Flaws In The Big Bang Point To **GENESIS**, A New Millennium Model Of The Cosmos: Part 9 — Disproof Of Big-Bang Cosmology Points To Seven Smoking Gun Signatures Of GENESIS' Astrophysical Framework

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

28 February 2001

Abstract

Earlier papers in this series have exposed major flaws in big bang's spacetime expansion hypothesis, effectively falsifying all aspects of big bang cosmology and its explanations of the Hubble relation, the 2.7K Cosmic Blackbody Radiation (CBR), the Sunyaev-Zeldovich effect, and Olber's paradox, to name a few. The fictitious nature of big bang's explanations of these phenomena requires a major revision in our perception of the cosmos, one that would bring order and a new understanding of these phenomena out of the chaos of big bang's collapse. A new model of the cosmos is at hand to do just that. Indeed, the fit to the new model is so unequivocal that all the aforementioned phenomena; namely, (i) Galactic recession from a nearby universal Center, as evidenced by the Hubble redshift relation, (ii) the 2.7K CBR, its temperature variation with redshift, and (iii) its proof of the existence of an absolute reference frame, (iv) the Sunyaev-Zeldovich effect, (v) Olber's paradox, (vi) SNe Ia confirmation of GENESIS' vacuum gravity universe, and (vii) the $(1+z)^{-1}$ time dilation of SNe and GRB light curves, are all Smoking Gun Signatures of GENESIS' astrophysical framework of the universe.

Previous papers in this series have analyzed big-bang cosmology's three cornerstone postulates, which are [1]: (i) the Cosmological Principle, the

assumption that the universe is everywhere homogeneous and isotropic, (ii) the universe is governed by the Friedmann-Lemaitre spacetime expansion hypothesis, and (iii) the Hubble relation and the 2.7K CBR are the result of expansion redshifts, wherein spacetime expansion, theorized to be a general relativistic effect, presumably acts to cause photon wavelengths to increase in-flight in proportion to the increase in the expansion factor between the times of emission and observation [1]. Results presented earlier in this series have demonstrated contradictions in all these postulates, in particular showing that the universe is not governed by Friedmann-Lemaitre spacetime expansion, and that there is unambiguous evidence for a nearby universal Center. Part 1 of this series summarized the New Redshift Interpretation (NRI) and documented why it operates as a valid astrophysical framework of the cosmos [2] without big bang's spacetime expansion postulate. Part 5 substantiated the relativistic basis for GENESIS' astrophysical framework, and Part 7 documented astronomical proof of its basic postulate of a nearby universal Center. Additional support for its validity is provided in this paper.

1 Seven Smoking Gun Signatures And Other Affirmations Of GENESIS

Ref. [2] showed how the NRI, which is GENESIS' astrophysical framework, accounts for the Hubble redshifts solely in terms of relativistic Doppler and Einstein gravitational redshifts, all cast within the framework of a finite, nonhomogeneous, vacuum-gravity universe with cosmic Center (C) somewhere astronomically near the Galaxy [2]. In this framework cosmic repulsion from vacuum gravity causes Hubble-type recession of the galaxies away from the cosmic Center. This orderly expansion of the galaxies away from C shows that this framework truly represents a new cosmic perspective on the universe. Prior to the formulation of the NRI it was generally assumed the universe had to be governed by the Friedmann-Lemaitre spacetime expansion hypothesis in order to account for the astronomical data supporting an expanding universe [1]. The discovery of the NRI has shown, however, this assumption is incorrect because this new framework can account for an 'expanding universe' independent of Friedmann-Lemaitre spacetime expansion.

1.1 The Hubble magnitude-redshift relation – A smoking gun signature of GENESIS

The NRI is strongly affirmed because it has already been shown to account for the Hubble redshift relation in terms of relativistic Doppler and Einstein gravitational redshifts, all cast within the framework of a finite, inhomogeneous, vacuum-gravity universe with a nearby cosmic Center. Reference is made to Part 8 of this series for details on how this astrophysical framework is capable of accounting for the Hubble (m, z) relation, $m = \mathcal{M}+5\log cz$.

