

Flaws In The Big Bang Point To **GENESIS**, A
 New Millennium Model Of The Cosmos: Part 2 —
 Is The Scientific Community Aware Of The
 Extraordinary Confusion Over Big Bang's
 Expansion redshifts?

Robert V. Gentry
 The Orion Foundation
 P. O. Box 12067
 Knoxville, TN 37912
 gentryrv@orionfdn.org

28 February 2001

Abstract

The scientific community widely understands that expansion redshifts are the centerpiece of big-bang cosmology. What is generally unknown is the widespread confusion in the ranks of cosmologists as to exactly what they are. A minority equate them with Doppler shifts due to actual recession. A majority, however, claim: (i) "... *the [expansion] redshift does not really have anything to do with velocities at all in cosmology,*" (ii) "... *it is common but misleading to convert a large redshift to a recession velocity using the special-relativistic formula $1 + z = \sqrt{(1 + v/c)/(1 - v/c)}$," and (iii) "*The truth is that expansion redshifts are totally different from Doppler redshifts, and the velocities catalogued by astronomers are not the recession velocities used in the velocity-distance law.*" Has the scientific community been victimized by astronomers as the foregoing implies? Or is it instead that the expansion redshift concept is flawed? This paper shows it's the latter, that it was accepted without ever being tested. In fact modern physics knows nothing of expansion's redshifts and their presumed origin due to expanding space rather than Doppler recession.*

Should We Believe the Big Bang Scenario? is the title of the side-bar in Martin Rees's recent review of big-bang cosmology [1]. He has done

the entire scientific community an enormous favor in setting forth the main reasons why certain discoveries have been interpreted in support of the big-bang theory. He is also to be commended for the summary appearing in the side-bar, part of which is now quoted:

The extrapolation by astrophysicists and cosmologists back to a stage when the universe had been expanding for a few seconds deserves to be taken as seriously as, for instance, what geologists or paleontologists tell us about the early history of our Earth: Their inferences are just as indirect and generally less quantitative.

Moreover, there are several discoveries that might have been made over the last 30 years which would have invalidated the big bang hypothesis and which have not been made — the big bang theory has lived dangerously for decades and survived. Here are some of those absent observations: ...

The big bang theory's survival gives us confidence in extrapolating right back to the first few seconds of cosmic history and assuming that the laws of microphysics were the same then as now.

In the first paragraph Rees makes it clear that what cosmologists are dealing with in the big bang is actually a huge extrapolation, one that rightly should be classified as an inference, not scientific fact. Moreover, it is significant that he places what geologists and paleontologists say about earth history in the same category because Parts 11 and 12 of this series will show just how tenuous those inferences have been, even to overturning their basic postulates and pointing to a radically different origin of the Earth and all its life forms. Nevertheless Rees claims there are reasons why big bang theory should be trusted in being extrapolated back to the first few seconds of cosmic history. The reasons given are that there are a number of astronomical/astrophysical observations made over the past few decades that could have differed with big-bang predictions, but instead all agreed with them.

Without realizing it Rees has come close to identifying the Achilles heel of big-bang cosmology; namely, when cosmologists looked at ways to affirm or deny certain of big bang's esoteric predictions, they interpreted a few apparently outstanding successes as virtual proof that the theory is essentially correct. The problem is, somewhat incredibly, they did not look carefully at all the possible ways that big-bang cosmology could have been contradicted. And most incredibly of all, they completely overlooked analyzing and test-

ing the very fundamentals of the theory. Dealing with the wide ranging implications of this oversight is precisely the essence of this series of papers.

