

Flaws In The Big Bang Point To **GENESIS**, A
New Millennium Model Of The Cosmos: Part 3 —
Galaxies Point To Flaws In Big Bang's
Expanding-Balloon Illustration And To Smoking
Gun Signatures Of GENESIS

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

28 February 2001

Abstract

Big bang's pennies-on-an-expanding balloon illustration depicts ever increasing separation of galaxies predicated on the assumption that the universe is governed by Friedmann-Lemaitre spacetime expansion. There is a significant contradiction connected with the effects of this assumption. It concerns how spacetime expansion is portrayed to interact with gravity. On one hand, clusters of galaxies are pictured as separating to increasingly greater distances despite their large gravitational attraction. On the other hand, for some mysterious reason expansion is said to be unable to cause galaxies themselves to increase in size even though the gravitational attraction within them is smaller than between clusters. Analysis shows that if expansion ever existed it would have caused continuous, uniform expansion of all matter, in which case galaxies would not have formed. Thus the existence of galaxies provides two powerful Smoking Gun Signatures, the first being that our universe knows nothing of big bang's spacetime expansion and, second, that the GENESIS of our universe must have occurred far differently than modern cosmology has ever envisioned.

In his article "*The new physics — Physical or mathematical science?*" Oldershaw suggests [1],

“... that an undesirable blurring of the distinction between physical science and mathematical abstraction has taken place in the fields of particle physics and cosmology over the past three decades.”

He comments specifically on certain results in particle physics which, before they were obtained, would have been considered sufficient to falsify a particular theoretical prediction, but which afterwards ended up being incorporated into a revision of the theory. His point is that, given the opportunity to inject endless revisions into a theory, there is no longer a standard by which it can be falsified. In the instances Oldershaw mentions it is evident that theorists consider they are in the repair business. The philosophy behind this mentality is of course the assumption that physicists have identified a core truth in whatever theory may be under study. All that is needed are continued modifications in order to asymptotically approach the final answer. To a certain extent it is this mentality that has guided the development of big-bang cosmology and has therefore, as Oldershaw points out, successfully blurred the distinction between theory and fact.

All this directs attention to the prime question to be settled concerning big bang cosmology, and in particular the one that is the focus of all the papers in this series: Is it a physical theory in the modern sense of the term, or is it rather a beautiful mathematical abstraction that has no relevance to the real universe we inhabit? In pursuing this topic further in this paper it is expedient to quote another part of Oldershaw’s article, for it emphasizes just what criteria must be used if the big bang is to qualify as a genuine physical theory [1]:

*The **sine qua non** of physical science is empirical testing of hypotheses. Without this acid test we would have no way of distinguishing scientific gold from fool’s gold and we might come to view ourselves as being quite rich when, in fact, our pockets were mostly full of pretty, but non-negotiable, iron pyrite.*

Parts 1 and 2 of this series have already spotlighted internal contradictions and other aspects of the big bang which could not be confirmed when tested by comparison with empirical data. Thus we already have strong evidence to suggest that the big bang is actually only an elaborate mathematical abstraction rather than a physical theory.

This paper considers another contradiction that has gone unnoticed until now. Reference is made to MTW’s venerable text, *Gravitation* [2]. A generation or more of physicists and cosmologists have looked to this text as

a highly respected authority on general relativity and cosmology. So it is appropriate to weigh its explanation of the expansion hypothesis against logic and commonly understood physical principles. On MTW's pages 739-740 the discussion centers on an attempt to find an answer to a rather elementary question about the physical implications of the expansion, namely:

"If every five seconds a volume of space is added to the universe ... about equal to the volume occupied by the Milky Way, where does that volume make its entry? Rather than look for an answer, one had better reexamine the question....(p.739). To speak of the "creation" of space is a bad way of speaking, and the original question is a bad question. The right way of speaking is to speak of a dynamic geometry. So much for one question!" (p.740)

The overtones of this "advice" from the authors seem almost Orwellian. Questions found at the root of the problem are labeled 'bad questions.' This is hardly an invitation for an open scientific inquiry. Stonewalling reasonable objections, however, rarely makes them disappear. Earlier on page 719 the authors expressed similar views:

"Of all the disturbing implications of 'the expansion of the universe,' none is more upsetting to many a student on first encounter than the nonsense of this idea. The universe expands, [but] ...Only distances between clusters of galaxies and greater distances are subject to the expansion. No model more quickly illustrates the actual situation than a rubber balloon with pennies affixed to it, each by a drop of glue. As the balloon is inflated the pennies increase their separation one from another but not a single one of them expands!" (p. 719)

Clearly, budding cosmology students' intuition was that spacetime expansion appeared to be so much nonsense at its very core. The reason for confusion is obvious. Confronting them was a very disturbing contradiction:

If spacetime expansion had caused separation of the galaxies, why didn't it also cause galaxies themselves to increase in size?

The expanding-balloon illustration describes the concept of "limited" expansion but does not explain why expansion ceases to operate within a galaxy. Nevertheless, cosmologists have utilized it for many decades. Peebles

concur with its long use by noting [3], “*The balloon analogy remains a standard device for explaining what the expansion of the universe means...*”.

This is evident in its wide use in popular accounts of big-bang cosmology. For example, Parker [4], in his attempted vindication of big bang cosmology, also cites the expanding balloon analogy to illustrate universal expansion. Like MTW, Parker also stresses that [4]: “*In the universe galaxies do not expand; only the space between them.*” But instead of pasting pennies on the surface, Parker refers to pasting small circles on the balloon’s surface, and in fact makes a special point of saying that “... *if you draw them [the circles] with a pen, the analogy will be incorrect because the dots will expand as the balloon expands.*” Interestingly, Parker does not provide any scientific justification for exempting the dots (galaxies) from the expansion.

Similarly, there is Peacock who, in his recent graduate level cosmology text, states [5]: “*In the common elementary demonstration of expansion by means of inflating a balloon, galaxies should be represented by glued-on coins, not ink drawings, (which will spuriously expand with the universe.)*” In much the same way that MTW used the terms, “*bad way of speaking*” and a “*bad question*”, here we find Peacock likewise discouraging inquiry into the expansion hypothesis by using the word “*spuriously,*” without making any attempt to show why expansion of the galaxies themselves should be considered a spurious occurrence.

Hawking also uses this illustration [6], but his version of it differs essentially from the usage of MTW, Parker, and Peacock. He compares Friedmann’s assumption of all galaxies moving directly away from each other with a “... *balloon with a number of spots painted on it being steadily blown up.*” Galaxies, as painted spots, would seem to be what Peacock describes as implying a spurious view of expansion, for it means that galaxies must continually increase in size, which is contrary to observation.

This difference over the essential features of the balloon illustration shows that something of extraordinary importance is missing from the preceding discussions. Physics is built on equations, not illustrations; illustrations simply give insight to the equations, and these are absent from the pennies-on-a-balloon illustration. It is presented as justification for constant galaxy sizes without any scientific substantiation whatsoever.

This lack of substantiation leads to the fundamental question: Is there any tangible experimental evidence that would prove that the universe is governed by spacetime expansion? More specifically, are there any experimental test results that would confirm that the relativistic structure of the universe is consistent with the Friedmann-Lemaitre expanding spacetime solution to the field equations? This is a prerequisite for the pennies-on-a-

balloon illustration to have any meaning in affirming big-bang cosmology as the correct theory of the cosmos.

It is certain that Schwarzschild's static solution to the field equations is consistent with the relativistic properties of the universe because, as further discussed in Part 5, it has become the general relativistic basis for the successful operation of the GPS [7]. And since the Schwarzschild static solution does not include the Friedmann-Lemaître hypothesis of time-dependent spatial coordinate expansion, it cannot be used to justify the expansion concept as portrayed in the balloon illustration. Thus, if the balloon illustration is going to convey anything meaningful about spacetime expansion, it should be independently supported by observable evidence. It certainly cannot be used to prove the universe is governed by expanding spacetime geometry when this is the assumption on which the illustration is based.