1.2 Identifying the Cosmic Blackbody Radiation as gravitationally redshifted blackbody cavity radiation from an outer galactic shell is another smoking gun signature of GENESIS

As additionally discussed in Part 1 of this series, this new framework assumes the widely dispersed galaxies of the visible universe are enclosed by a thin, outer shell of closely spaced galaxies at a distance R from the Galaxy [2]. Since this outer galactic shell is assumed to have an essentially uniform temperature, the blackbody cavity radiation filling the space enclosed by it would be isotropic when seen by an observer at C. The radial variation of gravitational potential within this volume requires the cavity radiation temperature measured at any interior point to depend on the magnitude of the Einstein gravitational redshift between that point and the outer shell—or, alternatively, between that point and the Center, C. By including vacuum energy density, ρ_v, and pressure, p_v, into the gravitational structure of the cosmos, it is possible to show how the radiation emitted from this outer shell is gravitationally redshifted to become the 2.7K blackbody cavity radiation here at the Galaxy [2].

In particular, if the vacuum pressure, p_v, is negative, then the vacuum density, ρ_v, will be positive, and the summed vacuum pressure/energy contributions to vacuum gravity will be $-2\rho_v$. So, excluding the outer galactic shell at R, the net density throughout the cosmos from C to R would be $\rho - 2\rho_v$, where ρ is the average mass/energy density of ordinary matter. Beyond R both densities are assumed to either cancel or diminish to negligible values, which effectively achieves for the NRI framework what Birkhoff's theorem did for standard cosmology. This framework is sufficient to compute the gravitational potentials needed to account for both the Hubble redshift relation and the 2.7K CBR in the NRI [2].

Almost thirty years ago Misner, Thorne and Wheeler [1] noted that

the 2.7 K CBR had the form expected if the Earth were enclosed in a box ("black-body cavity") with temperature 2.7K. But there is no record where they or any other cosmologist took this suggestion seriously. Indeed, this was never an option for cosmologists because a cavity-within-a-box scenario could not exist within big bang's homogeneous universe.

Thus the NRI, which does account for the 2.7K CBR as gravitationally redshifted cavity radiation from a distant, outer spherical shell of galaxies, remained undiscovered until recently [2]. The initial version of this model assumed the shell's temperature was uniformly about 5400K [2]. But a lower uniform average temperature of 3000K can be postulated equally well because, within certain limits, this is a free parameter. In this instance the gravitational redshift would then be $3000/2.726 = 1100$, instead of 2000 for the 5400K shell. Also, the distance from C to the outer shell is reduced from 14.24×10^9 ly to 14.13×10^9 ly.

A second important assumption concerning this outer shell is that its galaxies contain only trace amounts of heavier elements. The somewhat recently discovered *Extremely Red Objects* [3,4] appear to be in this category. This assures the virtual absence of heavy element emission lines and, with the assumption of a lower average temperature, provides the conditions for these galaxies to function as blackbody radiators. Light from these stars, or galaxies, is considered to be the source of the blackbody radiation for the 2.7K CBR. The collective radiation is still subject to the gravitational redshift to become the presently observed 2.7K CBR.

1.3 Accounting for the Cosmic Blackbody Radiation temperature variation with redshift via the expression, $\mathbf{T}(z) = 2.73(1 + z)$, is another smoking gun signature of GENESIS

Another most significant consequence of this new framework concerns the recent CBR temperature measurement at $z = 2.34$, reported [5] to be between 6.0K and 14K. As noted in Part 1, Bahcall extolled the big bang is 'bang on' [6] because this result fits big bang's prediction of 9.1K. His enthusiasm was based of course on the assumption that big bang's cornerstone postulates were correct. Now that these have been disproven it is obvious that a new explanation is needed. Indeed, in Part 1 it has already been shown that the NRI is equally 'bang on' because its $T(z) = 2.73(1 + z)$ equation exactly duplicates big bang's 2.73K at $z = 0$ and its 9.1K CBR at $z = 2.34$. In the big bang this equation represented a *temporal* difference in redshift conditions. In the NRI it results from a *spatial* difference in redshift

conditions; more specifically, the temperature dependence on redshift arises because of the latter's dependence on the universal gravitational potential, which in turn exhibits a dependence on the radial distance from the Center [2]. The end result is same equation as predicted by big bang's temporal dependence.