Modern cosmology rests on the presumed truth of big bang's spacetime expansion hypothesis. Even so, serious questions arise about the exact nature of expansion redshifts, z_{exp} . They are presumed to originate because of differences in \mathfrak{R} and \mathfrak{R}_e , the presumed values of the spacetime expansion factor at present and at time of photon emission. Hence it is assumed that

$$1 + z_{\text{exp}} = \mathfrak{R}/\mathfrak{R}_e. \quad (1)$$

One big problem with this assumption is that no one has ever found a method to measure \mathfrak{R} , or even verify that it exists. (More on this in Parts 4 and 5.) Nevertheless, according to Narlikar [2], big bang theory considers that galaxies are undergoing separation due to a spatial volume increase in time instead of being the result of galactic motion through space. In theory this is the origin of expansion redshifts, which is why they are considered to be fundamentally different from the special relativistic Doppler shift, $1 + z_d = (1 + v/c)/\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$. But if the expansion shift is not a Doppler shift, what is it? In the big bang the answer hinges on what cosmologists think galaxies are doing and how they think the universe is constructed.

Parker, for example, divides the universe into subluminal and superluminal regions and claims there are galaxies we cannot see [3] “...because they are receding from us at a speed greater than that of light.” He says this doesn't violate special relativity because, “We shouldn't think of galaxies as moving through space as they expand away from one another. In reality, it's the space between them that is expanding.” He then distinguishes between recessional velocities, “... due to the stretching of space ...”, and peculiar velocities due to “... the motion of galaxies through space ...”, and concludes by stating [3]:

“Because recessional velocity is not a true velocity, in the usual sense of the word, it is incorrect to think of the redshift of galaxies as due to the Doppler effect. The Doppler effect applies only to objects that actually move through space. The redshift of galaxies exists because their light waves are stretched as space is stretched, and therefore their wavelength is increased. This means, in effect that there are two types of redshifts: cosmological ones like the ones described above, and those due to the Doppler effect.”

In a similar vein Harrison claims [4(a)], “Despite the widespread confusion between expansion and Doppler shifts, the difference is quite marked and easily understood.” He supports Narlikar's and Parker's views as being the truth of the matter, saying [4(a)], “Expansion redshifts are produced by

the expansion of space between bodies that are stationary in space: ...,” and also that even though relative movement between two galaxies does lead to recessional velocities, the associated [4(b)], “... extragalactic redshifts are not the result of the Doppler effect.”

Like Narlikar and Parker, Harrison doesn’t explain why these recessional velocities do not produce a relativistic Doppler shift, but he admits that confusion on this point is so widespread that the galactic velocities catalogued by astronomers using the Hubble velocity-distance law, $v = Hr$, are not really recessional velocities at all. Neither, Harrison says, do those galactic velocities have anything to do with special relativistic effects, saying in particular that [4(a)], “... recessional velocities ... are not governed by the rules of special relativity.”

Narlikar concurs that the expansion redshift [2] “... does not arise from the Doppler effect ...”, nor can the redshift z be related to the velocity by “... the special relativistic relation $1 + z_d = \sqrt{(1 + v/c)/(1 - v/c)}$ ”, and further that “... it is not possible to attach an unambiguous meaning to the relative velocity of two objects separated by a great distance.” These are extraordinary descriptions, out of the realm of known physics. And yet other cosmologists have given the same interpretations. Longair, for example, states [5]:

“Redshift is simply a measure of the scale factor of the Universe when the source emitted its radiation.... Thus, redshift does not really have anything to do with velocities at all in cosmology. The redshift is a ... dimensionless number which, as $(1 + z)^{-1}$, tells us the relative distance between galaxies when the light was emitted compared with that distance now. It is a great pity that Hubble multiplied z by c . I hope we will eventually get rid of the c .”

Longair’s position, that redshifts have nothing to do with recessional velocities, calls Hubble’s view [6] into question while at the same time agreeing with those of Narlikar [1], Parker [3] and Harrison [7], who claims, “... that waves, wave trains, and distances between wave packets of radiation in space are progressively stretched and vary in proportion to the scale factor $R(t)$.” Moreover, Harrison [4(e)] quotes both Schrodinger and Rindler as also agreeing that cosmological redshifts are due to expansion, not Doppler effects. Then we have Peacock, who gives an almost identical description of the expansion redshift [8]:

“In terms of the normalized scale factor $a(t)$ we have simply

$a(t) = (1 + z)^{-1}$. Photon wavelengths therefore stretch with the universe, as is intuitively reasonable; see figure 3.3. This is the only correct interpretation of the redshift at large distances; it is common but misleading to convert a large redshift to a recession velocity using the special-relativistic formula $1 + z = \sqrt{(1 + v/c)/(1 - v/c)}$.” [Peacock’s figure 3.3 depicts a sine curve segment in three increasingly-sized cubes; in each one the wavelength is shown to increase in proportion to the cube’s size.]

