

## AGPhil 7: Alternative Ansätze I

Zeit: Mittwoch 9:30–10:30

Raum: GW2 B2900

AGPhil 7.1 Mi 9:30 GW2 B2900

**A physical-ontologic view of being "To be or not To be" —**  
 ●SADLER NORBERT — Wasserburger Str, 25a ; 85540 Haar

"In the beginning was the symmetry and the symmetry was broken and the gravitation and the bright physical reality got emergent and created for us".

At the "genesis of the universe" the fundamental entities and elements as the cosmic energy density distribution, the natural constants, the elementary particles and fields were not primary.

Ontologic primary was the CP-infraktion of the E8-symmetry group at the generation of two bright baryonic energy equivalents (2 x 4.6% bright matter energy) in the mutual gravitative reflection; ontologic "To be".

"(To be)" =  $4\pi \times \alpha(\text{QED}) = 2 \times \Omega(\text{bar.energ.density } 4.6\%)$ .

Further Information: [www.cosmology-harmonices-mundi.com](http://www.cosmology-harmonices-mundi.com)

AGPhil 7.2 Mi 10:00 GW2 B2900

**\*Experimentally proven\*: An argument used to justify mythological concepts and entities. —**  
 ●OSVALDO DOMANN —

Stephanstr. 42, D- 85077 Manching

Established theoretical models were adapted over time introducing fictitious entities to explain new experimental data that didn't fit with the prevailing theory. Examples are gluons, gravitons, dark matter, dark energy, time dilation, length contraction, etc. The result is a monumental patchwork without a strict internal logical structure and with paradoxes. A very often used argumentation to justify mythological entities is that they are experimentally proven, based on measurements which indirectly show consistency with the characteristics that were previously assigned to the mythological entities. The argument \*Experimentally Proven\* avoids that new models build on well proven physical interaction laws are pursued by scientists, models which can explain the new experimental data without fictitious entities. Fictitious concepts or entities can be the result of mathematical approaches (time dilation) or are directly introduced with the required characteristics (dark matter) to explain the new experimental data that doesn't fit. This shows the necessity to recognise when the argument \*Experimentally Proven\* is a real justification or simply a fallacy to justify mythological concepts. More at [www.odomann.com](http://www.odomann.com)