1.4 The Cosmic Blackbody Radiation acting as an absolute reference frame for the universe is another smoking gun signature of GENESIS

Another notable difference between big bang cosmology and GENESIS concerns the existence of a fixed, universal reference frame. In the big bang there could be no fixed reference frame, and none was ever recognized as such. But in the GENESIS framework there is a fixed universal Center, and a fixed Center absolutely demands the existence of a universal reference frame. It is significant therefore to note that Smoot [7] and Weisskopf [8] have characterized the 2.7K CBR as a universal frame of reference. Weisskopf in particular focused on this fact when he stated [8],

> *"It is remarkable that we now are justified in talking about an absolute motion, and that we can measure it. The great dream of Michelson and Morley is realized. ...It makes sense to say that an observer is at rest in an absolute sense when the 3K radiation appears to have the same frequencies in all directions. Nature has provided an absolute frame of reference. The deeper significance of this concept is not yet clear."*

The discovery of GENESIS' astrophysical framework has successfully unveiled the deeper significance of which Weisskopf spoke, for it provides a unique scientific understanding of why the 2.7K CBR does function as an absolute frame of reference of the cosmos. Since the proof is certain, the denial must be of a philosophical nature. Actually it appears to be in the same category as Hubble's ill-founded denial that the galactic redshift relation points to a nearby universal Center (see Part 7 for details). Hubble said cosmological theory — meaning the Cosmological Principle — denied the existence of a Center; therefore it must be excluded. And what Hubble said, others followed unquestioningly. It seems that modern cosmologists have done much the same with this proof of an absolute reference frame in that they have failed to recognize that it also contradicts the Cosmological Principle.

1.5 The Sunyaev-Zeldovich Effect is another smoking gun signature of GENESIS

As just noted, the evidence for a universal Center near the Galaxy and the evidence supporting GENESIS' interpretation of the 2.7K CBR as being gravitationally redshifted cavity radiation is substantial. These characteristics are precisely those needed to account for the Sunyaev-Zeldovich effect, which has been thought to be explainable only within the context of big-bang cosmology [9].

When Sunyaev and Zeldovich proposed their idea, they did so in the context of big-bang cosmology, assuming the reason CBR photons would backlight even the outermost galaxies is that photons presumed to have originated in big bang's primeval fireball would have originated before galaxies formed [9]. In this scenario hot gases surrounding very distant clusters of galaxies should scatter photons that originated from even earlier times, thus causing the CBR photon temperature to be slightly diminished in the shadow cast on Earth by those gases. The effect has been confirmed in observations of galactic clusters [10]. However, since big bang's expansion hypothesis has been disproven, it is evident the big-bang fireball never existed. Thus, there must be another source of CBR photons which backlights the galaxies of the visible universe.

The GENESIS framework identifies that source as the light emanating from the NRI's outer galactic shell [2]. Since the Center may lie within the Galaxy, it follows that CBR photons arriving locally from the outer galactic shell must have followed trajectories directed almost radially inward to the Earth, Thus all galactic clusters in the visible universe — meaning all inside the outer shell — will cast a shadow in local measurements of the 2.7K CBR. This explains why the S-Z effect is a logical consequence of the GENESIS model.

