

# Debunking Physics and Discovering Forever

(A Rational and Materialist Perspective of the Fundamental nature of the Universe)  
Stephen Mooney

*“... in all of science, and especially in empirical science, the regulatory idea of consistency plays a crucial role in the dynamics of scientific progress.”*

(Jesus Mosterin - The role of consistency in empirical science)

For a completely consistent understanding of the Universe, you need to begin from the most fundamental rational and materialist perspective. With its over-riding commitment to mathematics and measurements and other abstractions, the physics establishment is an abstractionist paradigm that's not completely rational and materialist and so doesn't begin from the most fundamental perspective. By adopting a completely rational and materialist and truly fundamental perspective, many of the theories and interpretations of the abstractionist paradigm are overthrown and this leads to the realization of new fundamental laws and the infinite existence and reoccurring nature of everything. This has a profound impact upon cosmology and the way in which we can understand the context of Human existence.

\* \*

The Universe is a completely consistent and self-organising process in which everything is composed of matter and is a product of the process of matter. This also involves everything absorbing and emitting as an inherent aspect of its existence.

The idea that some particles are matterless (massless) is a result of the procedures and assumptions of the abstractionist paradigm and is not evidence that they're actually matterless. Also, there's no such thing as anti-matter. It's not a case of a particle of matter and one of anti-matter magically destroying each other. It's a case of the emission of two particles of matter acting as pressure that causes their mutual destruction. This involves both having attained their maximum absorption capacities.

Physics accepts that it's not possible to accurately measure at the extreme microscale. It has been mistakenly claimed that this "... has nothing to do with the ability (or inability) of our instruments to make accurate measurements." (John Gribbin, "Companion to the Cosmos", 1996) The absorption and emission of the instrument with which you measure at the extreme microscale interacts with the absorption and emission of that which is being measured and is evidence that absorption and emission occurs at the extreme microscale.

Electrostatic attraction is seen by physics as being caused by dislike charges, and repulsion by like charges. This is clearly an inadequate explanation. Attraction is caused by the absorption of emission, and repulsion by the bodies having equivalent emission and pushing away from each other via this emission. Like charges equates with equivalent emission, and dislike charges equates with inequivalent emission.

The attraction that underpins the nuclear and gravitational forces has the same absorption of emission mechanism or cause as electrostatic attraction. In terms of Occam's razor, "Plurality should not be posited without necessity." Or, in the words of Aristotle, "The more perfect a nature is the fewer means it requires for its operation."

Given the absorption and emission process, the space between bodies is composed of the emission of bodies and is not a vacuum. The emission of a body forms a field around the body. The absorption of emission is via this field, which falls-off in density with the distance from the body. An emission field and a gravitational field are one and the same thing.

The so called missing dark matter and energy in the Universe is the emission between the galaxies and stars and planets and is the result of the emission of galaxies and stars and planets.

As emission travels across the Universe it disperses to a point that can be called the groundstate at the ultimate microscale. If this groundstate didn't exist then emission would be subject to infinite dispersion, which is unacceptable. The groundstate entails cycles of absorption and emission, which involves the emission that is not absorbed being impacting emission.

Billions of dollars is spent on particle accelerator collisions in the endeavour to identify the ultimate particle which is claimed to underpin all matter. As the space between all particles is composed of emission which is composed of particles, this is a misbegotten idea of the abstractionist paradigm that is derived from the failure to establish a completely consistent and connected and truly fundamental perspective of the Universe.

An electron being attracted to a nucleus would move towards the nucleus when it's absorbing emission and then pushes away when its emission becomes equivalent with that of the nucleus. At its furthest point from the nucleus its emission capacity is reached and it's once again attracted to the nucleus through the absorption of emission from the nucleus. Instead of electrons orbiting the nucleus, they form a field around the nucleus. The attraction between protons and neutrons is maintained through each particle having a different absorption and emission capacity.

Isaac Newton established that gravity can be seen as proportional to the product of the masses of two bodies and inversely proportional to the square of the distance between the bodies. This produced a mathematical representation of gravity as a force but left it as a magical action-at-a-distance in that it offers no adequate explanation for the mechanism or cause of the attraction. In his Principia Mathematica of 1687, Newton states that, "... bodies, by some causes hitherto unknown, are either mutually impelled towards each other, and cohere in regular figures, or are repelled and recede from each other."

