

Flaws In The Big Bang Point To **GENESIS**, A
New Millennium Model Of The Cosmos: Part 4 —
How Will The Scientific Community React To Big
Bang's Vast Nonconservation-of-Energy Losses?

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

28 February 2001

Abstract

In 1936 Hubble expressed his concern about astronomical redshifts and energy conservation: “*Obviously since the product [energy \times wavelength] remains constant, redshifts, by increasing wavelengths, must reduce the energy in the quanta. Any plausible interpretation of redshifts must account for the loss of energy.*” The scientific community rightly expects that big-bang cosmology resolved this concern consistent with energy conservation. Surprisingly, this did not happen. Instead, cosmologists exempted the big bang from energy conservation, but without saying how much was lost. This paper shows that, since $t = 1$ second after the big bang, expansion redshifting of CBR photons would have resulted in nonconservation-of-energy losses amounting to at least thirty million times the mass of the visible universe; moreover, losses continue at the rate of about a galactic mass every millennium. These results prove the big bang fails to match the physics of the real universe, that its expansion redshift hypothesis is fatally flawed, and hence that the big bang never possessed the qualifications necessary for being classified as a modern scientific theory.

Disney has noted many uncertainties in big-bang cosmology [1], but he did not question whether its basic postulates agree with known conservation laws. This fourth paper does this, specifically focusing on whether spacetime

expansion is consistent with conservation of energy. Concerning the relation between redshifts and photon energy, in 1936 Hubble wrote [2]:

“Obviously since the product [energy \times wavelength (= Planck’s constant \times c)] remains constant, redshifts, by increasing wavelengths, must reduce the energy in the quanta. Any plausible interpretation of redshifts must account for the loss of energy.”

Just how this loss could be reconciled with energy conservation did not become a major topic in physics in Hubble’s time. Nor has it since. Instead big bang’s expansion factor $a(t)$ has been *ex cathedra* granted the extraordinary ability to cause energy to disappear from the universe without providing an explanation as to how this happens. According to Peebles [3]:

“The second confusing point is the nature of the energy balance in the CBR. However, since the volume of the universe varies as $a(t)^3$, the net radiation energy in a closed universe decreases as $1/a(t)$ as the universe expands. Where does the lost energy go? ... The resolution of this apparent paradox is that while energy conservation is a good local concept,there is not a general global energy conservation law in general relativity theory.”

Harrison has likewise granted the same exemption. In his book, in a section titled, “*Where has the energy gone?*,” he states [4]:

“Radiation, freely moving particles, and gases lose energy in an expanding universe. Where does the energy go? We take it for granted that light is redshifted and usually do not concern ourselves about where its energy has gone....”

“Science clings tenaciously to concepts of conservation, the most fundamental of which is the conservation-of-energy principle....”

“The conservation-of-energy principle serves us well in all sciences except cosmology. ... To the questions where the energy goes in an expanding universe and where it comes from in a collapsing universe the answer is — nowhere, because in this one case energy is not conserved.”

Other cosmologists [5] affirm similar views. The scientific community believes all modern physical theories pass the test of energy conservation.

Yet here is proof that the big bang has been granted an exemption. Almost certainly the scientific community would long ago have expressed concern about this if cosmologists had publicized the magnitude of the expansion-induced energy loss. Their failure to do so is why this topic has remained in obscurity for so long. It appears my relatively recent reports were the first to give that calculation [6,7], which is repeated here.

Consider in particular the nonconservation-of-energy loss of CBR photons as in theory they were expansion-redshifted from 3000K at decoupling to the present 2.7K. In theory, if a photon was emitted at a wavelength λ_e at the time when the expansion factor was presumed to be some unknown value \mathfrak{R}_e —remember that the existence of this factor has never been verified—then its wavelength λ now at another unknown value, \mathfrak{R} , is presumed to be given by the expression $\lambda = \lambda_e(\mathfrak{R}/\mathfrak{R}_e)$. According to big bang theory the expansion ratio between the time of decoupling and the present is about 10^3 . In effect every photon is presumed to have had its wavelength expanded by a factor of 10^3 between that time and the present. On this basis it is possible to compute the energy lost in expansion from the expression relating a photon's wavelength with its energy, $\varepsilon = hc/\lambda$, where h and c are Planck's constant and the velocity of light, respectively. These expressions allow the computation of the expansion-induced radiation energy loss for the universe.