1.6 Olber's Paradox is another smoking gun signature of GENESIS

Olber's paradox concerns why the night sky is dark. Harrison [11] has shown that a static, infinite universe, with a constant volume density of stars with about the sun's temperature, would eventually produce a brilliant night sky of the same temperature, instead of the dark night sky that is seen. Harrison has discussed several different resolutions of this paradox both within the context of an infinite, static, Newtonian universe, as well as within the framework of Friedmann-Lemaitre spacetime expansion [11]. In the latter

case, he assumed the effects of spacetime expansion would eventually cause galaxies to disappear from our range of sight and that their disappearance would in itself account for the dark night sky. In essence a dark night sky will result whenever there are only a finite number of sources to consider. This result is applicable to GENESIS' astrophysical framework because its finite, constant density universe leads to a finite number of galaxies [2]. Additionally, as Part 8 in this series has shown, in the GENESIS framework the apparent brightness of distant galaxies is diminished by a factor of $(1+z)^{-3}$ due to Doppler and gravitational effects. So, in GENESIS the night sky is dark because of a finite number of galaxies and because light from those at increasingly higher redshifts is diminished by the $(1+z)^{-3}$ redshift dimming effect.

1.7 GENESIS' prediction that ours is a vacuum gravity universe is confirmed by the discovery of astronomical evidence of cosmic repulsion and the cosmological constant

The cosmological constant, $\Lambda = 8\pi\rho_v G$, originally conceived by Einstein as a way to stabilize the universe [12], but subsequently almost completely dismissed by big-bang cosmologists after Hubble's 1929 discovery of evidence of an expanding universe. Now, over seventy years later, the cosmological constant has again gained credence among cosmologists, but only because of the very unexpected 1998 discovery that Type Ia SNe exhibit characteristics that are strong evidence for cosmic repulsion due to a finite energy density, ρ_v, of the vacuum. At this writing the best estimate for $\Omega_\Lambda = 8\pi\rho_v G/3H_o^2$ derived from supernovae observations appears to be $\Omega_\Lambda \sim 0.7$ [13-16].

In contrast to big bang cosmology's long aversion to the cosmological constant, I reported in late 1997 [2], before the astronomical evidence for cosmic repulsion was published in early 1998 [13-16], that a necessary feature of the New Redshift Interpretation's (NRI's) astrophysical framework — which is also that of GENESIS — was that the universe should be characterized by a vacuum energy density, ρ_v, that exceeded the ordinary mass density, ρ. Moreover, not only was its existence predicted but also its approximate value, $\rho_v \simeq 8.9\times10^{-30}$ g-cm^{-3}. Substituting this value, together with $H_o = 68$ km s^{-1} Mpc^{-1} $= 2.2\times10^{-18}$ s^{-1} — the value used in ref. [2] — into the expression for Ω_Λ yields $(\Omega_\Lambda)_{NRI} \simeq 1$, which approximates the astronomical value. Thus it seems reasonably clear that GENESIS' prediction of ours being a universe dominated by vacuum gravity has been confirmed by the Type Ia SNe results.

1.8 Another smoking gun signature of GENESIS is that its astrophysical framework exactly predicts the observed $(1+z)^{-1}$ time dilation for Type Ia supernovae and GRB light curves

Goldhaber *et al.* [17], Perlmutter et al. [16(a,b)] and Filippenko and Riess [18] have all reported observations supporting the $1+z$ broadening of Type Ia SNe light curves, and have attributed this to cosmological time dilation from spacetime expansion. While Parts 2 through 6 of this series has shown the expansion explanation for this effect is no longer viable, refs. [2], [19] and [20], plus this paper and Part 8 of this series, collectively provide the basis for a new one. In particular, ref. [19] and Part 8 of this series reveal that the NRI's combined gravitational and relativistic Doppler shifts require that the clock rate at the point of emission is diminished by $(1+z)^{-1}$ compared to local terrestrial clocks. Relativistically speaking, this time dilation prediction exactly agrees with what refs. [16], [17] and [18] have reported for Type Ia SNe. Additional evidence for the same relativistic time dilation has also been obtained for a distant Gamma-Ray Burster [21]. Here then is another instance where GENESIS exactly accounts for specific observational data previously thought to be explainable only by the expansion hypothesis, and as such it qualifies as another smoking gun signature of this model.