The key point that stands out here is that, even though all the foregoing cosmologists associate high redshifts with expansion-induced in-flight stretching of photon wavelengths rather than to special relativistic Doppler effects, they in fact fail to provide any quantitative evidence showing that this hypothesized in-flight stretching is a verified physical phenomena. In effect they all depend heavily on intuitive arguments rather than direct experimental evidence to reject the Doppler interpretation of high redshifts.

Misner, Thorne, and Wheeler (MTW) likewise reject the Doppler interpretation of redshifts in favor of the cosmological redshift interpretation [9]. This is not surprising considering all the foregoing authorities do the same. But what makes MTW’s rejection most interesting is that they state why they reject the Doppler interpretation. They do not attempt to provide a physical basis for doing this. Instead they refer to quasars [9], and in a rather deft way pose what appears to be an unanswerable question — namely: How could such high redshift objects be accelerated to relativistic velocities without complete disruption?

The unstated implication is that this could not possibly happen, and hence that high redshifts cannot be Doppler shifts. Clearly, the reason MTW opted as they did is because neither they nor any other cosmologists have any physical principle that would guide their choice. To them it was simply a matter of eliminating a possibility that seemed improbable and then accepting what was left. Thus the process of cosmologists identifying galactic redshifts with cosmological redshifts appears to be in a state of disarray.

Strong evidence that this is the case comes from Weinberg’s opposite claim [10] that expansion redshifts do “... *find a natural explanation in terms of Doppler effects ...*” Novikov likewise argues that cosmological redshifts are Doppler shifts, and furthermore that no other explanation is possible [11]. Much earlier Hubble also seemed to lean toward interpreting galactic redshifts in terms of Doppler recession, but advised caution until more results were obtained [6]. The fact that astronomers and cosmologists have

been unable to agree on the nature of galactic redshifts illustrates the confusion that has long existed on this topic. Indeed, Harrison’s concern about this confusion was such that 1993, in a footnote in his paper [7], he felt impelled to point out that astronomer Alan Sandage [12] — whose work on determining the Hubble constant has spanned about five decades — as well as long-time cosmologists P. J. E. Peebles, D. N. Schramm, E. L. Turner, and R. G. Kron, all had some degree of misunderstanding of the expansion redshift and the velocity-distance law [13]. The reason for this continuing confusion, even among the authorities in the field, is not hard to find.

In particular, earlier discussion herein identified a consensus among those authorities to the effect that while galaxies are presumed to be fixed in space, they are somehow really moving apart. According to Parker, Harrison and Peacock, even though their moving apart does produce recessional velocities, these cannot be equated to the Doppler effect. Narlikar adds that we can never know what this relative velocity is because big bang’s non-Euclidean spacetime makes it impossible to give a clearly defined meaning to the relative velocity between two objects separated by a great distance [1]. Longair [5] and Peacock [8] go even further for large redshifts and claim the expansion redshift doesn’t have anything to do with recessional velocities at all. Harrison seems to corroborate this position when he says [4(a)]:

“Professionals know what they are doing and therefore avoid the pitfalls that by misuse of words they have unfortunately prepared for others. The truth is that expansion redshifts are totally different from Doppler redshifts, and the velocities catalogued by astronomers are not the recession velocities used in the velocity-distance law.”