The original torsion balance experiment to determine what physics calls the universal gravity constant, designated with a  $G$ , was conducted by Henry Cavendish and published in Philosophical Transactions of 1798. Cavendish discovered that heating one of the bodies on the balance resulted in repulsion: "... the arm moved backwards, in the same manner that it before moved forward". The heating of one of the bodies increased the emission of the body bringing it into an equivalence of emission with the other body. If bodies of equivalent emission are used on a torsion balance, the result will be repulsion.

The bodies used on a Cavendish torsion balance vary in their quantity of matter with different apparatus. The absorption of emission between the two bodies occurs while they are absorbing emission from their surroundings. This accounts for the relatively consistent rate of attraction between the bodies giving a relatively consistent value for the gravity constant  $G$ . The value of  $G$  is a measure of electrostatic attraction and only relates to gravity through the density of the emission (gravitational) field of Earth at the time and place the measurement is made.

Physics accepts that gravity involves acceleration but doesn't offer a viable explanation for why this should be the case. With the absorption of emission explanation, the acceleration is a product of the fact that the density of an emission field increases with the decrease in the distance to the body that is doing the attracting. As the density of the emission field

increases the rate of absorption and emission of the body that is being attracted increases resulting in the acceleration of the body that is being attracted.

Bodies of different quantities of matter are seen as being attracted to the Earth at the same rate of acceleration. Once again, physics doesn't have an explanation. Bodies can absorb emission in portion to their quantity of matter from all directions, which results in them all being attracted to the Earth at the same rate of acceleration.

In 1954 a French economist named Maurice Allais observed an anomalous rotation in Foucault's Pendulum, in that it moved faster during a solar eclipse. This has become known as the 'Allais Effect'. When the Moon is in front of the Sun it blocks part of the emission field of the Sun resulting in less absorption of emission by the emission field of the Earth. The slight reduction in the absorption of emission by the Earth, results in a decrease the density of the emission field of the Earth and less downward attraction of the pendulum allowing it to swing faster.

The 'Allais Effect' demonstrates that the strength of the gravity of the Earth varies with the difference in the density of the emission field of the Earth. If you want assistance with obtaining a high or long jump record you should do it at aphelion, around the 4th of July when the Earth is at its furthest point from the Sun, or during a solar eclipse.

For Albert Einstein, gravity was seen as caused by curved space. This idea works because curved space equates with the increase in density of the emission field of a body with the decrease in the distance from the body.

The occurrence of the emission from a distance galaxy or star being bent as it passes near a star closer to our point of observation, gravitational lensing, is a case of emission being deflect through the absorption of the emission of the star. This is the same process as an electron being deflected by electromagnetic field.

As gravity is caused by the absorption of emission, it's not possible for a star to collapse under the increase in its own emission and form a blackhole. The idea of stars forming blackholes is based on seeing gravity as caused by matter in-and-of-itself, with the absence of an adequate explanation for its cause. However, the dense core of a galaxy would attract matter through absorption and thus would consume surrounding matter and even other nearby galaxies. The core of the galaxy could involve absorption exceeding emission and so appear as a blackhole.

An experiment conducted by Don Kelly demonstrated that "A special arrangement of magnets and coils fell slower in drop experiments when the special coils were energized." (New Energy News, Vol. 5, No. 7, Nov. 1997) An energized body has an increased rate of emission. The results of these experiments demonstrate that the greater the emission of a body the less the absorption capacity and the less the acceleration due to gravity. Newton's universal law of gravity doesn't reflect this reality. The universal law of attraction should state that "all bodies are attracted through the absorption of emission, with the greater the emission of a body the less its absorption capacity."

It has been observed that the rotation of the Earth is decreasing, and that the distance between the Earth and the Moon is increasing. Physics claims that the decrease in the rotation of the Earth and the moving away of the Moon is derived from a tidal bulge in the Earth due to its attraction of the Moon. It also claims that 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. This could only occur if the angular momentum (rotation) of the Earth was responsible for holding the Moon in orbit. It's not. What holds the Moon in orbit

around the Earth, and stops it from crashing into the Earth, is its absorption of emission from the Sun counter-balancing its absorption of emission from the Earth. Only by the emission of the Sun increasing and/or the emission of the Earth decreasing can we account for the Moon moving away from the Earth.