Assuming a universal volume, V_{univ} , of 15 billion ly radius, the 2.7K CBR having about $\bar{n} \simeq 410$ photons-cm $^{-3}$ with average photon energy of about $\bar{\varepsilon}_{2.7} = 10^{-15}$ erg [8,9], and the 3000K radiation with $\bar{\varepsilon}_{3000} = 1.13 \times 10^{-12}$ erg, and conservation of photon number, we compute the total CBR expansion-induced, nonconservation-of-energy loss as $E_{\text{exp}} = \bar{n} \times (\bar{\varepsilon}_{3000} - \bar{\varepsilon}_{2.7}) \times V_{\text{univ}} = 5.7 \times 10^{75}$ erg. This is about three times the mass of the present universe, estimated to be about 10^{20} solar masses. For an initial fireball temperature of 3 million K instead of 3000K, the total radiation energy loss would be three thousand times the mass of the universe. Further, since in theory photon number conservation extends back to at least a fireball temperature of 30 billion K [8,9], in this case the theorized nonconservation-of-energy loss projects to be a gargantuan thirty million times the mass of the visible universe. This same result also follows from Silk's discussion [8], where he notes that the average energy of a single blackbody photon at $t = 1$ second after the initial instant of the big bang is presumed to have been 2.3×10^6 eV, whereas it is now only about 6×10^{-4} eV.

Moreover, since expansion is theorized to be continuing, then the predicted energy loss must also be continuing. In theory a single photon's rate of energy loss is presumed to be $\dot{\varepsilon} = -hc\dot{\lambda}/\lambda$, from which it follows that the fractional rate of energy loss for a single photon is $\dot{\varepsilon}/\varepsilon = -(\dot{\mathfrak{R}}/\mathfrak{R}) =$

$-H$, where H is Hubble's constant. Thus the expected present rate of nonconservation-of-energy loss for the entire universe would be $\bar{n} \times V_{\text{univ}} \times \bar{\varepsilon}_{2.7} \times H_0 \approx 10^{55} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ for $H_0 = 68 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1} = 2.2 \times 10^{-18} \text{ s}^{-1}$. Thus, if spacetime expansion of CBR photons were a physical reality, then it would presently be causing an amount of energy equal to 1/10 the mass of our Galaxy to somehow disappear from the universe about every hundred years.

The above discussion dealt with radiation losses. In theory expansion also causes free particle energy losses [10]. Each particle's de Broglie wavelength, $\lambda = h/p$, where h is Planck's constant and p is the particle's momentum, is also hypothesized to increase due to expansion. In theory [10] free particles moving at nonrelativistic velocities will lose energy in proportion to \mathfrak{R}^{-2} , while relativistic particles will lose energy in proportion to \mathfrak{R}^{-1} . Robertson and Noonan acknowledge these losses to be such that [11]:

“We are forced to conclude that two contradictory principles hold: first, there is conservation of energy; and second, the energy in the universe is not constant.... This non-constancy of energy should come as no shock. [Earlier] it was found that a free particle which experiences no forces loses momentum in an expanding universe.”

Free particle energy loss with no applied forces is a huge contradiction of basic physics, and simultaneous acceptance of energy conservation and energy nonconservation is an unambiguous denial of the fundamental axiom of logic excluding the simultaneous acceptance of a proposition and its opposite. In their criticisms of the NRI [12], Carlip and Scranton (C&S) offered plausibility arguments in their attempts to defend these contradictions [13]:

“Gentry notes, correctly, that the electromagnetic energy of the cosmic microwave background is not conserved during expansion: in a volume expanding along with the universe, the radiation goes as $(1+z)^{-1}$, and the redshift represents a genuine loss of photon energy. But there is nothing particularly ‘cosmological’ about this loss — a photon rising in a static gravitational potential experiences a similar loss. In the laboratory, there is nothing mysterious about this phenomenon, which simply reflects the need to include gravitational potential energy in one’s accounting. Indeed, energy conservation can be used to derive the red shift.” (At this point in their report C&S cite Sect. 7.2 of ref. [10].)

There appears to be an inconsistency here. On one hand C&S say expansion's $(1+z)^{-1}$ energy reduction factor proves that CBR microwave energy

“... *is not conserved during expansion ...*”, and hence that the expansion “... *redshift represents a genuine loss of energy.*” This agrees with Peebles [3], Harrison [4], and Alpher and Herman [5]. On the other hand, C&S then seem to reverse themselves and attempt to realign expansion redshifts with energy conservation by associating them with gravitational redshifts, which do conserve energy.

This contradiction invalidates any conclusions C&S may wish to draw from this attempted realignment. Nevertheless they have raised an issue of even greater relevance to the question of the existence of spacetime expansion by claiming that the gravitational redshift is characterized by “... *a photon rising in a static gravitational potential experiences a similar energy loss.*” As noted above, C&S cite MTW’s section 7.2, “*The energy of the photon must decrease just as that of a particle does as it climbs out of a gravitational field...*” to support their claim of photon energy loss due to gravity.

Here we come to the crux of the issue regarding the reality of the spacetime expansion hypothesis. The central issue is whether the Friedmann-Lemaitre solution of the field equations actually matches the relativistic characteristics of the universe we inhabit.

