# Flaws In The Big Bang Point To **GENESIS**, A New Millennium Model Of The Cosmos: Part 7 — Discovery Of A Nearby Universal Center Is The Smoking Gun Signature Of GENESIS That Overturns Big Bang's Cosmological Principle

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

28 February 2001

**Abstract**

Discovery of flaws in the expansion hypothesis reported in Parts 2 and 5 has led to the additional discovery of astronomical proof of a nearby universal Center. In particular, Part 5's disproof of space-time expansion invalidates explaining the Hubble redshift relation in terms of expansion redshifts, thereby exposing the Cosmological Principle as a fallacious concept. Without this Principle it is now evident that the spherical symmetry dictated by the Hubble relation must now be seen as proof of the existence of a nearby universal Center. This conclusion is overwhelmingly supported by the Galaxy also being at the center of the Gamma Ray Burster distribution, as well as by the unequivocal implications of certain cosmic inhomogeneities which have thus far received little attention, specifically meaning definite peaks in certain quasar redshift distributions. Confirmation of the New Redshift Interpretation's postulate of a nearby universal Center validates its explanation of the Hubble redshift relation and the 2.7K CBR, thus explaining why the NRI has been adopted as the astrophysical framework of GENESIS.

This paper details the discovery of the fallacious nature of the Cosmological Principle and why proof of a nearby universal Center is a another smoking

gun signature of GENESIS. Part 2 of this series discussed why cosmologists found it necessary to propose this Principle as an adjunct for big-bang cosmology. Actually this 'Principle' has never been a true experimentally-based principle at all. Instead it has simply been the speculative idea that the universe is everywhere the same. The validity of this speculation has always hinged on two underlying assumptions, the first being that the universe is relativistically governed by the Friedmann-Lemaitre expanding spacetime paradigm. Part 5 showed this expansion hypothesis is fatally flawed, which disproves one of this Principle's two underlying assumptions.

The second underlying assumption is disproven by our discovery of several lines of astronomical proof of a nearby universal Center, proof that astronomers, astrophysicists and cosmologists have long been aware of, but somehow failed to recognize its true significance. Disproof of both assumptions means the speculation about the universe being everywhere the same has always been just a fictional concept needed to support the big bang. Thus our discovery of the fallacious nature of the Cosmological Principle combines our discovery of flaws in the expansion hypothesis with our discovery of astronomical proof of a nearby universal Center.

One of the most important parts of that astronomical proof is none other than Hubble's 1929 discovery of a redshift-distance relation for certain galaxies he had observed [1]. A Doppler interpretation of the redshifts implied a linear velocity-distance relation would hold universally if galaxies with greater redshifts were observed to follow the same relation. Subsequent observations confirmed the original result, proving that the universe must be spherically symmetric about the Galaxy. Ockham's razor — the litmus test for all new observations in all fields of scientific endeavor — virtually demanded that this simplest interpretation of universal, ordered recession from a nearby Center quickly receive the closest attention.

Instead of an open-minded approach to this possibility, Hubble's 1937 book reveals a strong bias against it [2], "*Such a condition would imply that we occupy a unique position in the universe, ... . The hypothesis cannot be disproved, but it is unwelcome, ... But the unwelcome supposition of a favored location must be avoided at all costs.*" (pp. 50-51) Later he added, *"Such a favored position ... is intolerable; moreover, it represents a discrepancy with the theory because the theory postulates homogeneity." (p.58-59)*

Hubble's decision to promote 'theory' while denying the straightforward interpretation of the observational data is foreign to modern experimental physics. The 'theory' is of course the Cosmological Principle, which Hubble admitted was only, "... *a sheer assumption. It seems plausible and it appeals*

*strongly to our sense of proportion. Nevertheless, it leads to a rather remarkable consequence, for it demands that, if we see the nebulae all receding from our position in space, then every other observer, no matter where he may be located, will see the nebulae all receding from his position. However, the assumption is adopted. There must be no favoured location in the universe, no centre, no boundary; all must see the universe alike." (p.54)*