1.9 Microkelvin-range variations in the CBR noted in the MAXIMA observations are accounted for by millikelvin-range variations in the NRI's outer galactic shell

Big-bang cosmology assumes that weak temperature anomalies were produced in the CBR soon after the big bang, as large scale structures began to form. According to this theory these tiny variations should now be observable in the present 2.7K CBR. Indeed, last year's Boomerang balloon experiments in Antarctica [22], and the more recent MAXIMA-1 Balloon experiments [23], have both yielded anisotropies in the 2.7K CBR that have been attributed to big bang's predicted temperature anomalies. However, the falsification of big-bang cosmology shows this interpretation of the results cannot be correct. So there must be another explanation.

Again we turn to the GENESIS framework, and again we find an alternate explanation of results previously thought to be explainable only by big-bang cosmology. There is another way to account for the spatial and microtemperature variations in the CBR [22,23]; namely, GENESIS' outer galactic shell has a near perfect, rather than absolutely per-

fect, uniform temperature; moreover, the clusters of galaxies comprising the outer shell almost, but not perfectly, overlap. On this basis, the spatial/microtemperature variations observed in the MAXIMA map would actually be the result of galactic cluster separation plus gravitationally redshifted millikelvin-range temperature variations in different parts of the outer galactic shell. In this scenario the MAXIMA map would be interpreted as approximately reflective of galactic cluster separation in the outer shell, thus being reflective of the present state of the cosmos instead of a relic of its distant past [24].

References

[1] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, (W. H. Freeman & Company, 1973) pp. 763-797.

[2] Robert V. Gentry, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A 12**, 2919 (1997); arXiv:astro-ph/9806280.

[3] M. Stiavelli, arXiv:astro-ph/0010100.

[4] P. Martini, arXiv:astro-ph/0009287.

[5] R. Srinand, P. Pettijean and C. Ledoux, *Nature* **408**, 931 (2000).

[6] John Bahcall, *Nature* **408**, 916 (2000).

[7] George Smoot and Keay Davidson, *Wrinkles in Time (*Avon books, Division of the Hearst Corp., New York, 1993) *p. 117.*

[8] V. F. Weisskopf, *American Scientist*, **71**, No. 5, 473 (1983).

[9] John A. Peacock, *Cosmological Physics* (Cambridge University Press, 1999) pp. 145.

[10] L. Grego et al., arXiv:astro-ph/0003085.

[11] E. R. Harrison, *Cosmology, The Science of the Universe* (Cambridge University Press, 1981) pp. 251-262.

[12] A. Einstein, Preuss. *Akad. Wiss. Berlin, Sitsber.* **142** (1917). English reprint in *The Principle of Relativity*, (Dover Publications), pp. 177-198.

[13] P. M. Garnavich et al., *ApJ* **493,** L53, (1998); arXiv:astro-ph/9710123.

[14] B. P. Schmidt et al., *ApJ* **507**, 46 (1998); arXiv:astro-ph/9805200.

[15] A. G. Riess et al., *Astronom. J.* **116**, 1009 (1998); arXiv:astro-ph/9805201.

[16] (a) S. Perlmutter et al., *Nature* **391**, 51 (1998); arXiv:astro-ph/9712212; (b) S. Perlmutter et al., arXiv:astro-ph/9812473.

[17] G. Goldhaber et al., arXiv:astro-ph/9602124.

[18] A. V. Fillipenko and A. G. Riess, arXiv:astro-ph/0008057.

[19] Robert V. Gentry, arXiv:astro-ph/9810051.

[20] Robert V. Gentry and David W. Gentry, arXiv:gr-qc/9086061.

[21] Ming Deng and Bradley Schaefer, arXiv:astro-ph/9806010.

[22] P. de Bernardis et al., *Nature* **404**, 955 (2000).

[23] S. Hanany et al., *ApJ* **545**, L5 (2000).

[24] Many thanks to Dave Gentry for useful discussions.