

Sir Isaac Newton:
 PHILOSOPHIÆ NATURALIS PRINCIPIA MATHEMATICA.
 LIBER TERTIUS: DE MUNDI SYSTEMATE.
 REGULÆ PHILOSOPHANDI.

REGULA I.

Causas rerum naturalium non plures admitti debere, quam quæ & veræ sint & earum phænomenis explicandis sufficient.

No more causes of natural things should be allowed than such that are AND true AND sufficient to explain their appearances.

HR: of course he means **already known** truths, obtained by induction from phenomena!

REGULA II.

Ideoque effectuum naturalium ejusdem generis eadem assignandæ sunt causæ, quatenus fieri potest.

Therefore, natural effects of the same kind should be assigned the same causes, as far as possible.

REGULA IV.

In philosophia experimentalis, propositiones ex phænomenis per inductionem collectæ, non obstantibus contrariis hypothesibus, pro veris aut accurate aut quamproxime heberi debent, donec alia occurrerint phænomena, per quæ aut accuratiores reddantur aut exceptionibus obnoxia.

Hoc fieri debet ne argumentum inductionis tollatur per hypotheses.

In observation-based science, propositions collected by induction from phenomena must, notwithstanding any contrary assumptions, be considered true or accurate or approximate, until other phenomena occur, by which either more accuracy is rendered or they become liable to exceptions.

Therefore, no evidence by induction should be gainsaid by assumptions.

Sir Isaac Newton:
PHILOSOPHIÆ NATURALIS PRINCIPIA MATHEMATICA.
SCHOLIUM GENERALE:

(...) Rationem vero harum gravitatis proprietatum ex phænomenis nondum potui deducere & **hypothesefes non fingo**. Quicquid enim ex phænomenis non deducitur, *hypothesis* vocanda est; & **hypothesefes** feu metaphysicæ, feu physicæ, feu qualitatum occultarum, feu mechanicæ, **in philosophia experimentalis locum non habent**. In hac philosophia propositiones deducuntur ex phænomenis, & redduntur generales per *inductionem*. (...)

[Underscore & bold face by HR]

But the reason for these properties of gravitation have I not yet been able to deduce from phenomena & **I do not fabricate assumptions**. For whatever has not been deduced from phenomena is called an *assumption*; & **assumptions** whether they are metaphysical, or physical, or of hidden qualities, or mechanical, **have no place in observation-based science**. In this type of science propositions are deduced from phenomena, & rendered general by *induction*.

Hypothesefes non fingo!

I don't contrive concoctions!

Fieri debet
ne argumentum inductionis
*It must be that
no evidence by induction*

tollatur
per hypotheses.
*is gainsaid
by assumptions!*

Doppler effect:

$$\text{👍} \quad 1 + z = \sqrt{\frac{1+\beta}{1-\beta}} \quad \text{👍}$$

👍 **DERIVED** 👍

👍 **BY INDUCTION** 👍

👍 **FROM FACTS!** 👍

Listen to a car!

Cosmo-illogical redshift:

$$\text{👎} \quad 1 + z = \frac{a(t_{\text{obs}})}{a(t_{\text{em}})} \quad \text{👎}$$

👎 **CONGONCTED!** 👎

👎 Deduced from 👎

👎 nothing at all! 👎

👎 **THOUGHT UP!** 👎

Scientia does not need erotebeteers, nor charlatans!
Conclude from truths! DON'T think it up! DAMN!

Cosmological redshift cannot exist.

Wave velocity is a property of a *medium* and not of the *wave* itself (cf. *speed of sound* in different media), and *frequency* is a property of an *oscillator*. When combining a *medium* and an *oscillator*, a wave arises with an *equiphase distance*, called *wavelength*. **This is neither a property of the medium, nor of the oscillator.** It simply emerges from their combination.

The speed of light is NOT a property of light, nor of a photon, but of empty space, which acts as a medium. Any *velocity* added to the *speed of light* yields the very same *speed of light* as perceived by the observer [Einstein, Ann. Phys. 17 (1905): 891-921]. Of course this also applies to any added *velocity* due to *cosmic expansion*.

