

Smulsky & Persson Memorandum
about
Falseness of 7 Cosmology Hypotheses
23.11.2007.

We agree about falseness of such 7 hypotheses of contemporary science.

1. Hypothesis about particles of light.
2. Hypothesis about the light speed of gravitation.
3. Hypothesis about black holes.
4. Hypothesis about a deviation of light by gravity.
5. Hypothesis about gravitational waves.
6. Hypothesis about the expanding Universe.
7. Hypothesis about the Big Bang.

P.S.

Any scientist in agreement with the Memorandum is invited to join. Please inform us to include in the list of signers.

List of signers

1. Joseph J. Smulsky. A chief scientist of the Institute of Earth's Cryosphere of Siberian Branch of Russian Academy of Sciences, doctor of physical-mathematical sciences, professor of theoretical and applied mechanics. Address: Institute of Earth's Cryosphere, P.O.B 1230, 625000, Tyumen, Russia. <http://www.smul1.newmail.ru/>.
2. John - Erik Persson, Engineer, retired, MA in EE. Address: Fastlagsvägen 2, 12648 Hägersten, SWEDEN. <http://www.geocities.com/mail0110261847/index.html>.

COMMENTS

1. 23.11.2007. The grounding of falseness of these hypotheses is given in article: Joseph J. Smulsky "Real Forces and Unreal Hypotheses", which had been submitted on the 14th Annual Conference of the NPA at UConn-Storrs May 21-25, 2007: <http://www.ikz.ru/~smulski/Papers/RealFUH2.pdf>.

John-Erik Persson about grounding of falseness of hypotheses 1, 6 and 7 has the same opinion. Almost the same opinion he has about grounding of falseness of hypotheses 2, 4 and 5:

- a) Hypotheses 2 and 5: Persson think speed of gravity is irrelevant for a constant and stationary property of space. Gravity waves do not exist, and are almost impossible to produce, because that means changing distribution of matter in the Universe, so we cannot find out if changes propagate with velocity c .
- b) Hypotheses 4: Light has no mass, and cannot be affected by gravity. Deviation can be caused by refraction.

Smulsky agree with item b).

John-Erik Persson about grounding of falseness of 3-rd hypothesis has other opinion.

Hypotheses 3: Limitations by other factors than light-speed are possible. Assuming an omnidirectional flow of small particles can perhaps eliminate the need for Black Holes. Near a big body the flow passing the body is reduced, and spherical symmetry is disturbed. A force in direction towards the big body is produced. If the big body is very big the particle flow in one half sphere approaches zero and an upper limit on the gravitational field is defined. We do not need black holes. No, the redshift can be explained by falling ether moving towards the body instead of the body per se.

But Persson thinks that the word 'ether' can be applied to an omnidirectional flow of small particles. The interaction between them can be called waves.

Important difference exists only in relation to the ether concept. Persson think that hypotheses shall be a direct link between reality and theory, and not built on other hypotheses. His hypotheses is based on particles with mass. The mass is too small for detection, and the flow is omnidirectional. This hypotheses is not based on other hypotheses is not the base for other hypotheses. A velocity can be defined by the average particle velocity.

There are two kinds of ether's: 1 Absolute (autonomous) or 2 entrained (local), dependent on distribution of mass. 2 was said to be excluded by starlight aberration. 1 was said to be excluded by Michelson-Morley's measurements. Persson think that both these conclusions are wrong.

John-Erik Persson has written his ideas in a contribution to NPA 2007 called "The Special Theory of Relativity and the Sagnac Effect". A contribution to Galilean Electrodynamics is called "Too See the Light Is to See the Invisible". These and some other articles can be found on the homepage of John-Erik Persson, which has a link from NPA homepage <http://www.worldnpa.org>.