It's assumed by physics that the gravity of the Earth has remained the same over time. However, as the Earth absorbs the emission from the Sun to a greater extent than it emits, its quantity of matter and the extent of its emission must have increased over time. This means that the gravity of the Earth was less in the past than it is now. The increasing gravity of the Earth means that the Moon moving away from the Earth is due solely to an increase in the emission of the Sun.

The advance in the perihelion of Mercury (precession) can be explained by the increasing density of the emission field of the Sun. This sees Mercury remain in close contact at perihelion with the Sun a little longer during each orbit.

As emission travels through interaction with emission, its speed is relative to the density of the emission through which it travels. It couldn't possibly have a constant speed throughout the Universe as is claimed by physics. If you measured the speed of emission at a distance above the surface of the Earth, where the emission field is less dense than at the surface, it would be greater than at the surface.

A good example of abstractionist interpretation by physics involves placing one clock on the surface of the Earth and another above the surface. The clock is called a "quantum logic clock" and is based on an electrically charged aluminium atom vibrating between two energy levels. The clock above the surface vibrated faster than the clock on the surface. Physics claimed that this proves that time, as a thing-in-itself, runs faster above the surface of the Earth than at the surface due to the clock moving faster with the rotation of the Earth than the clock on the surface. Both clocks absorb and emit, and this is connected to their vibration. The difference in the time keeping of the two clocks is due to the difference in density in the emission field in which they're located. The decreased density of the emission field above the surface of the Earth involves an increased rate of absorption and emission by the clock which is seen in it vibrating faster. Time is a measure of the process of real material things. To treat time as a thing-in-itself is to commit the fallacy of reification or misplaced concreteness.

Jere Jenkins, the Director of the Radiation Laboratory at Purdue University, observed that the rate of atomic decay of uranium varies with the yearly orbit of the Earth around the Sun. When the Earth is at its furthest point from the Sun (aphelion), the rate of atomic decay is increased. This occurs because the density of the Sun's emission field impacting upon the Earth is decreased. A spacecraft travelling away from our solar system would encounter decreasing density of impacting emission and have an increasing rate of atomic decay. The rate of atomic decay on Earth was greater in the past than it is today.

Physics sees the nuclear forces as independent of the emission environment in which they occur. The nuclear forces involve the absorption of emission within a context of the increasing density of impacting emission. The planets within the solar system are subject to the increasing density of the emission of the Sun. This leads to the universal law of matter which states that, "all matter absorbs and emits and its stability is relative to the density of the impacting emission."

Our solar system presently involves the Sun and eight planets. The four inner planets can be categorized as solid matter, compared to the outer four which appear to be largely composed of gas. A fundamental difference between the solid matter and gas planets is

their distance from the Sun. In terms of the universal law of matter, the solid matter planets have greater atomic stability due to them being subject to the greater density of emission from the Sun.

As uranium will decay back to lead within the context of the present density of impacting emission within the solar system, all the elements could decay back to hydrogen and helium within a context of the decreased density of impacting emission out-side of a solar system. This accounts for the abundance of hydrogen and helium in the Universe.

With the emission of the Sun increasing over time, its gravitational attraction increases. All the planets will eventually be destroyed by being drawn towards the Sun. The Sun will eventually explode and form a solar disc from which a Sun and planets can be constructed in an infinite cycle of construction and destruction. The solar system may have begun with more than the present number of planets.

The atmosphere of the Earth is retained through its interaction with the emission/gravity field of the Earth. It doesn't just hang there by way of magic. Equally, it's not magic that sees the density of the atmosphere decrease with the increase in its distance from the surface of the Earth is tune with the density of the Earth's emission/gravity field. As the density of the Earth's emission/gravity field increases over time, due to the increasing emission of the Sun, the density of the atmosphere would increase through more of the chemicals which make-up the atmosphere being retained for a longer period of time. This would result in the temperature of the Earth increasing through the greenhouse effect and would occur over the history of the Earth and involve a gradual increase.

A wave of emission impacting upon the Earth from outside of the solar system would see the emission/gravity field of the Earth increasing in density as the wave approached and would result in the temperature of the Earth increasing. As the wave passed the density of the emission/gravity field would gradually decrease and result in a decrease in the temperature back to level of the gradual increase due to the increasing emission of the Sun.