Some professionals may very well have convinced each other that they knew what they were doing. But whatever they have been doing raises some penetrating questions. In particular:

- How will the scientific community react when they realize that, by their own admission, cosmologists like Narlikar [3], Harrison [4], Longair [5], and Peacock [8] don’t believe the velocities catalogued by astronomers are recession velocities at all? And if they are not recession velocities, then why do astronomers continue their decades-long practice of cataloging them as such?
- How are the scientific community and general public going to react to Parker’s remarkable claim of galaxies we cannot see [3], “... because they are receding from us at a speed greater than that of light.”? It’s remarkable because probably more than 99.99% of physicists have

taught and believed that if a theory is presumed to be based on established laws, then the upper limit is c , the velocity of light.

- How will the scientific community react when now coming to understand Davis and Lineweaver's recent analysis of spacetime expansion and its associated redshifts [14]? They agree with Parker that superluminal recession exists. But they disagree on whether superluminally receding galaxies can be observed. They not only claim they can be observed but that all galaxies and quasars with a redshift greater than three are even now receding superluminally, and furthermore, superluminal recession is a fundamental part of the relativistic description of the expanding universe.

What we have here is proof that the big bang expansion hypothesis has long been accepted by cosmologists in spite of both its internal contradictions and its contradictions with established physical laws. Thus, it has never been a theory in the modern scientific usage of the term but instead one that has always needed 'exceptions' to the rule for it to work. So how are the scientific community and the general public going to react when they begin to comprehend that the foregoing explanations of the presumed differences between Doppler and expansion redshifts are not just confusing and contradictory, but that they are confusing and contradictory to the point of suggesting that expansion redshifts are imaginary entities of an imaginary hypothesis that has never existed in the real universe?

Everyone can understand that, whenever there is recessional motion between two bodies, there is always an associated Doppler shift. If the relative velocity is small, there is the first order Doppler shift. For recession at relativistic velocities, there must be a relativistic Doppler shift. To deny these facts is to deny the essence of modern experimental physics. But this is exactly what the expansion hypothesis leads to because, as Harrison notes, it forces a new definition of velocity [4(c)]: "*Recession velocity is therefore not an ordinary velocity in the usual sense and is quite unlike the velocities encountered on Earth, in the solar system, or in the Galaxy.*" This is indistinguishable from Parker's claim that [3], "... *recessional velocity is not a true velocity, in the usual sense of the word ...* ", and essentially the same view expressed by Davis and Lineweaver [14].

Indeed, perhaps nothing illustrates the unusual aspects of the expansion hypothesis more vividly than Davis and Lineweaver's recent discussion of photon velocity in the big-bang framework [14]. They claim to clarify all previous treatments of the topic. They specifically refer to subluminal

and superluminal regions of the expansion and ask how photons from the superluminal region can ever move into the subluminal region, which they must do in order to eventually be seen by a local observer. To illustrate and presumably clarify how this can happen they use the analogy of a swimmer attempting to make headway against a current that is flowing faster than he can swim. They admit, “*It seems impossible.*” By comparison neither could photons escape being dragged backward if the expansion was proceeding much faster than c . Without at all defining what is meant by photons being dragged backward by the expansion — or explaining what new physical force would have to be invoked to cause this backward motion — they say the reason photons finally get on their way to the observer is that sooner or later photons pass from the superluminal region to the subluminal region. There they presumably begin to approach the observer without being dragged backward [14]. Of course, their whole discussion is predicated on one unverified assumption after another; in particular modern experimental physics knows nothing about photons being dragged backwards by an hypothesized expansion that has never been observed.

Thus big-bang cosmology requires not only the invention of an unknown type of redshift which has never been experimentally confirmed but also the invention of some indefinable, nondescript “velocity,” which is also impossible to verify because it is said to be unlike anything in the Galaxy. But if this “velocity” is unlike anything ever seen or measured, how did it and the unverified expansion postulate come to be two of the cornerstones of big-bang cosmology? Modern physics holds that cornerstone postulates must be verified before they are used to erect a scientific theory.