The preceding discussions focus on the dilemma that was obviously troubling the MTW graduate students first encountering the complexities of spacetime expansion. On one hand, the balloon illustration was authoritatively presented as that which should resolve their doubts about the reality of spacetime expansion. On the other hand, was the persistent question: Where are the equations that would justify spacetime expansion causing galaxies to separate to greater and greater distances, *without causing stars within the galaxies to separate to greater and greater distances?* MTW doesn't give these equations [2]. Peebles doesn't give them [3]. Neither does Parker [4], nor Peacock [5], nor Rees [8], nor Sandage [9], nor Narlikar [10], nor Harrison [11], nor Longair [12], nor Weinberg [13], nor Padmanabhan [14], nor Robertson and Noonan [15]. MTW [2] do cite a paper by Noerdlinger and Petrosian [16], but a close reading shows it is ambiguous in addressing the question of galactic expansion. Obviously the heavy hand of authority has prevailed, because a generation or more of budding cosmologists have continued to promote spacetime expansion using this illustration.

Clearly, if it were admitted that expansion works to enlarge the physical size of galaxies, as well as to expand the separation between them, then logic would say there should be no galaxies at all, for such expansion would long ago have equally separated stars to very great distances from each other, just as the galaxies themselves are now separated very great distances. Thus, ever since its inception, there has been hidden within the balloon illustration the requirement that expansion must have been exceedingly selective. But this requirement is easily shown to be contradictory because, if expansion existed at all, then by its very definition it must have acted impartially on all celestial entities, regardless of their masses.

Consequently, in order for big-bang cosmology to be perceived as a scien-

tific theory there has always been a crucial need for the balloon illustration to be accepted as validating the intricacies of expansion without its ever being critically analyzed. We do not deal with why the illustration's essential features remained unchallenged for so many decades but instead turn to the examination that has been missing for so long. In proceeding with this analysis significant contradictions are immediately apparent.

Using the spherical mass approximation for the Galaxy we can compare the gravitational force, $F_{GS} = -4\pi GM_{\odot}\rho_{avg}r_s/3$, exerted on the sun by the mass of the Galaxy interior to the sun's position, with the force, $F_{GC} = -GM_C^2/r_c^2$, between two large galactic clusters of mass M_C . If we assume each cluster contains about 500 galaxies the size of the Galaxy ($M_G = 2 \times 10^{11} M_{\odot}$) with a center-to-center separation of $r_c = 10^8$ ly, then the ratio $F_{GC}/F_{GS} \approx 10^{10}$, assuming $r_s \simeq 3 \times 10^4$ ly and $\rho_{avg} = 10^{-24}$ g cm⁻³.

This shows the attractive gravitational force between clusters to be about 10^{10} times greater than that which the interior mass of the Galaxy exerts on the sun. Moreover, since big-bang cosmology assumes galaxies were present when the universe was only 1/10 its present size, then the gravitational force between clusters would have been 10^{12} times greater than that within the Galaxy. Yet, according to big-bang theory and the balloon illustration, expansion somehow overcame these vastly larger gravitational attractions and caused the galaxies, or clusters of galaxies, to separate, while at the same time failing to cause the separation of the far more weakly gravitationally bound stars within the galaxies. Here is quantitative proof of the contradiction presented by the expansion hypothesis in general and the balloon illustration in particular. And the contradiction becomes progressively greater when considering big bang's earlier stages.

In particular, if gravity is going to be invoked to prevent galaxies themselves from increasing in size, then the much higher gravity in the big bang's earliest moments should have prevented any expansion whatsoever. This can be seen quantitatively by first calculating the gravitational field intensity, I , when the expansion was about the size of a dime [17] and the mass was at least 10^{82} erg, or about $m = 10^{61}$ g, as per Part 4 of this series. In this case $I = Gm/r^2 \approx 10^{54}$ dynes g⁻¹ for $r = 1$ cm. For comparison we can also calculate the field intensity that acts on a unit mass at the position of the solar system in the spiral arm of the Galaxy. If the average density of the Galaxy is assumed to be $\rho_{avg} \approx 10^{-24}$ g cm⁻³, then the field intensity is $I_G = 4\pi G\rho_{avg}r/3 \approx 7 \times 10^{-9}$ dynes g⁻¹ for $r_s \simeq 3 \times 10^4$ ly. The contradiction is undeniable. On one hand, gravity within a galaxy is theorized to prevent expansion from increasing a galaxy's size. On the other hand, expansion effects are presumed to have overcome gravitational field intensities that are

at least 10^{62} times greater than those within a galaxy.

