Answer to Gamma-Burst

Dear Vladimir.
Thank you for your essay: *Burst Astrophysics*. I don't think you're going to burst astrophysics. Only few people question their faith. You have undoubtedly worked diligently, for which you have my compliment. Despite our different starting positions, I even discovered some approaches to plasma properties. I agree with you in the points,

- that the photons in the universe lose energy but because the cosmic medium has optical properties with it the photons interact (Compton effect) and
- that the GRBs might have an analogy in the sun-flares.

On the other hand, however, I have to conclude that the whole thing is just too speculative to me seriously.

- The first thing that struck me was that the term gamma-burst caused confusion among nuclear physicists, as they are X- rays, and they have a source other than gamma rays.
- Secondly, it occurred to me that you can not make a solid statistic, nor a serious theory, with a whole of 21 recorded events, which do not even show a pattern in their characteristics.
- Thirdly: GBR and FBR do not show any similarities no similarities according to my sources . However, their location is much more difficult.

As you may know, we proponents of the electric universe, reject the standard model and nonmesurable terms like black holes. The WUM theory, however, does not dissociate itself from such empty concepts and is based on a nonbaryonic hypothetical dark matter.
From mass spectroscopy, however, we have learned that a mass flow is the product of charge and magnetic field strength, and that under space conditions. This is the basis for our knowledge of the structure of all existing chemical elements that we know in the universe.
We continue to assure that nuclear fusion processes generate atoms of higher order numbers from protons and electrons by fusion to neutrons, which must lead to an electron deficiency in stars which must be compensated for by an electric current flow. Consequently, stars are seen as electrically anodes and the surrounding space is a virtual cathode. The model of a galaxy is therefore similar to a gas discharge tube. Where the gases between the stars is the positive column and what is held for dark matter is the Faraday dark space. In this dark space is then quite ordinary gas. Nuclear physics and the optical spectra support this model.
Anthony Perrat has simulated such a model by twisting two filaments of currents on the computer and the results are very convincing. Besides, I do not need to make any additional assumptions that I can not prove.
From the comparison of Coulomb's law and Newton's law, we know that the electrical forces are 36 orders of magnitude greater than the gravitational forces. This is enough to dispense with black holes and the theory of relativity.

In the classification of galaxies after Hubble a few years ago I noticed that there are spectroscopically only three classes of galaxies.

- TypeI: Galaxies with pure line spectra comparable to a gas discharge tube in the laboratory, predominantly hydrogen,
- TypeII: Galaxies with line spectra with thermal background and Hubble type S
- TypeIII: Galaxies with absorption lines in thermal background. Hubble type E

I used the SDSS Data Release 7 as a data base and tested over 341 000 galaxies in a range of 0 to 15 degrees declination, limiting the red shift to 0.4, which is about 1.7 Gpc. A larger red shift

would have shifted the H_α line out of the observation window. But that was my reference line for the investigation.
More than 68% of these galaxies were spiral galaxies of spectral typeII. About 20% were elliptical galaxies of spectral typeIII and 12% were spectral-typeI galaxies, which were visualized as blue dots.
From this I have learned that two-thirds of the galaxies, namely the spiral galaxies, do not turn to Newton or Einstein, but the Lorentz force determines their rotation and this has something to do with the hydrogen present in the galaxies.
Black holes I have not been able to observe, since by definition they give no radiation. But what I can not measure has no scientific relevance for me.
In the case of the electric universe, the real dense plasma focus take place for the fictive black hole, which can cause an initial ignition of a nuclear fusion with hydrogen. This dense plasma focus radiates high luminous energy in the R^3 perpendicular to the rotational plane of the galaxy, which extend into the wavelength range of the X-rays.
If you look into this eye, you get a picture that was called quasar. Halton Arp showed in some galaxies that small mini-galaxies can be found in the radiation direction. No one, however, has observed how they got there. Whether Arps observations and the GRBs or better XRBs could be linked, the future will show. It would therefore be interesting to know which spectral type belongs to the galaxies in which a GRB was detected. I bet; type II, where the most electrical activity.
Half of the red shifts of the GRBs are greater than 0.4. Until then, the distance information about z is quite reliable. In addition, I would no longer trust any distance by red shift. Spectral lines from quasars not only teach a strong red shift of the spectral lines, but also an unusual broadening, which indicates extreme dense plasmas in the heart of the galaxy. Halton Arp has attend to an entire book to these unusual red shifts. Seeing Red: Redshifts, Cosmology and Academic Science - Amazon.de

You can find a lot of stuff about the electric universe on my website. http://mugglebibliothek.de

Sincerely remains Mathias