In 2015, it was announced that a gravity wave had been detected by the Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory. It was claimed that it emanated from two stars which had collapsed under their own gravity and formed blackholes and which merged to form a single blackhole. In 2017 a Noble Prize was awarded for this discovery. The gravity wave was actually a wave of emission impacting upon of the emission/gravity field of the Earth. If this detection represents the peak of the impacting wave of emission, then the temperature of the Earth will begin to decrease back to the level of the gradual increase due to the increasing emission of the Sun. This would be in addition to the proposed increased carbon emissions-based cause of global warming.

"The universe's rate of expansion is in dispute – and we may need new physics to solve it". This is the title of an article that appeared in an on-line magazine called The Conversation on the 3rd of August 2018. The author was Thomas Kitching, a lecturer in Astrophysics at the University College London. He pointed out that cosmologists had recently made two precise measurements of what they claim to be the rate of expansion of the Universe in accordance with the big bang theory. The measurements don't agree. "The expanding ... picture of the universe may not work anymore and cosmologists are in a race to ... explain this result. If new physics is required to explain these new measurements, then the result will be a showstopping change of our picture of the cosmos."

It was in 1929 that an astronomer by the name of Edwin Hubble discovered that the emission called light from distant galaxies appeared as redshifted. The emission has a wavelength that goes from the short blue end of the spectrum to the long red end. Redshift is when the

emission is increased in wavelength. To account for this, some physicists proposed that the redshift is due to the galaxies accelerating away from our point of observation. They equated this with the Doppler Effect, which sees sound waves increase in length as the source of the sound moves away from our point of observation. This interpretation requires that the Universe began from an extremely small and dense clump of matter that exploded, and that it's continuing to expand as a result. This is the big bang theory.

In response to Edwin Hubble's observation, a Swiss Astronomer by the name of Fritz Zwicky proposed what he called the tired emission (light) theory. This states that the increase in the wavelength of the emission from distant galaxies is due to it decreasing in energy as it travels across the Universe. It's a simple fact that as the emission travels it fades (decreases in energy) and increases in wavelength and interacts with the emission it encounters.

There's something called Olbers paradox. This states that if the sky is full of galaxies and stars then it should be flooded with the emission from galaxies and stars. The sky is full of galaxies and stars. The reason that it's not flooded with their emission is due to the fact that the galaxies and stars are at various distances from us and their emission fades and increases in wavelength as it travels towards us. The further we look out into regions that at first appear to be empty black space, the more galaxies and stars we discover in those regions.

Astronomers by the name of Arno Penzias and Robert Wilson discovered, by way of radio telescope, what is called the background microwave radiation (BMR). It's claimed that this is left over from the big bang and is evidence that supports the big bang theory. However, the Universe involves the emission and explosion of stars and this are the source of the BMR. The only reason that you would claim that the BMR was left over from a big bang would be if you wanted to support your expanding Universe interpretation of the red shift phenomenon.

An objection to the tired emission interpretation claims that if the dispersion of the emission from galaxies and stars was the basis of the red shift phenomenon then it would blur the images of distant galaxies and stars more than is seen. There is nothing to indicate that any blurring that is seen is not the result of the emission from distant galaxies and stars interacting with the emission which is closer to our place of observation.

Distant clouds of hydrogen and helium have been detected in ratios that are said to be consistent with the Universe beginning with a big bang. However, these clouds are also consistent with my proposed universal law of matter. The tired emission theory is correct. The Universe is infinite in space and time.

Although there's an infinite number of things in the Universe, if there were an infinite number of types of things (infinite variability) then we wouldn't observe the discrete types that we do observe: you can't get an infinite number of types from a finite number of types. The Universe involves a finite number of types within infinite space and time. Everything exists in every stage of its development or evolution in every moment of time and does so an infinite number of times. The Earth is constructed and evolves and is destroyed an infinite number of times with a finite number of histories. You don't need to believe in a non-existent god to obtain eternal life, because it's a given fact of existence. We live and die forever in a finite number of permutations of our individual and collective selves.

\* \*

[Mooney300@gmail.com](mailto:Mooney300@gmail.com)