Wavelength is not a property of a photon. Photons do not have any spatial property (only momentum & polarisation, $E = |\vec{p}|c$, $\nu = E/h$), hence it cannot ever be stretched or so. Moreover, would it have any *length* ℓ , it were Lorentz contracted to:

$$\ell \sqrt{1 - (v = c)^2/c^2} = 0.$$

Distant light sources simply recede from the observer, from his perspective far behind an *oncoming photon* that is approaching him at the

very *speed of light*, identical to each observer. Einstein's 2nd postulate explicitly says the *velocity* of a light source with respect to the observer is irrelevant. By the way, not any *wave velocity* depends on that of its source.

From its own perspective, a photon experiences *zero travel time* and *distance*. **It literally has no time to accomplish any change.**

A photon is an amount of *energy* that manifests to us as an oscillation with a *frequency* directly proportional to this *energy*. A photon's *frequency* must remain constant because of conservation of *energy*. Where would the *energy* go to or come from if it would change? Other on-the-fly photons? Ever observed? **ROFL. Energy quanta do not divide & are only transferred as a whole.**

[Einstein, Ann. Phys. 17 (1905): 132-148, Nobel Prize 1921].

Its *energy*, hence *frequency*, is *immutable* & it travels at the *speed of light*, a *universal constant*, hence its **equiphase distance cannot change.**

HR: *in the observer's frame, a photon must already be immediately Doppler shifted at emission & then it remains forever immutable.*

Sigh.

Liars, crocheteers & charlatans

need a very good memory,
as well as the ability to perform correct logical reasoning.

THEORETICAL PHYSICISTS

are no better!

Many (most?) of them also come up with *thought-up* theories built on premises that have **not** been properly *deduced* from *already known ascertained truths*.

Ex falso sequitur quodlibet.

From falsehood follows whatever you like.

THE big mistake:

haphazardly translating abstract maths to presumed physical reality.

*The fact that you can't grasp some phenomenon confirms not more than your own ignorance. And yes, I am aware this reaches only well-thinking people, the stubborn (YOU!) cannot be convinced... Homo Sapiens is curious and wants to understand everything unfathomable. If necessary, we creatively contrive concoctions that we are able to grasp and then we fool ourselves by thinking we understand the incomprehensible. Then we teach this gobbledygook to our children who may become so stupidly fanatic that they blow themselves up in crowded places, fly airplanes into the WTC, or put my friend Galileo Galilei, one of the greatest conclusions-from-facts-drawing scientists ever, under lifelong house arrest because he was right. Well done, boys! We're a bunch of stupid morons who think they can think. **Theoretical physicists are no better** than the rest of ~~stupid~~ humanity. What they (incl. Einstein!) thought up or not or incorrectly concluded from underlying observed phenomena or propositions obtained by flawless induction from phenomena is too much to enumerate, but I'll give it a try: phlogiston, simultaneous arrival of molecules at the rear edge of a wing, relativity of simultaneity, cosmological constant, cosmological redshift, geodesic motion through curved spacetime, string theory, inflationary universe **ROFL**, Keplerian decline & dark matter¹, WIMPS, accelerated expansion, dark energy, Λ CDM, diameter of the cosmos being 93 billion light yeaheaheaHeeHEEHAHAHAH, space being flat (it's a glome²), CMB redshift of 1100 (it's a million times larger²), distant objects of merely a few hundred Ma (they're at least 11 Ga³), Hubble tension, superluminality & tachyons, age of sunlight, temperature of corona & IGM, worm hoHOHAHAHooHoohohoholes (Einstein!) use a dimension of $\sqrt{\text{LENGTH}}$, **MORON! DUNCE!***

*And so on and so forth. **Balderdash.***

Ex fabricationibus sequitur castrum in cælum, stultorum paradísium.

¹ <https://henk-reints.nl/astro/HR-Dark-matter-slideshow.pdf>

² <https://henk-reints.nl/astro/HR-Geometry-of-universe-slideshow.pdf>

³ <https://henk-reints.nl/astro/HR-Hubble-Lemaitre-slideshow.pdf>