

The **ANSWER** Einstein looked for Issued: July 10th 2018.

ANSWER in htm: - <http://amperefitz.com/answer.htm>

Also ANSWER in Word: - <http://amperefitz.com/answer.doc>

And ANSWER in Adobe pdf: - <http://amperefitz.com/answer.pdf>

the

E xpanding U niverse R eligion

cosimoblue stated:

>>Personally, I never thought Dr. Hubble did Dr. Einstein any favours.>>

Hubble DID discover the red shift but NEVER associated it with an expanding universe.

Quite the contrary, he WARNED against doing so.

It was [Lemaitre](#) who, year after year kept after Einstein pushing it.

Einstein kept telling him he was wrong until during one of the [Lemaitre](#) lectures, Einstein recognized a factor that [Lemaitre](#) presented that seemed to destroy Einstein's cosmological argument and Einstein turned on a dime and applauded [Lemaitre](#) .

It made the headlines "**Einstein's Biggest Blunder**" and ushered in the era of the expanding universe.

[George Gamow](#) took what we subsequently learned about the atom and destroyed [Lemaitre](#)'s math and replaced it with his own and [George Gamow](#) then took over as head expansionist actually predicting the CMBR.

Bob [Dicke](#) looked for the CMBR and found some Bell scientists had already discovered it but did not understand the importance of what they had found. [Dicke](#), who knew, then arranged for ALL of them to publish together telling what ALL of them had found and [Dicke](#) took part credit for discovering the CMBR and then---hard to believe---said he never even knew about any CMBR prediction of [George Gamow](#).

During all this Fred [Hoyle](#) stood steady as a rock---like his British compatriot Wellington at Waterloo. Fred [Hoyle](#) never wavered with his steady state universe but now made it oscillate so as to incorporate some of the popular elements of what the expansionists were expounding.

[Fitz](#)

[web page](#)

[Fitzpatrick's First Book \(FREE\)](#)

[Fitzpatrick's view](#)

[motion](#)

[Theory of Everything Group](#)

[Limits to Logic](#)

[a NEW Science Tool](#)

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

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

--- In TheoryOfEverything@yahoogroups.com, "cosimoblue"

<cosimoblue@y...> wrote:

>
>> There is just one other possibility, and that is if the the
electron
> has
>> a finite size which has shrunk by 42 orders of magnitude since
its
>> creation. This implies some link twixt the size of the electron
and the
>> expansion of the universe in some unknown inverse relation. (See
Tony
>> Bermanseder's QR hypothesis, and maybe it's not so unknown after
all).
>> This is the view I personally favour as it can happen
independently of
>> known quantum processes and does not affect known empirical
facts.
>
> Folks are so hung up on expansion that they ignore the inverse.
>
> Or over emphasize one of its aspects (such the CERN
Hairsplitteratron...)
>
> ... but if what you say is true, when the photons were created, the
> electrons were smaller, and it took a larger distance to radiate
the
> same frequency of energy... or we would see the frequency as
> elongating... either way this leads you down the slippery slope of
> questioning some of Hubble's assumptions.
>
> Personally, I never thought Dr. Hubble did Dr. Einstein any
favours.

[World Scientist Database - - Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.](#)