Only one conclusion can be drawn from the foregoing facts: The space-time expansion hypothesis abounds in so many contradictions and ad hoc inventions, at least one of which clearly denies the fundamentals of modern physics, that it must be false. The question is now raised:

What has caused modern cosmology to embrace a scenario that is so clearly contradicted by experimental physics, a scenario wherein confusion has openly reigned supreme for decades with little or no challenge or remonstrance from the worldwide astronomical community?

Possibly Harrison provides a clue to the answer [4(d)]:

“By failing to distinguish between recession velocity and ordinary velocity, and ... between expansion redshift and Doppler redshift, a confused student is presented with a situation that is tantamount to proof that the edge of the universe is at a distance of 15 billion light years and that we occupy the center of a bounded universe.”

This appears to be a virtual admission that unless expansion and Doppler

shifts are somehow distinguished, then the spherical symmetry of the Hubble relation, if linked with the Doppler interpretation, would inescapably show the universe does have a nearby universal Center. The obvious reason Harrison wishes to dissociate expansion shifts from Doppler shifts is that big bang cosmology and a universal Center are mutually exclusive; they cannot both exist in the same universe. This is not new information. Edwin Hubble knew this at least as early as 1937 when he expressed considerable antipathy about the possibility of interpreting his own galactic redshift discovery — the Hubble redshift relation — as implying the existence of a universal Center [15]. In one instance he referred to the “*horror*” of a Center, on another that it should be avoided at all costs, and on another that it was “*intolerable*” [15]. Hubble obviously spoke for cosmologists and astronomers of his day in expressing these views. And there is no question that this strong, unequivocal bias against a universal Center has remained a fundamental postulate of modern cosmology and astronomy. But why are big-bang cosmologists so averse to the possibility of a nearby universal Center?

The general public very much need to understand that big-bang cosmology postulates that, within a tiny fraction of a second of an assumed initial singularity of unimaginably small size, expansion effects are supposed to have caused energy to fill a space vastly larger than the extent of the visible universe. In theory everything at that time was the same everywhere in this incomprehensibly large, energy-filled, expanding spacetime universe. And, according to big-bang theory, what was everywhere the same then, is required to be everywhere the same now. Just as there was no universal Center at this hypothesized earlier event, neither, according to big bang, can there be a universal Center now. Big-bang theory rules it out completely. This is why cosmologists who are unalterably convinced that the big bang is correct must necessarily oppose, reject, dismiss, or otherwise formulate various plausibility arguments against the evidence for a universal Center. It absolutely cannot be tolerated. If they were to apply Ockham’s razor to the Hubble relation and admit a universal Center exists at present, this would immediately contradict big bang’s cornerstone expansion postulate.

One very deftly constructed plausibility argument that seems to have been most effective in deflecting attention away from the well-nigh overwhelming evidence of a nearby universal Center relies on the insinuation, repeated in virtually every text on cosmology, that since the universe is presumed to be the same everywhere, then observers anywhere in the universe would see the same redshift relation and would then conclude they are at or near the center of the universe. This fictional scenario makes it seem quite plausible to accept the notion that in big bang’s spacetime expansion

universe anywhere in the universe must also be ‘*a center.*’ And with ‘*a center*’ everywhere, there must also be ‘*a center*’ nearby. The net effect of this reorientation is to reject the ‘*nearby universal Center,*’ obtained by applying Ockham’s razor to the Hubble redshift relation, and substitute in its stead the convoluted ‘*center everywhere*’ edifice needed to mesh with the expansion hypothesis.

No less an authority than Stephen Hawking acknowledges that scientific support for the ‘*center everywhere*’ speculation is lacking, saying [16], “*We have no scientific evidence for, or against, this assumption. We believe it only on the grounds of modesty: it would be most remarkable if the universe looked the same in every direction around us, but not around other points in the universe!*” Remarkable or not, Part 7 details the proof of my discovery of the overwhelming evidence that has long existed for a nearby universal Center. It should likewise be noted how amazing it is that one of big bang’s cornerstone postulates is openly acknowledged to be based on nothing more than modesty.