If, as C&S [13] claim, photon energies do change as a photon traverses a gravitational potential gradient, this would agree with MTW’s description of the relativistic effects of the expansion hypothesis — namely, that expansion operates to cause wavelengths to increase while photons are in-flight but ceases to operate during emission and absorption [10]. If confirmed, this would prove the universe is relativistically governed in accord with the Friedmann-Lemaitre expanding spacetime solution of the field equations, which is big bang’s cornerstone postulate. So it has always been of critical importance for cosmologists to ascertain whether general relativistic effects cause photon wavelengths to change in-flight as the expansion hypothesis predicts. It has likewise always been of extreme importance for physics in general to determine if this is true because what is at stake is conservation of energy. If expansion is correct, then we live in a universe characterized by inconceivably large nonconservation-of-energy losses.

Nevertheless, in what may be one of the more significant oversights in modern science, *there appears to be no record where C&S — or any other cosmologists, for that matter — ever sought to determine whether photons actually do experience an in-flight change in wavelength, or energy, in passing through a gravitational potential gradient.* In other words, when C&S attempted to justify the existence of expansion redshifts by associating them with the gravitational redshift, they were unable to offer any firm evidence supporting this association. Instead, they appealed to the authority of MTW

[10] as substantiating the idea that the gravitational redshift is characterized as “... *a photon rising in a static gravitational potential experiences a similar energy loss* [13].” Part 5 of this series reveals this is likewise the position of many other highly respected authorities in cosmology and general relativity.

Despite this virtual unanimity, however, there is a great fallacy in the long held views about how photons interact with gravity. As will be seen in Part 5, the operation of the GPS proves that photons moving through a gravitational potential gradient do not change energy. This disproves any possibility of aligning expansion redshifts with energy conservation. The failure of cosmologists and general relativity theorists to recognize the cosmological implications of this experimental fact may now attract attention because there is no middle ground; expansion and energy conservation are mutually exclusive. In the final analysis, the fatal defect in the expansion hypothesis cannot be hidden. Expansion redshifts must be fictitious because they violate conservation of energy. And fictitious expansion redshifts can only mean that the big bang itself is a fictitious theory.

- **Summary**

Spacetime expansion not only violates conservation of energy, it does so in a way that the radiation energy losses are so large as to be incomprehensible. Part 5 in this series shows there is no way out of this contradiction. There we discuss the experimental data which prove that photons do not exchange energy with the field when passing through a gravitational potential gradient. This fact excludes all possibility of attributing expansion’s energy loss to an energy exchange with the gravitational field in an expanding cosmos.

By using the accepted standard by which all modern theories must be tested, big bang cosmology fails when tested against consistency with conservation of energy. By every principle of modern physics it is a falsified theory. Thus, despite its wide acclaim, in reality it never possessed the qualifications needed to be classified as a physical theory. Its nonconservation-of-energy losses are so vast — and its logical contradictions so great — that they surely indicate there must be a fatal flaw in the expansion hypothesis [14]. And if we look carefully, we expect that it should be found. The next paper in this series examines this topic in detail.

References

- [1] M. J. Disney, arXiv:astro-ph/0009020.
- [2] Edwin Hubble, *The Realm of the Nebulae* (Yale University Press, 1936) p. 121.
- [3] P.J.E. Peebles, *Principles of Physical Cosmology* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1993), p. 139.
- [4] E. R. Harrison, *Cosmology, The Science of the Universe* (Cambridge University Press, 1981) pp. 275-276.
- [5] Robert A. Alpher and Robert Herman, *Early work on 'big bang' cosmology and the cosmic blackbody radiation*, in *Modern Cosmology In Retrospect* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990), p. 152.
- [6] Robert V. Gentry and David W. Gentry, arXiv:gr-qc/9806061.
- [7] Robert V. Gentry, arXiv:physics/9810051.
- [8] Malcolm S. Longair, *The Physics of Background Radiation*, in *The Deep Universe*, eds. B. Binggeli and R. Buser (Springer, Berlin, 1995), pp. 426-432.
- [9] Joseph Silk, *The Big Bang* (W. H. Freeman & Co., Revised ed. 1989) pp. 423-425.
- [10] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, (W. H. Freeman & Company, 1973) pp. 187.
- [11] H. P. Robertson and Thomas Noonan, *Relativity and Cosmology* (W. B. Sanders Company, 1968) pp. 355-356.
- [12] Robert V. Gentry, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **12** (1997) 2919; arXiv:astro-ph/9806280.
- [13] Steven Carlip and Ryan Scranton, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **14** (1999) 71; arXiv:astro-ph/9808021.
- [14] Many thanks to Dave Gentry for useful discussions.