Hubble not only ignored Ockham's razor in interpreting his data, he made every effort to make a contrived explanation appear as reasonable as possible. Rarely if ever has a fundamental premise of a new scientific theory been promoted and accepted with nothing more substantial than the strong bias of its leading proponents. Ignoring the obvious, astronomers and cosmologists united in a consensus in interpreting the Friedmann-Lemaitre spacetime solutions of the field equations as a viable explanation of the Hubble redshift relation. This nicely avoided the 'horror' of a universal center [2, p.59]. That consensus had been developing since 1931, when Eddington was alerted to Lemaitre's 1927 expanding spacetime solution to the field equations [3,4]. Between 1931 and Hubble's 1937 book, it was additionally found that, in 1922 and 1924, Friedmann had previously discovered [5,6] Lemaitre's solutions.

Despite its wide acceptance certain notable cosmologists have occasionally expressed doubts about this Principle over the past few decades. In 1978 Weinberg described it as the [7], "*...one great uncertainty that hangs like a dark cloud over the standard model.*" A decade later Hawking made an equally frank admission, saying [8], *"... it might seem that if we observe all other galaxies to be moving away from us, then we must be at the center of the universe. There is, however, an alternate explanation: the universe might look the same in every direction as seen from any other galaxy, too. This, as we have seen, was Friedmann's second assumption. We have no scientific evidence for, or against this assumption. We believe it only on 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 ...".*

Peebles has added to this, saying [9], *"Might we be at the center of an inhomogeneous but spherically symmetric universe?"*, only to conclude shortly thereafter that, *"... the best argument against a spherically symmetric inhomogeneous universe is that the Milky Way does not appear to be a special galaxy, nor does it seem to be in a special place."*

That eminent cosmologists could openly describe the Cosmological Principle as being under *"a dark cloud'*, or that it should be accepted *"only on grounds of modesty*," or that the "*Milky Way does not appear to be a special*

*galaxy, nor does it seem to be in a special place,"* without awakening serious inquiry of this topic in astronomical and astrophysical journals, shows how deeply this hypothesis is entrenched in modern cosmology.

More proof of this comes from: (i) Fishman and Meegan's 1995 review of Gamma-Ray Bursters (GRBs), wherein they noted [10], *"The isotropy and inhomogeneity of the* [gamma-ray] *bursts show only that we are at the center of the apparent burst distribution,*" and (ii) Woolsey's 1995 review, wherein he noted [11], *"The observational data show conclusively that the Earth is situated at or very near the center of the gamma-ray burst universe."* These evaluations occurred before GRBs were discovered to be at cosmological distances. Now that this has been confirmed [12], it is obvious that GRBs unambiguously prove a nearby universal Center does exist. Yet the astronomical literature has remained deafeningly silent about this implication.

One occasion where a universal Center was mentioned as a possible interpretation of astronomical data occurred over two decades ago. Varshni reported — on the basis of quasar redshift data then available — that the quasar redshift distribution exhibited certain peaks and suggested there were only two interpretations of the data [13]. Either there was some intrinsic phenomena responsible for these peaks, which was the option he favored, or that quasar redshifts are of cosmological origin, in which case they must be clustered into different spherical shells. He argued it was unreasonable to consider the latter option because such an interpretation would prove the cosmos had a universal Center near the Earth.

Most interesting in this respect is Hoyle, Burbidge, and Narlikar's recent book [14], particularly the section in Chapter 23 titled, *"Peculiarities in the redshift distribution."* There we find the following statements:

"*Among all of the observational discoveries of the past 30 years, it has been those which involve the measured redshifts which cause the most problems. They are so difficult to understand and so unexpected, that discussion of them has been almost completely left out of other books on cosmology."*

"*We have described some of the data in Chapter 11 and have tried to take these into account in our theoretical discussion. But there are some phenomena that we have not so far described since we also have not been able to understand or explain them. Nevertheless we have concluded that they cannot be ignored since we believe that the data are good and will ultimately affect our view of the universe."*

