, the Cepheid Variable stars enabled us to measure enough of our universe where the star count times the weight of each star in each spiral nebula gave us a weight for each nebula that was far too light. We therefore know there must be far more gravity in each of these spiral nebulae, holding them together, to keep these spiral arms from exceeding their escape velocity. So, for some reason, we were not seeing all of the mass.

Where is this missing mass?

Now after measuring more of the universe with Type 1A Supernovas and using the Hubble telescope, even more things don't seem to add up correctly. This is why NASA is telling us we have 72% invisible Dark energy, 23% invisible Dark matter and about 5% visible matter in our universe.

A good many scientists are now saying, what NASA is telling us does not make sense.

Why are good scientists telling us this?

Did we somehow get the big picture wrong?

As http://map.gsfc.nasa.gov/universe/bb_tests_ele.html states "In 1948, Physicist George Gamow hypothesized that all of the elements might have been made in the hot and dense early universe. He suggested to his student, Ralph Alpher, that he calculate this. Alpher did so for his PhD thesis, with Robert Herman participating in much of the work. Alpher and Herman found that Gamow was wrong: most elements could not have been made in the early universe. The problem is with neutron capture. Neutrons decay in about 10 minutes, and their density decreases as the universe expands in that time. There just isn't enough time to keep building up to the heavier elements before the neutrons are gone."

Yes, but what if the neutron was once stable? Perhaps this

was an all neutron universe for eons of years and then about 15 billion years ago we had a massive **beta decay** situation as the neutron was *starting to become* unstable. A **beta decay** turns each free neutron into a proton and an electron. The only neutrons that could remain were the ones locked inside the first atoms.

Not only does a **beta decay** big bang of an all neutron universe solve this problem that Alpher and Herman discovered, it also solves three other problems that NASA tells us about in http://map.gsfc.nasa.gov/universe/bb_cosmo_infl.html . The Flatness problem, the Horizon problem and the Monopole problem show us something is wrong with the present big bang theory that begins this universe with nothing but pure energy

When you see the number of protons exactly equaling the number of electrons then that also suggests a **beta decay** big bang of an already existing all neutron universe with neutron stars and galaxies -- all dark -- because there would have been no electrons yet.

So it's quite possible that the fine-structure constant is not exactly a constant and for eons of time the neutron was quite stable until enough energy leakage between the microcosm and the macrocosm gave us an unstable neutron about 15 billion years ago.

Yes, our universe of electrons, protons and atoms started

with a big bang about 15 billion years ago but all the evidence we now have tells us it was a **beta decay** big bang, occurring all throughout an all neutron universe that was already here for eons of years.

A **beta decay** big bang of an already existing all neutron universe would give us a flat CMBR projection and this is what we see. A universe that started from pure energy would not show us a flat CMBR. It would have the Horizon problem and also the Monopole problem described in the above link.

A few of us who understand [Dr. Milo Wolff](#) is right and that this is a scalar, standing wave frequency universe also understand that you simply cannot convert energy into mass unless an entire universe is already in place!

A universe with 72% invisible Dark energy, 23% invisible Dark matter and about 5% visible matter is proof our scientists are missing something important.

They are missing something very important!

Read some more of my thoughts about all this: [Einstein's Cosmological Constant - a repulsive force](#)

For more about all this see: [From where do we get this quantity c squared?](#)

Also read this: <http://www.amperefitz.com/einstein.hoyle.htm>

Be sure to read: <http://www.amperefitz.com/acceleratingexpandinguniverse.htm>

See this short, clear picture:

<http://www.amperefitz.com/principle-of-equivalence.htm>

Also <http://www.amperefitz.com/aphaseuniverse.htm>

And <http://www.rbduncan.com/schrod.htm>

There's a lot more too.

And this you can find out by buying my latest book **Universities Asleep at the Switch** at Amazon.com or by reading it FREE simply by clicking the following links:

<http://www.amperefitz.com/unvasleep.htm> (This link is faster if you have dial up.)

http://www.amperefitz.com/ua_20071020_ck_ds_jm_ds.pdf (This is the book FREE in Adobe.).

Web pages are at: <http://www.amperefitz.com> & <http://www.rbduncan.com>

[Over 4 Decades of Daniel P. Fitzpatrick's Books, Papers and Thoughts](#)

Thanks for reading this. Let me know what YOU think. e-mail is Th1nker@indiainfo.com

This page can be copied and published by anyone as long as it is copied and published in its entirety.

April 23, 2010

[Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.](#)