An equally eminent authority, Steven Weinberg, seems to express even greater concern over the validity of this ‘*center everywhere*’ edifice — also known as the Cosmological Principle — by describing it as the [17], “*... one great uncertainty that hangs like a dark cloud over the standard [big bang] model.*” Proof that this dark cloud has now enshrouded the big bang is confirmed because this ‘*center everywhere*’ concept is critically hinged on Friedmann-Lemaitre spacetime expansion, which this paper, and an earlier one [18], have already shown exhibits severe contradictions, sufficient to prove that it must be seriously flawed. Furthermore, a detailed analysis of these flaws is given in Parts 3 through 7 of this series of papers. The net result is that both spacetime expansion and its crucially-needed ‘*center everywhere*’ corollary appear at best to have been spurious inventions that have long been used to prop up the big bang while denying the existence of the nearby universal Center. It is most unfortunate that cosmologists have maintained an almost deafening silence about these matters in scientific journals for several decades.

On the other hand, it is exceedingly fortunate that the arXiv now provides a medium of unfettered, rapid scientific communication — one where this enforced silence can now be challenged and surmounted, one where real freedom of inquiry about the origin and history of the universe can occur without encountering the suppression and censorship I have met in the last three decades in attempting to bring these and other topics to the attention of my colleagues in the scientific community. More on this in Part 12.

Prior to this series of papers the scientific community and general public

were likely unaware that my 1997 discovery of a new cosmic model with a nearby universal Center does provide a new foundation for understanding and explaining both the Hubble relation and the 2.7K CBR, independent of big bang's expansion hypothesis. It appears to be the only paper of its kind ever published [19]. A brief response to criticisms [20] of this model has been given [21]; a more extended response is given in this series [22].

References

- [1] Martin Rees, *Science* **290**, 1919 (2000).
- [2] J. V. Narlikar, *Introduction to Cosmology* (Cambridge Press, 1993) p. 94.
- [3] Barry Parker, *The Vindication of the Big Bang* (Plenum Press, 1993) pp. 76-77.
- [4] E. R. Harrison, *Cosmology, The Science of the Universe* (Cambridge Press, 1981); (a) p. 236; (b) p. 208; (c) p. 214; (d) p. 240; (e) p. 244.
- [5] Malcolm S. Longair, *The Physics of Background Radiation*, in *The Deep Universe*, eds. B. Binggeli and R. Buser (Springer, Berlin, 1995) p. 369.
- [6] Edwin Hubble, *The Realm of the Nebulae* (Yale University Press, 1936) p. 121.
- [7] E. R. Harrison, *ApJ* **403**, 28 (1993).
- [8] John A. Peacock, *Cosmological Physics* (Cambridge University Press, 1999) pp. 71-72.
- [9] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (W. H. Freeman & Company, 1973) p. 767.
- [10] Steven Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology* (John Wiley & Sons, 1972) p. 417.
- [11] I. D. Novikov, *Evolution of the Universe* (Cambridge University Press, 1983) pp. 48-49.
- [12] Alan Sandage, *Ann. Rev. Ast. & Astrophys.* **26**, 561 (1988).
- [13] P. J. E. Peebles et al., *Nature* **352**, 769 (1991).

- [14] Tamara Davis and Charles Lineweaver, arXiv:astro-ph/0011070.
- [15] Edwin Hubble, *The Observational Approach to Cosmology* (Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1937) pp. 50-51, 54, 59.
- [16] Stephen Hawking, *A Brief History of Time* (Bantam Books, 1988) p. 42.
- [17] Steven Weinberg, *The First Three Minutes* (Bantam Books, 1977) p. 111.
- [18] Robert V. Gentry and David W. Gentry, arXiv:gr-qc/9806061.
- [19] Robert V. Gentry, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **12**, 2919 (1997); arXiv:astro-ph/9806280.
- [20] Steven Carlip and Ryan Scranton, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **14**, 71 (1999); arXiv:astro-ph/9808021.
- [21] Robert V. Gentry, arXiv:physics/9810051.
- [22] Many thanks to Dave Gentry for very useful discussions.