They next discuss the results of Tifft [15], who has made repeated claims of observing differential redshifts in certain nearby galaxy groups, and of confirmatory observations by Guthrie and Napier [16], among others, in finding

evidence of quantized redshifts in normal galaxies within the local supercluster with a periodicity $c\Delta z = 37.6$ km s$^{-1}$. Hoyle, Burbidge and Narlikar acknowledge these results are so puzzling that they have been completely ignored by the astronomical and cosmological community [14], adding that in more than 20 years no one has been invited to talk about these data at any of the many cosmological conferences devoted to big bang cosmology.

Also discussed are peculiarities in quasar redshifts that appeared as early as 1968, when the redshift distribution of a certain class of quasars was found to be quantized [17] with $\Delta z = 0.061$. In 1990 more than 700 quasars were known, and in this larger set the peaks again appeared, especially at $z = 0.061$ [18]. Also cited are other statistical studies of certain quasar populations, showing the strong periodicity is real, the exact value being $\Delta z = 0.0565$. It is further noted that the significance of this value is increased when the redshifts are transformed to the galactocentric frame [19] and that a redshift histogram of 7300 quasars shows obvious redshift peaks at $z \simeq 0.3, 1.4$ and $1.9 - 2.0$ [14,20].

Just as impressive are the more recent confirmatory results of Burbidge and Napier [21], who report redshift periodicity for: (i) quasars close to companion galaxies, (ii) binary or multiple quasars, (iii) X-ray sources close to bright active galaxies which, on investigation turn out to be quasars, and (iv) the 3C and 3CR quasars, which effectively comprise a complete sample. Especially impressive is their confirmation that the redshift distributions of the samples which exhibit peaks with a periodic separation of $\sim 0.089$ in $\log(1+z)$, are now found to include higher redshift peaks, $z = 2.63, 3.45$ and 4.47, as predicted by the formula, but not previously seen [21].

Hoyle, Burbidge and Narlikar interpret these peaks in terms of an intrinsic redshift effect, which they are presently unable to identify [14], while admitting that they have uncovered some "... *phenomena whose origins we do not understand either within the framework of the big-bang cosmology or within the framework of the QSSC. But there is no excuse for ignoring observations which do not apparently fit into a picture which is largely based on some well accepted results, but also a number of preconceived ideas.*"

It is to their very great credit that these researchers have so openly faced this controversial topic and forthrightly admitted their own and others' inability to fit these observations within either the big bang or their own Quasi-Steady-State Cosmology. As they say, there is no excuse for ignoring observations just because they do not fit the prevailing cosmological dogma.

Since observations are a primary criteria for formulating a realistic model of the cosmos, how interesting it is that: (i) The quantized redshifts reported by Tifft [15] and confirmed by Guthrie and Napier [16], (ii) the inhomoge-

neous quasar redshift distributions reported by Varshni [13], and (iii) the quantized and inhomogeneously distributed quasar redshifts reported by Hewitt and Burbidge [20], discussed by Hoyle, Burbidge and Narlikar [14], and very recently confirmed by Burbidge and Napier [21], can all be understood within the framework of the universe demanded by the Hubble redshift relation and the inhomogeneously distributed GRBs — a universe that possesses a nearby universal Center. So we see that what was previously an astronomical mystery in the big-bang scenario, a topic which was too sacrosanct to be discussed openly in the literature, now finds a natural explanation in the GENESIS astrophysical framework of the cosmos.

**Summary** —

Early on, Hubble recognized the Ockham's razor interpretation of his redshift relation was the existence of a nearby universal center. But in his 1937 book he reveals a strong bias against the Galaxy occupying a unique position in the universe. He admitted this hypothesis could not be disproved, but argued it was an unwelcome supposition, a horror, that must be avoided at all costs, because it represents a discrepancy with the theory, which postulates homogeneity. Hubble admitted it was a sheer assumption. Nevertheless, he demanded that there must be no favored location in the universe, no center, no boundary; all must see the universe alike in order to maintain belief in F-L expansion and the Cosmological Principle.

