

Shades of Einstein and Fred Hoyle

All the latest information we are gathering from looking into space with all the newest instruments are vastly changing our concept of this universe.

In 1917 almost the entire scientific community believed we were in a steady-state universe, in fact, Einstein built his theory of general relativity on this assumption.

Einstein held his belief of a steady-state universe for many years and noted British astronomer Fred Hoyle held his belief, of a steady-state universe, even decades longer than Einstein.

Hubble's discovery of the redshift and Ryle's counts of extragalactic radio sources put an end to the steady-state universe belief but new evidence from [WMAP](#) and the **Cosmic Microwave Background Radiation** now combined with what Hubble and Ryle discovered seem to be returning us, once again, to Einstein's **cosmological constant** that

Einstein designed to specifically fit a steady-state universe.

Although my eminent science peers have brought back Einstein's **cosmological constant** (350, 000 spots on Google) they have not brought back its partner the steady-state universe so they are forced to partner it now with an accelerating, expanding universe, which is giving them problems.

Well, if you are going to bring back Einstein's **cosmological constant** then why not bring back its matching partner -- *a steady-state universe* -- as well?

It's the belief now that Einstein's original **cosmological constant** does indeed exist. Einstein originally saw his **cosmological constant** as a force equal but opposite to gravity. This repulsive **cosmological constant** force can be visualized as existing between all the stars and galaxies keeping them apart.

The big problem is the evidence of the **CMBR**: This evidence absolutely does not support the present popular belief of a big bang happening at one spot that progressively grew bigger and bigger giving us the universe we see today.

The evidence of the **CMBR** does support an expansion happening equally all over an existing universe.

The picture we get today from the **CMBR** is a panorama that

would have resulted from a steady-state all neutron universe with all neutron stars and galaxies that suddenly had a beta decay.

We know if we remove a neutron from the nucleus that it eventually beta decays into a proton and an electron in about 15 minutes. Why so long a beta decay time? This 15 minute delay before it beta decays may be a clue as to how the big bang actually happened. Was this beta decay time 30 minutes 5 billion years ago and an hour 10 billion years ago? Was the neutron entirely stable 20 billion years ago?

All the evidence now is sending us a picture that the neutron was once stable for eons of years and, for eons of years, we had an all neutron universe with neutron stars and galaxies. Also, let's say there was a very minimal energy leakage between the microcosm and macrocosm finally changing the fine-structure constant enough so that about 15 billion years ago we had a big bang beta decay happening all over this all neutron universe giving us the very first electrons, protons, atoms and molecules. In fact this is precisely what the **CMBR** evidence is pointing to.

If this happened then Ryle's counts of extragalactic radio sources would put them further away from the earth exactly as Ryle discovered.

If we consider a **cosmological constant** repulsive force in the microcosm as well, keepng all the molecules apart, then a

prism bending the longest wavelength red light the least via this **cosmological constant** repulsive force can be considered as doing much the same as the **cosmological constant** repulsive force between all the stars also bending red light the least. Thinking this way removes the redshift as evidence for an expanding universe.

New evidence and the awareness of what energy, space and time really are will make the present big bang concept -- *of a universe beginning with pure energy that grew bigger and bigger* -- fade away similar to phlogiston.

My bet is that all the new evidence will mount up to further support not only a beta decay big bang but also the realization that one cannot discern the difference between an accelerating, expanding universe and a steady-state universe with this **cosmological constant** repulsive force between all the stars and galaxies. This would be an extension of Einstein's principle of equivalence.

For more about all this see: <http://www.amperefitz.com/assymfree.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.).

Over 4 Decades of Fitzpatrick's Books, Papers & Thoughts <http://www.amperefitz.com/4.decades.htm>

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

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 4, 2010

[Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.](#)