If such vast forces of expansion ever existed, they would have worked not only to expand the sizes of galaxies but also to prevent their formation. That is, since expansion is presumed to cause ever-increasing separation of even the smallest particles, it would also have worked to cause ever-increasing separation of atoms of the big bang's presumed primordial H and He, thus inhibiting even the formation of stars. Without stars there would have been no galaxies, no sun, and no planet Earth. These results demonstrate that galaxies cannot form under the assumption that the expansion hypothesis has been governing the universe. This contradiction invalidates the balloon illustration, revealing it as perhaps one of the most seriously flawed illustrations ever used in modern science.

These results prove the balloon illustration and the expansion hypothesis are completely at odds with the existence of galaxies. Peebles [3] earlier attempted to defuse this embarrassing fact by referring to galaxy formation as being a puzzle, but not one that really threatens the validity of big-bang cosmology. Longair, on the other hand, is more forthright in listing some of the truly difficult problems that face any attempts to account for galaxy formation using expansion [18]. Trefil goes further, openly expressing extreme skepticism about the efforts of cosmologists and astrophysicists to solve the problem, and forthrightly emphasizes five reasons why "...*galaxies cannot exist...*" in the big bang scenario [19]. This article confirms Trefil's skepticism by concluding the existence of galaxies is *prima facie* evidence that the expansion hypothesis is false. Further, since expansion was the prop for the balloon illustration, its deflation brings us to the collapse of all that this illustration was intended to portray, including big bang's cornerstone expansion postulate.

We conclude, therefore, that the existence of galaxies provides two powerful Smoking Gun Signatures; first, that our universe knows nothing of big bang's spacetime expansion and secondly, that the GENESIS of our universe occurred far differently than modern cosmology has envisioned [20].

References

- [1] Robert L. Oldershaw, *Am. J. Phys.* **56**, 1075 (1988).
- [2] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, (W. H. Freeman & Company, 1973) pp. 719, 739-740.

- [3] P.J.E. Peebles, *Principles of Physical Cosmology* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1993), pp. 81, 608-610.
- [4] Barry Parker, *The Vindication of the Big Bang* (Plenum Press, 1993) pp. 70-74.
- [5] John A. Peacock, *Cosmological Physics*, (Cambridge University Press, 1999) p. 88.
- [6] Stephen Hawking, *A Brief History of Time* (Bantam Books, 1988) p. 42.
- [7] Neil Ashby and J. J. Spilker, Jr., Chapter 18 in *The Global Positioning System: Theory and Applications, Vol. 1*, eds. B. W. Parkinson and J. J. Spilker, Jr. (American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics Inc., Washington, DC, 1995)
- [8] M. J. Rees, *Perspectives in Astrophysical Cosmology*, (Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- [9] A. Sandage, *Practical Cosmology: Inventing The Past*, in *The Deep Universe*, eds. B. Binggeli and R. Buser (Springer, Berlin, 1995).
- [10] J. V. Narlikar, *Introduction to Cosmology* (Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- [11] E. R. Harrison, *Cosmology, The Science of the Universe* (Cambridge University Press, 1981).
- [12] Malcolm S. Longair, *The Physics of Background Radiation*, in *The Deep Universe*, eds. B. Binggeli and R. Buser (Springer, Berlin, 1995).
- [13] Steven Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology*, (John Wiley & Sons, 1972).
- [14] T. Padmanabahn, *Cosmology and Astrophysics Through Problems* (Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- [15] H. P. Robertson and Thomas Noonan, *Relativity and Cosmology* (W. B. Sanders Company, 1968).
- [16] P. D. Noerdlinger and V. Petrosian, *Ap. J.* **168**, 1 (1971).
- [17] P. J. E. Peebles et al., *Scientific American* **271**, 35 (1994).

- [18] M. S. Longair, *Our Evolving Universe* (Cambridge University Press, 1996) pp. 122-125.
- [19] James Trefil, *The Dark Side of the Universe* (Anchor Books, New York, 1988) pp. 55-66.
- [20] Many thanks to Dave Gentry for very useful discussions.