Hubble's decision to promote 'theory' while denying the straightforward interpretation of the observational data not only ignored Ockham's razor in interpreting his data, he made a determined effort to make a contrived explanation appear as reasonable as possible. Rarely if ever has a fundamental premise of a new scientific hypothesis been promoted and accepted with nothing more substantial than the strong bias of its leading proponents. And rarely if ever has the bandwagon effect been so successful preventing the implications of overwhelming astronomical evidence from being correctly understood for so long. Ignoring the obvious, eminent astronomers and cosmologists have long united in a consensus in interpreting the Friedmann-Lemaitre spacetime solutions of the field equations as a viable explanation of the Hubble redshift relation. This has happened in spite of the fact that leading cosmologists have themselves referred to the uncertainties and lack of proof of the Cosmological Principle. The failure of comologists and astronomers to recognize the overwhelming evidence of a nearby universal Center may yet become known as the second greatest faux pas in the history of science.

The discovery of astronomical proof of the existence of a nearby universal Center, as reported herein, plus the disproof of the Friedmann-Lemaitre

expansion hypothesis, as shown in Part 5 of this series, effectively disprove the Cosmological Principle. Accordingly, the correct description, or model of the cosmos must include as one of its foundational postulates the existence of a nearby universal Center. Such a model must be capable of accounting for the Hubble redshift relation and the 2.7K CBR. The 1997 discovery of the New Redshift Interpretation (NRI) accomplished this. So the NRI becomes GENESIS' astrophysical framework [22]. Additional supporting evidence for this framework is given in Parts 8 and 9.

## References


[1] E. P. Hubble, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*. **15**, 168 (1929).

[2] E. P. Hubble, *The Observational Approach to Cosmology*, (The Clarendon Press, 1937). pp. 50-51, 54 and 58.

[3] Georges Lemaitre, *Ann. Soc. Sci. Bruxelles* **A 47**, 49 (1927).

[4] Georges Lemaitre, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*. **91**, 483 (1931).

[5] A. Friedmann, *Z. Physik* **10**, 377 (1922).

[6] A. Friedmann, *Z. Physik* **21**, 326 (1924).

[7] Steven Weinberg, *The First Three Minutes*, (Bantam Books, New York, 1977) p. 111.

[8] S. W. Hawking, *A Brief History of Time* (Bantam Books, New York, 1988). p. 42.

[9] P.J.E. Peebles, *Principles of Physical Cosmology* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1993). p. 665.

[10] G. J. Fishmann and C. A. Meegan, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **33**, 415 (1995).

[11] S. E. Woosley, *Gamma-Ray Bursts - What Are They?*, in *Seventeenth Texas Symposium on Relativistic Astrophysics and Cosmology* (New York Academy of Sciences, New York, 1995), p. 446.

[12] P. Meszaros, *Science* **291**, 79 (2001).

[13] Y. P. Varshni, *Astrophys...* & *Space Science* **43**, 3 (1976); —, **51**, 121 (1977).

[14] Fred Hoyle, Geoffrey Burbidge, and J. V. Narlikar, *A Different Approach to Cosmology* (Cambridge University Press, 2000). pp. 325-333.

[15] W. Tifft, *Astrophys.. & Space Science* **244**, 29 (1996).

[16] B. N. Guthrie and W. M. Napier, *Astron. & Ap.* **310**, 353 (1996).

[17] G, Burbidge, *Ap. J.* **154**, L41 (1968).

[18] G. Burbidge and A. Hewitt, *Ap. J.* **359,** L33 (1990).

[19] D. Duari, P. Das Gupta and J. V. Narlikar, *Ap. J.* **384**, 35 (1992).

[20] A. Hewitt and G. Burbidge, *Ap. J. S.* **87**, 451 (1993).

[21] G. Burbidge and W. M. Napier, arXiv:astro-ph/0008026.

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